

# OMNI NEWSLETTER, SPECIAL NUMBER ON NATIONALISM, IMPERIALISM, MILITARISM, FLAG PATRIOTISM, Building a Culture of Peace, SEPTEMBER 20, 2007

**Compiled by Dick Bennett**      The last newsletter on these subjects appeared on July 3, 2007.

These writings are intended to assist in calling and writing letters to friends, to our Congressional delegates and other Cong. representatives, and to newspaper editors, to defend a government of, by, and for WE, THE PEOPLE.

## CHECKBOOK IMPERIALISM

[http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/20070918\\_checkbook\\_imperialism\\_the\\_blackwater\\_fiasco/](http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/20070918_checkbook_imperialism_the_blackwater_fiasco/)

> "Checkbook Imperialism: The Blackwater Fiasco"

>> By Robert Scheer

> Truthdig: September 18, 2007

>

> Please, please, I tell myself, leave Orwell out of it.

> Find some other, fresher way to explain why "Operation

> Iraqi Freedom" is dependent upon killer mercenaries.

> Or why the "democratically elected government" of

> "liberated" Iraq does not explicitly have the legal

> power to expel Blackwater USA from its land or hold any

> of the 50,000 private contractor troops that the U.S.

> government has brought to Iraq accountable for their

> deadly actions.

>

> Were there even the faintest trace of Iraqi

> independence rising from the ashes of this failed

> American imperialist venture, Blackwater would have to

> fold its tents and go, if only in the interest of

> keeping up appearances. After all, the Iraqi Interior

> Ministry claimed that the Blackwater thugs guarding a

> U.S. State Department convoy through the streets of

> Baghdad fired "randomly at citizens" in a crowded

> square on Sunday, killing 11 people and wounding 13

> others. So the Iraqi government has ordered Blackwater

> to leave the country after what a government spokesman

> called a "flagrant assault ... on Iraqi citizens."

>

> But who told those Iraqi officials that they have the

> power to control anything regarding the 182,000

> privately contracted personnel working for the U.S. in

> Iraq? Don't they know about Order 17, which former

> American proconsul Paul Bremer put in place to grant

> contractors, including his own Blackwater bodyguards,

> immunity from Iraqi prosecution? Nothing has changed

> since the supposed transfer of power from the Coalition

> Provisional Authority, which Bremer once headed, to the

> Iraqi government holed up in the Green Zone and guarded

> by Blackwater and other "private" soldiers.  
>  
> They are "private" in the same fictional sense that our  
> uniformed military is a "volunteer" force, since both  
> are lured by the dollars offered by the same paymaster,  
> the U.S. government. Contractors earn substantially  
> more, despite \$20,000 to \$150,000 signing bonuses and  
> an all-time-high average annual cost of \$100,000 per  
> person for the uniformed military. All of this was  
> designed by the neocon hawks in the Pentagon to pursue  
> their dreams of empire while avoiding a conscripted  
> army, which would have millions howling in the street  
> by now in protest.  
>  
> Instead, **we have checkbook imperialism.** The U.S.  
> government purchases whatever army it needs, which has  
> led to the dependence upon private contract firms like  
> Blackwater USA, with its \$300-million-plus contract to  
> protect U.S. State Department personnel in Iraq. That  
> is why the latest Blackwater incident, which Prime  
> Minister Nouri al-Maliki branded a "crime," is so  
> difficult to deal with. Iraqis are clearly demanding  
> to rid their country of Blackwater and other  
> contractors, and on Tuesday the Iraqi government said  
> it would be scrutinizing the status of all private  
> security firms working in the country.  
>  
> But the White House hopes the outrage will once again  
> blow over. As the Associated Press reported on Monday:  
> "The U.S. clearly hoped the Iraqis would be satisfied  
> with an investigation, a finding of responsibility and  
> compensation to the victim's families-and not insist on  
> expelling a company that the Americans cannot operate  
> here without." Or, as Ambassador Ryan Crocker testified  
> to the U.S. Senate last week: "There is simply no way  
> at all that the State Department Bureau of Diplomatic  
> Security could ever have enough full-time personnel to  
> staff the security function in Iraq. There is no  
> alternative except through contracts."  
>  
> Consider the irony of that last statement-that the U.S.  
> experiment in building democracy in Iraq is dependent  
> upon the same garrisons of foreign mercenaries that  
> drove the founders of our own country to launch the  
> American Revolution. As George Washington warned in  
> his farewell address, once the American government  
> enters into these "foreign entanglements," we lose the  
> Republic, because public accountability is sacrificed  
> to the necessities of war for empire.  
>

