

Who's MAWO?

Mobilization Against War and Occupation is a coalition of over 50 endorsing organizations and also individual members, most of which are working class organizations, student groups, grassroots organizations, and ethnic communities. This is including Indigenous activists and groups from the third world as well as women, youth and elder fighters for social justice and against war and occupation. We are the people in struggle because we are people that suffer at the hands of imperialism. We have the energy, drive and will for change because it is in our interest to make this change in order to create a better world for all of humanity!

Get involved



with MAWO!

Meetings & Forums on Tuesdays - 7:00PM

For location, please visit our website:

mawovancouver.org

e. info@mawovancouver.org

t. 604-322-1764

f. 604-322-1763

*** Next Organizing Meeting ***

TUESDAY November 4 at 7 pm

**Britannia Community Center - Learning Resource Centre
1661 Napier Street**

MAWO Newsletter #51 Created by: Tamara Hansen, Alison Bodine and Ali Yerevani

Who is Private Manning "Soldier of Humanity"?

To find out more about the case of whistleblower Private Manning, pick up a brochure and petition from a MAWO info table or download one from our website www.mawovancouver.org

TERRORISM IN CANADA OR BY CANADA?

ANTI-WAR FORUM + DISCUSSION
**TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 18TH
7PM @ JOE'S CAFE** 1150 COMMERCIAL DR

@MAWO VAN
MOBILIZATION AGAINST WAR + OCCUPATION
WWW.MAWOVANCOUVER.ORG



stop the war! stop the occupations!

www.mawovancouver.org

MAWO 51

newsletter

1st Edition

October 2014

mobilization against war & occupation

**NO TO ANOTHER U.S. WAR IN IRAQ!
CANADA HANDS OFF IRAQ AND SYRIA!
NO TO ALL FORMS OF TERRORISM!
- MAWO IRAQ STATEMENT -
October 24, 2014**

Since the beginning of June 2014, the open wounds of Iraq caused by sanctions, wars and occupations have grown deeper. This is when the Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS, also known as ISIL) began an onslaught against Iraq, establishing control of important border crossings, cities and territories in Iraq through terrorist actions directed against Iraqi civilians. As of June 29, ISIS had taken control of Iraq's second largest city, Mosul, and declared a "Caliphate" state in the areas under their control in Northern Iraq in opposition to the Iraqi state. Fighting between ISIS and the Iraqi military forces continues, imposing more violence and destruction on the people of Iraq who are already facing the daily reality of a country devastated by over 11 years of U.S.-led war and occupation.

In response to the ISIS terrorist attacks, the U.S. government has sent 770 troops (with the possibility of many thousands more to be sent) into Iraq. The majority of them, 470, are charged with security of the gigantic U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. The remaining have been assigned as so-called 'military advisers' to assess the training and condition of the Iraqi Army which the U.S. government built-up and trained as part of the ongoing occupation of Iraq. Increased U.S. troop presence in Iraq has been accompanied by F-18 jets, Apache helicopters and drones on surveillance missions and their influence has been expanded to also include the protection of Iraq's main airport in Baghdad.

The U.S. government has justified their increased troop presence by claiming that they are sending troops and military equipment to Iraq in order to help bolster the efforts of the Iraqi army in their fight against ISIS and to help Iraq achieve stability. But how is this possible when, in fact, it is the U.S. government itself that is the biggest destabilization and terrorist force in Iraq? U.S.-led war, occupation, destruction in Iraq over more than 20 years has caused the deaths of at least 3 million people. 500,000 children alone were killed by 12 years of devastating U.S. sanctions that began in the 1990s. Sanctions were followed by 11 years of the occupation which began with the March 2003 carpet bombing and invasion and continues on to today. This occupation has resulted in the complete destruction of medical, educational and sanitary infrastructure, with all factors of quality of life in Iraq plummeting under the assault of the full force of the U.S. military.

