

GAZETTE DU GOLFE ET DES BANLIEUES

Nouvelle série

@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@

Numéro 14 -- novembre 2002

>gazettegb@yahoo.fr<

><http://ggb.0catch.com><

News in French, Spanish and English

Established 1991 by Serge Thion

@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@

US GO HOME

FORMONS PARTOUT DES COMITÉS DE SOUTIEN A ZACCARIA MOUSSAOUI

MOUSSAOUI, COURAGE !

**8000 PRISONNIERS POLITIQUES PALESTINIENS
TORTURÉS CHAQUE JOUR EN ISRAEL**

**DÉMANTELONS LES USA
ABOLISSONS RÉSOLUMENT ISRAEL
RESTAURONS LA PALESTINE**

LET'S HANG THE BUSHES AND LYNCH BLAIR

FREE GUANTANAMO

L'IRAQ DES BOURBIERS SE RAPPROCHE

CHIRAC NE TIENT SON PANTALON QUE D'UNE MAIN

LES USA PIÉTINENT LES DROITS

Avec la collaboration volontaire ou involontaire de Tareq Aziz, Ibrahim Alloush, Yair Sheleg, Israël Shamir, Robert Fisk, Leonard Spencer, Neil Mackay et quelques autres.

L'Etat juif est aussi mauvais que l'Etat aryen, et quiconque rejette l'Etat aryen devrait rejeter, tout autant, la notion d'Etat juif.
Israël Shamir, 24 sept. 2002.

Everyone is condemning the suicide bombers [Not us...]. They ask how the Palestinians can send their children to kill themselves for their cause. On the other hand, we might ask: "How can we send our children out to be killed for no cause at all ?"
Ralph Johnson

USA PAYS DE LA CONNERIE

Le 11 septembre 2001 est maudit pour la justice américaine. Un nouveau scandale met en lumière les dysfonctionnements du système judiciaire. "Le parquet fédéral a donné par erreur 48 dossiers du FBI, classés "secret défense", à Zacarias Moussaoui", révèle le *New York Times*. Le jeune Français, seul terroriste présumé d'Al Qaida arrêté par les services américains, a décidé de se défendre sans avocat. Le parquet lui a alors transmis les documents nécessaires à sa défense. Malheureusement, raconte le *New York Times*, "un certain nombre de rapports ultrasecrets et non-transférables se sont glissés dans le lot". Ces documents "sont les résumés des interrogatoires de Moussaoui, mais aussi l'ensemble des conclusions des enquêtes du FBI sur le réseau Al Qaida".

Une fois la bourde connue, les juges américains en charge du procès ont ordonné la fouille de la cellule de Zacarias Moussaoui. Après deux jours de recherches, la majorité des documents ont été retrouvés sous les yeux bienveillants du prisonnier, qualifié de très "coopératif", par le *New York Times*. Cependant, deux rapports manquent encore, "ce sont les plus importants", assure un proche de l'enquête. Pour un responsable du ministère de la Justice américain, cité par le quotidien, "il est pratiquement impossible que le prévenu ait lu ces documents perdus dans un million d'autres..."

Courrierinternational, 28 Septembre 2002

<http://www.courrierinternational.com/actual/drapios/etats_unis.gif>

Le procès de Moussaoui est repoussé à mai ou juin. Il croule sous le poids des documents qu'il doit compiler. Il se plaint d'avoir été perturbé par les connards du FBI venus reprendre les documents qu'ils n'auraient pas dû lui donner, in the first place ! L'incompétence du FBI est proverbiale. Ils avaient aussi "oublié" des documents dans l'affaire de Tim McVey (explosion de l'immeuble officiel d'Oklahoma City).

Ce procès sera d'une grande importance car, à moins d'autres événements, il devrait être l'occasion pour l'Etat américain de dire, pour la première fois, ce qu'il sait, ou ce qu'il croit savoir de ce qui s'est passé le 11 septembre 2001. Jusqu'à présent, vous aurez remarqué qu'on nous gave de rumeurs mais sous le prétexte des enquêtes en cours, les instances politiques sont enfermées dans un mutisme qui prête à toutes les interprétations. Or face à l'armée des procureurs, des enquêteurs du FBI et d'autres officines, on trouvera un type tout seul, qui n'a pas fait confiance -- et qui lui reprocherait ? -- aux avocats américains, un Marocain de culture française, Zaccaria Moussaoui. Il a vécu à Londres et doit donc maîtriser l'anglais. Il va donc défendre sa peau contre la raison d'Etat du plus puissant Etat du monde...