- > Despite the fact that Blackwater USA gets almost all of
- > its revenue from the U.S. government-much of it in no-
- > bid contracts aided, no doubt, by the lavish
- > contributions to the Republican Party made by company
- > founder Erik Prince and his billionaire parents-its
- > operations remain largely beyond public scrutiny.
- > Blackwater and others in this international security
- > racket operate as independent states of their own,
- > subject neither to the rules of Iraq nor the ones that
- > the U.S. government applies to its own uniformed
- > forces. "We are not simply a 'private security
- > company,' " Blackwater boasts on its corporate website.
- > "We are a professional military, law enforcement,
- > security, peacekeeping, and stability operations firm.
- > ... We have become the most responsive, cost-effective
- > means of affecting the strategic balance in support of
- > security and peace, and freedom and democracy
- > everywhere."
- >
- > Yeah, so who elected you guys to run the world?

## WILLIAM BLUM

*Anti-Empire Report*, September 11, 2007

<http://killinghope.org/aer49.htm>

*Anti-Empire Report*, August 10, 2007

<http://killinghope.org/aer48.htm>

*"Anti-Empire Report,"* July 9, 2007

<http://killinghope.org/aer47.htm>

## NEXT US WARS, REPLACING THE UN, THINK TANK AND MEDIA SUPPORT FOR EMPIRE (in a racy style)

“The Architecture of Perpetual War”

by Werther

Of late, many of the nation’s literati have preoccupied themselves with a mendacious *New York Times* op-ed column by a couple of think tank hacks named Michael O’Hanlon and Kenneth Pollack, the burden of which is that, by golly, the glorious Surge really is working. Of course, the whole thing was a put-up job, sold on the man-bites-dog pretence that the two authors were longtime critics of the Bush administration who had gone to Iraq and seen the light. Their performance [is deftly skewered here](#).

But as edifying as it might be for us to wallow in the discrediting of Messrs. O’Hanlon and Pollack, the piece is rather unimportant in itself – merely one of a thousand bits of semi-official war propaganda, essentially backward-looking as it attempts to vindicate the disastrous decision to invade and occupy Iraq. Our eyes alighted upon a more fruitful field for analysis in the form of a column by two other think

tank hacks, Ivo Daalder of the Brookings Institution (not coincidentally, the place of employment for Mr. O'Hanlon as well), and Robert Kagan of the catastrophically misnamed Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The piece is ominously titled "[The Next Intervention](#)." Just when we thought two cloddishly mismanaged wars at the same time in Iraq and Afghanistan might chill the American appetite for military intervention, the authors rush to assure us that the dreadful prospect of a few years of peace can be safely ruled out. Why? "Despite the problems and setbacks in Iraq and Afghanistan, America remains the world's dominant military power, spends half a trillion dollars a year on defense and faces no peer strong enough to deter it if it chooses to act." Might makes right apparently. Rather than fighting on behalf of some morally unimpeachable cause, the principal reason the authors advance for going to war is because we can do it. This is, in fact, the opposite of "peace through strength," and suggests that critics of Pentagon spending were right all along in their assertion that more spending equals more war.