These are the open wounds in Iraq created by the US government and their allies. But, really, the question must be asked: what are the roots of an organization like ISIS? First of all, ISIS is the product U.S.-led war and sanctions, that combined left Iraq broken and divided. Western occupying forces utilized the age-old strategy of 'divide and conquer' as they fomented a bloody sectarian war in Iraq that turned brothers into enemies in order to defeat a powerful Iraqi resistance to U.S./U.K occupation. ISIS has also benefited from Western military, financial and covert intervention in Syria. They are one of the many so-called rebel forces in Syria that operate with the support and backing of the U.S. government, and funding and support from U.S.-allies Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait. On top of this, it is also clear who is benefiting from the ISIS attacks on Iraq. The U.S. government and their allies need an unstable and divided Iraq in order to continue their occupation,

resource theft and struggle for complete hegemony in the Middle East.

Mobilization Against War and Occupation - MAWO is standing with antiwar coalitions and peace-loving people around the world in demanding "No to Another U.S. War in Iraq!" What the people of Iraq need is not more U.S. troops, drones and war-planes; the people of Iraq demand their self-determination. People in Iraq are completely capable of defending themselves against any foreign intervention including ISIS. The march of ISIS is not the result of a sectarian battle in Iraq, as Western media might have us all believe. It is the product of imperialist intervention in Iraq, Syria and across the Middle East. It is the result of the new era of war and occupation that began with the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001.

While MAWO condemns the recent tragic terrorist actions in Ottawa and Quebec, including the attack on Parliament Hill, which resulted in the loss of two innocent and unarmed soldiers, however, this should not distract us from the terrorism which the government of Canada is responsible for against the hundreds of thousands of innocent people of Iraq and Syria. Canada is now sending six CF-18 fighters, two surveillance aircrafts, an air-to-air tanker and 600 military personnel to take part in air strikes on Iraq. The government of Canada is also responsible for terrorizing the people of Afghanistan with over 13 years of war and occupation. As well, the terrorism that has been inflicted upon indigenous people in Canada for hundreds of years by all administrations and governments both before and after Canada's foundation as a modern state still remains unaccounted for.

The acts of terrorism in Ottawa and Quebec are only made more tragic as they are being used to justify the government of Canada's war drive and the further killing of innocent people under war, occupation and military aggression for the sole purpose of colonization of third world countries. Military aggression by the Government of Canada against Iraq and Syria is the continuation of their participation of wars and the brutalization of former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Libya. Since the beginning of the new era of war and occupation all governments of Canada have participated in joint terrorist actions against colonial and semi-colonial countries. Now, the government of Canada, a terrorist itself, is trying to scare working and oppressed people in Canada about the danger of "home-grown" terrorism "The only purpose of this fear-mongering is to allow the government to rule in an atmosphere of fear and suspicion; to justify their further military aggression abroad; and to severely limit democratic, human rights, and civil liberties in Canada in an attempt to suppress voices of decent and opposition at home.

MAWO is committed to continuing to organize against any forms of imperialist intervention in Iraq and Syria. We oppose the Harper regime's use of fear mongering and Islamophobia, especially after the recent tragedies, to justify further wars and occupations. We invite all peace-loving people to join our peaceful direct actions to demand:

No to Another U.S. War on Iraq! U.S./Canada Out of Iraq Now! U.S./Canada Hands Off Syria Now! Stop bombing Iraq and Syria!

**U.S./FRANCE/CANADA & ALL IMPERIALISTS
HANDS OFF IRAQ!
NO TO NEW U.S. WAR ON IRAQ!
U.S. & CANADA HANDS OFF SYRIA!
End the Blockade of Cuba!**

MONTHLY ANTIWAR RALLY & PETITION CAMPAIGN

**SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 22, 2014 1PM
Vancouver Art Gallery
Robson St & Hornby St, Downtown Vancouver**