Mindful of the idiotic way in which the Bush administration handled diplomacy in the run-up to their Mesopotamian *Blitzkrieg*, the authors concede that getting other countries to sign off on our wars is a good thing. For one thing, it sells war to the Better Sort of People in America (the ones who shop at Whole Foods, watch PBS, can find foreign countries on a map, and are likely to be reading one's op-ed in the *Washington Post*): "It matters to Americans, who want to believe they are acting justly and are troubled if others accuse them of selfish, immoral or otherwise illegitimate behavior." Horrors, the mortification of being accused, as a right-thinking American, of such low-class behavior! As well to receive a nasty letter from one's homeowner's association berating one for not cutting the lawn. After all, if the Frogs are on board as well as the Brits, it makes the war more Atlanticist and gives everyone a dose of righteous nostalgia for the Euro-American solidarity of the cold war.

But the problem, as Messrs. Daalder and Kagan see it, is that damned United Nations. We aren't ever likely again to be in a situation like 1950, when the Russians boycotted the Security Council, so there will always be a permanent member able and willing to veto a U.S. military intervention. We need to overcome this problem because, as the authors pompously remind us, "Toppling Saddam Hussein was a just act and therefore was inherently legitimate." That is no doubt a great comfort to the next of kin of the 600,000 or so "excess mortalities" that the British medical journal *Lancet* estimates have occurred pursuant to the U.S. invasion.

The solution? – a "Concert of the Democracies" to replace the United Nations. One can almost hear the director cuing the inspirational music, à la the "Why We Fight" series. Nowhere, of course, do the authors define what a democracy is. If it means majoritarianism via one-man-one-vote, then the U.S. Senate and the Electoral College would have difficulty passing muster. If it means the rule of law maintained by such bedrock principles as habeas corpus, there will be a lot of embarrassed coughing behind the hand in Washington's think tanks.

Even on more practical grounds, one can find insuperable problems with this scheme. One could point to any number of indubitable democracies in Latin America that, from bitter experience, would hesitate a long time before giving a blank check to Washington to intervene wherever it liked. In all likelihood, the authors' vision, were it ever realized, would amount to no more than the same "coalition of the willing" we have in Iraq, i.e., a smallish group of subservient and/or well-bribed countries. It has, in fact, always been the administration's preference to act as the *capo* among a group of clients, rather than as one sovereign country dealing with others of the same status. The op-ed piece so neatly fits the administration's line, in fact, that it might as well have been drafted in the White House basement.

Much has been written about the military industrial complex: its obscene cost overruns; the corrupt relations between the uniformed military, the contractors, and Congress; the wild threat inflation. Too

little studied has been the role of ostensibly non-partisan think tanks as the semi-official propaganda arm of the complex, and as the transmission belt of propaganda themes between the government and the prestige press. While the activity of the American Enterprise Institute as a propaganda organ is widely known because of its tub-thumping for the Iraq war and its championing of Iranian spy Achmed Chalibi, the same charge applies, to a greater or lesser degree, to most of the "prestige" think tanks: Brookings, Carnegie, CSIS, the Hudson Institute, etc.

They are an integral part of the government's two-track propaganda machine for selling war. For the downscale end of the market, Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, or Michael Savage will do nicely. Their braying voices and crude arguments are finely calibrated to reach every low-status white male out in satellite dish country. The notion that it's even theoretically a good idea to have world opinion on America's side before it embarks on war would be derided as sissy stuff in such precincts. One recalls the eve of the Iraq war, when the visceral hatred of the French in the Murdoch gutter press actually exceeded the vituperation against Saddam Hussein.

But to convince the professionals, the academics, the people who show up at the various world affairs councils which dot the provinces, it is critically useful to have mediators like Messrs. Daalder and Kagan. The Better Sort roughly corresponds to the National Bourgeoisie in Wilhelmine Germany or the outer Nomenklatura in the Soviet Union. They may not send their kids to war in any appreciable numbers, but their support for war is crucial to any administration. The more tender-minded of the Better Sort, in particular, lust in a most alarming way for some sort of "humanitarian" intervention they could support. It is the task of the Daalders and Kagans to toss around terms like "genocide" to provide a humanitarian gloss to whichever invasion advocacy project they are promoting at the moment.<sup>1</sup>

Note as well, that in the division of propaganda labor between the roughneck demagogues and the think tank chin-scratchers, the propaganda themes to promote a given policy are disparate or even contradictory. The Limbaughs and the O'Reillys sell a frank brand of gutter patriotism emphasizing the joys of killing foreigners. If there is any policy reason that appeals to the target audience, it is likely to be something direct and tangible, like the acquisition of valuable resources such as oil. On the flip side, the fear used to motivate Limbaugh Nation is some comic book level bugaboo, such as the notion that an Islamic army will physically invade and conquer America.<sup>2</sup>

That sort of thing won't sell with the Better Sort. Ideally, we are fighting, after a vigorous and probing national debate, and much searching of souls, for a better world, to prevent genocide, to stop female circumcision, or for credibility with our allies. If there is an overriding fear that motivates the Better Sort, it is that old nemesis of the MacNeil-Lehrer set, "regional instability." While the lumpenproles seethe with apocalyptic visions of hand-to-hand combat with the minions of the Caliphate in downtown Paducah, the Better Sort's fantasies parse like a graduate seminar from hell. Mr. Daalder and Mr. Kagan are only too happy to feed the conceits of the class that nurtured them on behalf of the government that employs them at one remove.

The day before yesterday it was Vietnam; yesterday it was Kosovo; today it is Iraq. Tomorrow it could be Iran, or Belarus, or Venezuela, or any one of a dozen prospects. The duty of the think tank hacks is to make war seem not only inevitable, but respectable in the eyes of the Better Sort.

1. One rather doubts a bunch of fuzzy-minded do-gooders was able to finance the recent campaign to intervene in Darfur that included full-page advertisements in the prestige papers and 60-second spots on television; there must have been more substantial interests involved. Although the "invade Sudan" lobby has thus far failed in its aim, it must be admitted that the target country of Sudan was a poor prospect: with a head of government not one person in ten thousand could name, it lacked

an identifiable Hitler; and with a technology base more suited to the stone age than the space age, the fearmongers and threat inflators could hardly suggest WMD without eliciting laughter. When President Clinton dispatched cruise missiles against a Khartoum aspirin factory, the operation was not wildly popular, even among normally bellicose Republicans. One suspects the latter regarded it as an unwelcome distraction from their relentless drive to impeach him. If so, it was a rare case of domestic concerns trumping national security issues.

2. Lest the reader think we exaggerate here, internet columnist [Glenn Greenwald has written about](#) exactly how prevalent this fantasy is among the Right Wing.

August 15, 2007

*Werther is the pen name of a Northern Virginia-based defense analyst.*

Copyright © 2007 Werther

## PATRIOTISM

Even though we know militarism is a complex of related historical currents, we have to divide them in order to grasp them and then to reconnect. Underpinning militarism, nationalism, imperialism is patriotism, a powerful engine for the others. Patriotism itself is often a congeries of contradictions. Often it functions to excite, stir up national animosities, prepare for invasions, reinforce wars. But reinforcement also works by covering up. One of patriotism's many concentration points is Memorial Day, or "Memorial Day Mush," as Michael Massing refers to it in his article by that title in *Columbia Journalism Rev.* (July-Aug. 2007). Massing excoriates this year's Memorial Day for the mainstream media evading the realities of a USA in the "fifth year of a calamitous war that has divided the nation, chewed up the armed forces, turned America into an international pariah, caused the deaths of perhaps hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and been judge by some historians to be the most serious foreign-policy blunder in U.S. history." Instead of telling these truths by giving the troops and their families the opportunity to speak honestly, CBS told about memory books for families of the fallen and interviewed a Marine who declared "morale is high," ABC recounted care packages, both networks told the story of the puppy "Hero" that a soldier in Iraq had adopted, and so on. "Most mawkish of all was CNN." ACTION: Lead a group to expose patriotism (discuss articles and books, show films, demonstrate, purchase ads, Short Takes and forums on CAT) for its destructive part in the nationalism-militarism-imperialism complex. Dick