MOBILIZATION AGAINST WAR & OCCUPATION - MAWO @MAWO_VAN
WWW.MAWOVANCOUVER.ORG

ARTICLE BY FIDEL CASTRO

THAT WHICH CAN NEVER BE FORGOTTEN

• THOUGHTS BY COMPAÑERO FIDEL REGARDING AN ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN THE SUNDAY EDITION OF THE THE NEW YORK TIMES, WHICH EVALUATES THE PATH THE COUNTRY SHOULD FOLLOW IN RELATION TO ITS POLICY TOWARD CUBA, IN THE OPINION OF THE NEWSPAPER

Reprinted from: www.granma.cu

Yesterday morning, on Sunday October 12, the Sunday internet edition of The New York Times – a newspaper which under certain circumstances follows the political line most convenient to its country’s interests – published an article entitled “Obama should end the embargo on Cuba;” with opinions as to how, in its view, the country should proceed.

There are times when such articles are written by some prestigious journalist, such as someone I had the privilege of meeting personally during the first days of our struggle in the Sierra Maestra with the remainder of a unit which had been almost totally eliminated by Batista’s air force and army. We were at that time quite inexperienced; we didn’t even realize that giving the impression of strength to the press would be something that could merit critique.

That is not what the brave war correspondent, Herbert Matthews, thought with a story which made his name during the difficult times of the fight against fascism.

Our supposed fighting ability in February 1957 was a little less, but still more than sufficient to wear down and overthrow the regime.

Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, leader of the People’s Socialist Party, was witness to what, after the Battle of Jigüe in which an entire unit of select troops were forced to surrender after 10 days of combat, I expressed regarding my fear that the regime’s forces would surrender in July 1958, when the elite troops hastily retreated from the Sierra Maestra, despite being trained and equipped by our northern neighbors. We had discovered an effective way of defeating them.

I could not help but expand a little on this point as I wished to explain the spirit with which I read the aforementioned article of the U.S. newspaper, last Sunday. I will cite the most important parts in quotations:

“Scanning a map of the world must give President Obama a sinking feeling as he contemplates the dismal state of troubled bilateral relationships his administration has sought to turn around. He would be smart to take a hard look at Cuba, where a major policy shift could yield a significant foreign policy success.

“For the first time in more than 50 years, shifting politics in the United States and changing policies in Cuba make it politically feasible to re-establish formal diplomatic relations and dismantle the senseless embargo. The Castro regime has long blamed the embargo for its shortcomings, and has kept ordinary Cubans largely cut off from the world. Mr. Obama should seize this opportunity to end a long era of enmity and help a population that has suffered enormously since Washington ended diplomatic relations in 1961, two years after Fidel Castro assumed power.

“...a devastated economy has forced Cuba to make reforms — a process that has gained urgency with the economic crisis in Venezuela, which gives Cuba heavily subsidized oil. Officials in Havana, fearing that Venezuela could cut its aid, have taken significant steps to liberalize and diversify the island’s tightly controlled economy.

“They have begun allowing citizens to take private-sector jobs and own property. This spring, Cuba’s National Assembly passed a law to encourage foreign investment in the country. With Brazilian capital, Cuba is building a seaport, a major project that will be economically viable only if American sanctions are lifted. And in April, Cuban diplomats began negotiating a co-operation agreement with the European Union. They have shown up at the initial meetings prepared, eager and mindful that the Europeans will insist on greater reforms and freedoms.

“The authoritarian government still harasses and detains dissidents. It has yet to explain the suspicious circumstances surrounding the death of the political activist Oswaldo Payá.”

As you can see a slanderous and cheep accusation.

“Travel restrictions were relaxed last year, enabling prominent dissidents to travel abroad. There is slightly more tolerance for criticism of the leadership, though many fear speaking



openly and demanding greater rights.

“The pace of reforms has been slow and there has been backsliding. Still, these changes show Cuba is positioning itself for a post-embargo era. The government has said it would welcome renewed diplomatic relations with the United States and would not set preconditions.