## MILITARY SPENDING, ARMS PROLIFERATION

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

*SIPRI Yearbook 2007*: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security. The Yearbook is SIPRI's annual compendium of data and analysis of developments in security and conflicts, military spending and armaments and non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. For more on the book and ordering details, visit the [Yearbook 2007 site](http://www.sipri.org/). <http://www.sipri.org/>

## MILITARISM: USA ARMS MERCHANT OF THE WORLD: USA FIRSTS

We're # 1! "A Nation of Firsts Arms the World," May 20, 2007, By Frida Berrigan

They don't call us the sole superpower for nothing. Paul Wolfowitz might be looking for a new job right now, but the term he used to describe the pervasiveness of U.S. might back when he was a mere deputy secretary of defense -- hyperpower -- still fits the bill.

Face it, the United States is a proud nation of firsts. Among them:

*First in Oil Consumption:* The United States burns up [20.7 million barrels](#) per day, the equivalent of the oil consumption of China, Japan, Germany, Russia, and India combined.

*First in Carbon Dioxide Emissions:* Each year, world polluters pump 24,126,416,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) into the environment. The [United States](#) and its territories are responsible for 5.8 billion metric tons of this, more than China (3.3 billion), Russia (1.4 billion) and India (1.2 billion) combined.

*First in External Debt:* The United States owes \$10.040 trillion, [nearly a quarter](#) of the global debt total of \$44 trillion.

*First in **Military Expenditures**:* The White House has requested \$481 billion for the Department of Defense for 2008, but this huge figure does not come close to representing total U.S. military expenditures projected for the coming year. To get a sense of the resources allocated to the military, the costs of the global war on terrorism, of the building, refurbishing, or maintaining of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, and other expenses also need to be factored in. Military analyst Winslow Wheeler [did the math](#) recently: "Add \$142 billion to cover the anticipated costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; add \$17 billion requested for nuclear weapons costs in the Department of Energy; add another \$5 billion for miscellaneous defense costs in other agencies.... and you get a grand total of \$647 billion for 2008."

Taking another approach to the use of U.S. resources, Columbia University economist Joseph Stiglitz and Harvard Business School lecturer Linda Bilmes [added](#) to known costs of the war in Iraq invisible costs like its impact on global oil prices as well as the long-term cost of health care for wounded veterans and came up with a price tag of between 1 trillion and \$2.2 trillion. If we turned what the United States will spend on the military in 2008 into small bills, we could give each one of the world's more than 1 billion teenagers and young adults an Xbox 360 with wireless controller (power supply in remote rural areas not included) and two video games to play: maybe [Gears of War](#) and [Command and Conquer](#) would be appropriate. But if we're committed to [fighting obesity](#), maybe *Dance Dance Revolution* would be a better bet. The United States alone spends what the rest of the world combined devotes to military expenditures.

*First in **Weapons Sales**:* Since 2001, U.S. global military sales have normally totaled between \$10 and \$13 billion. That's a lot of weapons, but in fiscal year 2006, the Pentagon broke its own recent record, inking arms sales agreements worth \$21 billion. It almost goes without saying that this is significantly more than any other nation in the world.

In this gold-medal tally of firsts, there can be no question that things that go bang in the night are our proudest products. No one makes more of them or sells them more effectively than we do. When it comes to the sorts of firsts that once went with a classic civilian manufacturing base, however, gold medals are in short supply. To take an example:

*Not First in Automobiles:* Once, Chrysler, General Motors, and Ford ruled the domestic and global roost, setting the standard for the automotive industry. Not any more. In 2006, the U.S. imported [almost \\$150 billion](#) more in vehicles and auto parts than it sent abroad. Automotive analyst Joe Barker told the [Boston Globe](#), "it's a very tough environment" for the so-called Detroit Three. "In times of softening demand, consumers typically will look to brands that they trust and rely on. Consumers trust and rely on Japanese brands."

*Not Even First in Bulk Goods:* The [Department of Commerce](#) recently announced total March exports of \$126.2 billion and total imports of \$190.1 billion, resulting in a goods and services deficit of \$63.9 billion. This is a \$6 billion increase over February.