“As a first step, the Obama administration should remove Cuba from the State Department’s list of nations that sponsor terrorist organizations, which includes Iran, Sudan and Syria. Cuba was put on the list in 1982 for backing terrorist groups in Latin America, which it no longer does. American officials recognize that Havana is playing a constructive role in the conflict in Colombia by hosting peace talks between the government and guerrilla leaders.

“Starting in 1961, Washington has imposed sanctions in an effort to oust the Castro regime. Over the decades, it became clear to many American policy makers that the embargo was an utter failure. But any proposal to end the embargo angered Cuban-American voters, a constituency that has had an outsize role in national elections (...)The generation that adamantly supports the embargo is dying off. Younger Cuban-Americans hold starkly different views, having come to see the sanctions as more damaging than helpful. A recent poll found that a slight majority of Cuban-Americans in Miami now oppose the embargo. A significant majority of them favor restoring diplomatic ties, mirroring the views of other Americans.

“Cuba and the United States already have diplomatic missions, called interests sections, which operate much like embassies. However, under the current arrangement, American diplomats have few opportunities to travel outside the capital to engage with ordinary Cubans, and their access to the Cuban government is very limited.

“The Obama administration in 2009 took important steps to ease the embargo, a patchwork of laws and policies, making it easier for Cubans in the United States to send remittances to relatives in Cuba and authorizing more Cuban-Americans to travel there. And it has paved the way for initiatives to expand Internet access and cell phone coverage on the island.

“For instance, it could lift caps on remittances, allow Americans to finance private Cuban businesses and expand opportunities for travel to the island.

“It could also help American companies that are interested in developing the island’s telecommunications network but remain wary of the legal and political risks..

“Failing to engage with Cuba now will likely cede this market to competitors. The presidents of China and Russia traveled to Cuba in separate visits in July, and both leaders pledged to expand ties.

“It would better position Washington to press the Cubans on democratic reforms, and could stem a new wave of migration to the United States driven by hopelessness.

“Closer ties could also bring a breakthrough on the case of an American development contractor, Alan Gross, who has been unjustly imprisoned by Cuba for nearly five years. More broadly, it would create opportunities to empower ordinary Cubans, gradually eroding the government’s ability to control their lives.

“...Western Hemisphere heads of state will meet in Panama City for the seventh Summit of the Americas. Latin American governments insisted that Cuba, the Caribbean’s most populous island and one of the most educated societies in the hemisphere, be invited, breaking with its traditional exclusion at the insistence of Washington.

“Given the many crises around the world, the White House may want to avoid a major shift in Cuba policy. Yet engaging with Cuba and starting



September 16, 2014

President Barack Obama announced Sept.10 that the U.S. military would build an international coalition to make “war on the Islamic State.” He said there were already 10 countries in this coalition. Administration spokespeople on the Sept. 14 Sunday morning talk shows said they were still building the coalition. The next morning a conference of 30 countries opened in Paris on this theme.

The electronic media and the pages of major newspapers — the New York Times, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times and Christian Science Monitor, for example — were filled with debate on Obama’s new war policy. Active and retired Pentagon officers, State Department officials, policy strategists from the imperialist think tanks and op-ed writers all put out their critiques of Obama’s strategy of opening another long U.S. war while promising no U.S. “boots on the ground.”

Arguments raged from “just right” to “too little, too late,” with only a few saying “no way.” Many of the retired officers — for example, General Jack Keane, who urges a policy even more aggressive than what Obama proposes — are currently sitting on the boards of military contractors. That’s one sector of U.S. capitalism that gains from war, whichever way the battle goes.

That this debate is going on in front of the public reflects hesitations within the U.S. ruling class about the wisdom of waging yet another open-ended U.S. war of conquest in West Asia. More important than reviewing their arguments is the need to stress what this debate is really about: They are discussing what foreign policy will best defend and expand the strategic and economic interests of the U.S. ruling class.

What’s at stake are the interests of the richest one hundredth of the 1%, those who own the oil companies, the weapons industry, the banks and the other major monopolies. To the debaters, this tiny but super-wealthy and powerful group’s interests are paramount.

Far from aiding Syrians or Iraqis, U.S. imperialism’s aims are antagonistic to the interests of the masses of people there. Washington’s new war also has nothing to do with defending the interests of the working class in the United States. It will not protect the Black people of Ferguson, Mo., from racist cops. It will not protect workers from low wages and layoffs. There is already talk of raising the Pentagon budget, thereby exempting it from sequester cuts imposed on the federal budget.

What U.S. policy did

to unlock the potential of its citizens could end up being among the administration’s most consequential foreign-policy legacies.

“Normalizing relations with Havana would improve Washington’s relationships with governments in Latin America, and resolve an irritant that has stymied initiatives in the hemisphere.”

“...The Obama administration is leery of Cuba’s presence at the meeting and Mr. Obama has not committed to attending.

“He must — and he should see it as an opportunity to make history.”

One of the most educated societies in the hemisphere!!!! This is indeed recognition. But why doesn’t it mention this straight away, that in no way is this society comparable to that which Harry S. Truman bequeathed to us when his ally and great public treasury looter Fulgencio Batista took power on March 10, 1952, only 50 days after the general election. This can never be forgotten.

The article is obviously written with great skill,

Starting with the war in 1991 and the subsequent sanctions against the Iraqi people, followed by the invasion in 2003 that led to eight years of occupation, U.S. war crimes tore Iraqi society apart. U.S.-led wars and sanctions killed between 1 million and 2 million people. They demolished Iraq’s economic infrastructure and drove 5 million more into exile. U.S. occupation policies divided Iraqi society and provoked a sectarian civil war.

Washington and its allies in NATO and West Asia have also caused great loss of life and destruction in Syria. NATO, including Turkey, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf monarchies, weaponized the groups fighting the Syrian government. Most arms wound up in the hands of groups like al-Nusrah Front and ISIS (also called ISIL or just I.S.). Hundreds of thousands of people were killed; millions became refugees. Without NATO and Saudi Arabian aid, ISIS would have stayed local.

Various media claim that the repeated showing of two reporters from the U.S. and one from Britain being executed by ISIS have whipped up some popular fervor for “revenge” — although this mood falls short of support for another Iraq-type war.

While popular revulsion to the televised beheadings is understandable, think of what U.S. imperialism has done. U.S. weapons killed millions of Iraqis and Syrians. They, like the reporters, were victims of terror.

Much ruling-class debate involves what relationship the U.S. should have with the governments of Syria and Iran. Washington has demonized these two governments and steadily worked to overthrow Bashar al-Assad in Syria and sabotage the economy of Iran. Yet both Syria and Iran have been on the front lines fighting against ISIS.

So far, U.S. spokespeople insist they will make no agreements with Syria or Iran. Actually, there is good reason to suspect that — should the “war on ISIS” be successful — it will quickly morph into a U.S. war against Syria.

It is the pinnacle of imperialist arrogance to pose, as many have in the ruling-class debate, the question: “Should the U.S. help resolve the conflicts in the Middle East?”

Washington’s past interventions have brought only misery and suffering to the region. From the point of view of the interests of all the people involved in the region, as well as those of the working class here, the only thing the U.S. can rightly do is get out, stay out and pay reparations to rebuild what it has wrecked.

By John Catalinotto

Originally appeared on: www.iacenter.org

seeking the greatest benefit for U.S. policy in a complex situation, in the midst of increasing political, economic, financial and commercial problems. To these are added the effects of rapid climate change; commercial competition; the speed, precision and destructive power of weapons which threaten the survival of mankind. What is written today has a very different connotation to that which was written just 40 years ago when our planet was already forced to stockpile and withhold water and food from the equivalent of half the world’s current population. This without mentioning the fight against Ebola which is threatening the health of millions of people.

Add to this that in a few days the global community will reveal before the United Nations whether it agrees with the blockade against Cuba or not.

Fidel Castro Ruz

October 13, 2014 - 8:30 p.m.