But why be gloomy? Stick with **arms sales** and it's dawn in America every day of the year. Sometimes, the **weapons industry** pretends that it's like any other trade -- especially when it's pushing our **congressional** representatives (as it always does) for fewer restrictions and regulations. But don't be fooled. Arms aren't automobiles or refrigerators. They're *sui generis*; they are the way the USA can always be number one -- and everyone wants them. The odds that, in your lifetime, there will ever be a \$128 billion trade deficit in weapons are essentially nil.

### **Arms are our real gold-medal event.**

*First in Sales of Surface-to-Air Missiles:* Between 2001 and 2005, the United States delivered 2,099 surface-to-air missiles to nations in the developing world, 20% more than Russia, the next largest supplier.

*First in Sales of Military Ships:* During that same period, the U.S. sent 10 "major surface combatants" like aircraft carriers and destroyers to developing nations. Collectively, the four major European weapons producers shipped thirteen. (And we were first in the anti-ship missiles that go along with such ships, with nearly double (338) the exports of the next largest supplier Russia (180).

*First in Military Training:* A thoughtful empire knows that it is not enough to send weapons; you have to teach people how to use them. The Pentagon plans on training the militaries of 138 nations in 2008 at a cost of nearly \$90 million. No other nation comes close.

*First in Private Military Personnel:* According to bestselling author [Jeremy Scahill](#), there are at least 126,000 private military personnel deployed alongside uniformed military personnel in Iraq alone. Of the more than sixty major companies that supply such personnel worldwide, more than 40 are U.S. based.

### **LOCKHEED MARTIN: WEAPONS FOR THE WORLD**

Rest assured, governments around the world, often at each others' throats, will want U.S. weapons long after their people have turned up their noses at a range of once dominant American consumer goods. Just a few days ago, for instance, the "trade" publication *Defense News* reported that Turkey and the United States signed a \$1.78 billion deal for **Lockheed Martin's F-16 fighter planes**. As it happens, these planes are already ubiquitous -- Israel flies them, so does the United Arab Emirates, Poland, South Korea, [Venezuela](#), Oman and Portugal, not to speak of most other modern air forces. In many ways, F-16 is not just a high-tech fighter jet, it's also a symbol of U.S. backing and friendship. Buying our weaponry is one of the few ways you can actually join the American imperial project!

In order to remain number one in the competitive jet field, Lockheed Martin, for example, does far more than just sell airplanes. TAI -- Turkey's aerospace corporation -- will receive a boost with this sale, because **Lockheed Martin** is handing over responsibility for parts of production, assembly, and testing to Turkish workers. The Turkish Air Force already has 215 F-16 fighter planes and plans to buy 100 of Lockheed Martin's new F-35 Joint Strike Fighter as well, in a deal estimated at \$10.7 billion over the next 15 years.

\$10.7 billion on fighter planes for a country that ranks 94th on the United Nations' Human Development Index, below Lebanon, Colombia, and Grenada, and far below all the European nations that Ankara is courting as it seeks to join the European Union -- now that's a real American sales job for you!

### **MEDIA IRRESPONSIBLE SILENCE**

Here's the strange thing, though: This genuine, gold-medal manufacturing-and-sales job on

weapons simply never gets the attention it deserves. As a result, most Americans have no idea how proud they should be of our weapons manufacturers and the Pentagon -- essentially our global sales force -- that makes sure our weapons travel the planet and regularly demonstrates their value in small wars from Latin America to Central Asia.

Of course, there's tons of data on the **weapons trade**, but who knows about any of it? I'm typical here. I help produce one of a dozen or so sober annual (or semi-annual) reports quantifying the business of war-making. In my case: the Arms Trade Resource Center report, [U.S. Weapons at War: Fueling Conflict or Promoting Freedom?](#) These reports get desultory, obligatory press attention -- but only once in a blue moon do they get the sort of full-court-press treatment that befits our number one product line.

Dense collections of facts, percentages, and comparisons don't seem to fit particularly well into the usual patchwork of front-page stories. And yet the mainstream press is a glory ride, compared to the TV News, which hardly acknowledges most of the time that the weapons business even exists.

In any case, that inside-the-fold, fact-heavy, wonky news story on the arms trade, however useful, can't possibly convey the gold-medal feel of a business that has always preferred the shadows to the sun. No reader checking out such a piece is going to feel much -- except maybe overwhelmed by facts. The connection between the factory that makes a weapons system and the community where that weapon "does its duty" is invariably missing-in-action, as are the relationships among the companies making the weapons and the generals (on-duty and retired) and politicians making the deals, or raking in their own cut of the profits for themselves and/or their constituencies. In other words, our most successful (and most deadly) export remains our most invisible one.

## ARMS BUSINESS/DRUG BUSINESS

Maybe the only way to break through this paralysis of analysis would be to stop talking about weapons exports as a trade at all. Maybe we shouldn't be using economic language to describe it. Yes, the weapons industry has associations, lobby groups, and trade shows. They have the same tri-fold exhibits, scale models, and picked-over buffets as any other industry; still, maybe we have to stop thinking about the export of fighter planes and precision-guided missiles as if they were so many widgets and start thinking about them in another language entirely -- the **language of drugs**.

After all, what does a **drug dealer** do? He creates a need and then fills it. He encourages an appetite or (even more lucratively) an addiction and then feeds it.

**Arms dealers** do the same thing. They suggest to foreign officials that their military just might need a slight upgrade. After all, they'll point out, haven't you noticed that your neighbor just upgraded in jets, submarines, and tanks? And didn't you guys fight a war a few years back? Doesn't that make you feel insecure? And why feel insecure for another moment when, for just a few billion bucks, we'll get you suited up with the latest model military... even better than what we sold them -- or you the last time around.

Why does Turkey, which already has 215 fighter planes, need 100 extras in an even higher-tech version? It doesn't... but Lockheed Martin, working the Pentagon, made them think they did.

We don't need stronger arms control laws, we need a global sobriety coach -- and some kind

of 12-step program for the dealer-nation as well.

*Frida Berrigan is a Senior Research Associate at the World Policy Institute's Arms Trade Resource Center.*

## CLUSTER BOMBS: GOOD NEWS BUT REQUIRING OUR ACTION

### From the Hill: Senate Panel Bans Cluster Exports

A key Senate committee has approved legislation that would effectively ban the U.S. from exporting cluster bombs, a weapon with a particularly deadly record of killing and maiming civilians, both during and after their initial use. The legislation must still be approved by the full Senate and reconciled with a House version. You can help by ensuring that [your senators](#) and [representative](#) are cosponsors of the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act of 2007. [Read more.](#)

## LINCOLN AND PRYOR ARE NOT COSPONSORS

**Subject: Cluster Bombs** in the Spotlight: Write Your Local Media



## Legislative Action Message



### Cluster Bombs in the Spotlight: Write Your Local Media

August 8, 2007

#### Take Action

[Write your local media outlet.](#) Call the attention of your community and your senators to the cluster bomb issue.

Well done! You and others in the FCNL network have sent over 50,000 messages to Congress supporting legislation to ban the use of cluster bombs in or near civilian populated areas. Due in part to this lobbying, last month a U.S. cluster bomb ban moved one step closer to reality when a key Senate committee voted to effectively ban the export of these weapons.

**Now we need to build on this success. With your help, we can persuade the full Senate to support legislation that would restrict the use of these horrendous weapons,** which are designed to kill all living creatures within a specific area that is often as large as several football fields.

#### Take Action

**You can influence your senators and others in your community by writing a letter to the editor of one of your local newspapers. Congressional staff tell FCNL that most senators read every letter to the editor in the local papers in their state -- especially if the letter mentions her or his name.**

Use FCNL's website to find out if your senators have [cosponsored this legislation](#). Then you can use the website to [find contact information for your local newspapers](#). Pick one local newspaper or other publication and send a letter today. We also provide a sample letter, but the most effective letters are the ones that you personalize to say something about yourself and your perspective on this issue.

**Background**

[Find out more about cluster bombs](#)

[Find out if your senators have cosponsored the legislation](#) banning the use of cluster bombs in or near civilian populated areas

Find more [tips for writing a letter to the editor](#)

---

[Contact Congress and the administration.](#)

Order [FCNL publications](#) and "[War is Not the Answer](#)" campaign bumper stickers and yard signs.

**[Contribute to FCNL.](#)**

[Subscribe or update your information to this list.](#) To unsubscribe from this list, please see the end of this message.

--Senator Blanche Lincoln: Web Site (they have contact links): [www.lincoln.senate.gov](http://www.lincoln.senate.gov);  
<http://www.lincoln.senate.gov/index.cfm>; <http://www.lincoln.senate.gov/webform.html>

Washington Office: 355 Dirksen Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510-0404

**Phone: (202) 224-4843 Fax: (202) 228-1371.**

**Fayetteville office: 251-1380.** Lincoln's staff is better informed than Boozman's (see below), but obviously (her vote to join Bush in appropriating \$95 billion more to keep the occupation going and her vote to further extend warrantless phone taps)) they need a lot of education. **Call her and her staff.**

**Getting to her office:**

Northwestern Regional Office

4 South College Avenue, Suite 205, Google Maps puts the marker 308 feet south of Meadow Street.

Fayetteville, AR 72701

(479) 251-1224; FAX (479) 251-1410

**Staff members:**

Community Affairs Specialist: John Hicks, Tamika S. Edwards and Kim Mullen,  
Office Manager\Special Projects Coordinator Cydney Pearce

**State Central Office**

912 West Fourth Street

Little Rock, AR 72201

TEL: (501) 375-2993

FAX: (501) 375-7064

Donna Kay Yeargan

State Director

Rod Sweetman

Arkansas Military Liaison\Caseworker (Academy Appointments, Immigration, Military, Prisons (Federal), and Veterans)

--Senator Mark Pryor: Web Site (see contact link): [www.pryor.senate.gov](http://www.pryor.senate.gov) ;  
<http://pryor.senate.gov/contact/> Pryor has no office in NWA, so call or write him and his staff in DC: **Washington Office: 217 Russell Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510-0403. Phone: (202) 224-2353 Fax: (202) 228-0908**  
Main District Office: 500 Pres. Clinton Ave., Suite 401, Little Rock, AR 72201.  
**Phone: (501) 324-6336 Fax: (501) 324-5320.**

--Congressman John Boozman, District 3, 12 counties from Benton to Washington  
**Lowell office: 479-725-0400.** 213 W. Monroe, Suite K, 72745. Boozman's new office in Lowell is located at 213 West Monroe in Lowell between I 540 and Business 71. Go there, talk to Boozman's staff members. They need your explanation of reality and values. To reach that office take Exit 78 off I - 540 and go east on Hwy 264 which is also West Monroe. The office is in the Puppy Creek Plaza, past the McDonald's on the right. His suite is in the back of the complex to the left. Or write or call. **Ms. McClure** is Assistant Chief of Staff for the Lowell office, Ms. Breazeal focuses on gangs, and Ms. Stacy Davis is constituent staff member.  
**Ft. Smith office: 479-782-7787;** 30 South 6th St. Rm 240, Ft. Smith 72901.  
**Harrison office: 870-741-6900;** 402 N. Walnut, Suite 210, Harrison 72601.  
**DC address: 1708 Longworth House Office Bldng., Washington, DC 20515; 202-225-4301. Leslie Parker, appointments secretary: 202-225-4301.** (Or she was, let me know if it's now someone else.)

***OMNI SEEKS A WORLD FREE OF WAR AND THE THREAT OF WAR, A SOCIETY WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL, A COMMUNITY WHERE EVERY PERSON'S POTENTIAL MAY BE FULFILLED, AN EARTH RESTORED. GRASSROOTS NONVIOLENCE, WORLD PEACE, HUMAN RIGHTS, SOCIAL and ECONOMIC JUSTICE, ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP PROTECTING SPECIES AND THE EARTH.***