Nous appelons donc à la formation de **Comités de soutien à Moussaoui**. Il va en avoir besoin et, sans même parler de l'hostilité que l'on peut éprouver pour les politiques ignobles des Etats Unis, tout un chacun comprendra que l'on est en droit d'espérer que ce procès permette d'entrevoir la vérité sur les attentats du 11 septembre qui justifient et valident la politique de terreur mondiale déclenchée par la Maison Blanche et le Pentagone. Zaccaria, tous les amateurs de vérité sont avec toi !

ICI BAGHDAD
October 4, 2002

An Exclusive interview with Mr. Tariq Aziz

Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq, Member of the Revolution Command Council, and former long-time Foreign Minister

This meeting took place in the Prime Minister's offices in Baghdad on 29 September 2002. The far-ranging interview dealt with a wide variety of topics, including the Iraqi rationale behind the unconditional acceptance of the return of the international inspectors, Iraq's military strategy in the coming confrontation with America, the issue of democracy in Iraq, the case of Abu Nidal, Iraq's position on the Palestine Authority and Yassir Arafat, as well as some theoretical issues. Mr. Tariq Aziz is known for his political sophistication, intelligence, and unique ability to deal with the media and diplomatic corps. In what follows he fully lived up to that reputation. But this dialogue essentially aimed at lifting the veil on how things are thought out in the mind of the Iraqi leadership, going beyond the usual journalistic fare that is restricted to the events of the moment. On this basis, our talk began with a focus on general issues, not on specifics. The Free Arab Voice was represented by its editor-in-chief, **Dr. Ibrahim Naji Alloush.**

FAV: Mr. Aziz, the decision to allow the inspectors to return was a decision that did not conform to the interests of Iraq or to Arab interests. That is, it was clear that among the inspectors are some individuals known to be foreign agents who were plotting with the Zionists and Americans. There is a whole archive of news reports attesting to this. In addition, Iraq had been demanding that the return of inspectors be linked to the end of the embargo and a solution to the issue of mass destruction weapons throughout the whole region. In spite of that, we find that you agreed to the return of the inspectors unconditionally.

Of course this occurred just days after a number of Arab countries changed their positions and declared that they were ready to participate in an attack on Iraq because "they had no other choice", or words to that effect. Do you believe that your agreement to the return of the inspectors will lead to restraining the aggression, or that this decision will prevent an attack by the United States, Britain and the Zionists on Iraq altogether? Or do you believe it can result in delaying an attack, that it's a way to gain time, and to compel them to show more of their cards, even those who claim that Iraq has mass destruction weapons?

Tariq Aziz: We have no illusions about the intentions of American imperialism and Zionism, both the international Zionist movement and the entity in the occupied Palestinian territories. We have no illusions. But in any battle you wage, you must take the steps necessary to reduce the number of your opponents, in the first place, steps that will help you gain friends. We analyzed the situation deeply.

Support for American aggression in the world and in the region is very limited. There is no Arab or foreign party, other than the Zionist Entity, and other than the British government in the person of Tony Blair and his group, [other than them] no one wants this aggressive military action against Iraq. Everyone is afraid of the consequences that will result from it.

FAV: Particularly since they are openly raising the issue of redrawing the map of the region.

Tariq Aziz: Yes, exactly. We said that if we took this step, we would strengthen those who do not want the attack, and this would place us in a much more comfortable position. We would free ourselves from all the pressures, and the pressure had reached a point where it was coming from all directions, "Brothers, please, accept the return of the inspectors so you can avoid a war". We know that this decision might not prevent a war, or prevent aggression. We know that. Nevertheless, we took that decision. But now we can say, in case the aggression occurs, that the political position of those opposing the aggression will be stronger than it would have been had we not made such a decision.

There are some weaklings for whom it is easy to blame Iraq. They say, "Iraq is fanatical. Iraq is stubborn. Iraq won't listen to advice, etc." That position gives them an excuse to get out of their obligations, whether they are Arabs or foreigners. We have our foreign friends who should supposedly shoulder their responsibilities, the legal ones in the first place, according

to international law, and shoulder their responsibilities with respect to a country that was friendly to them, like Russia. The weaklings in Russia come along and say, "We advised the Iraqis but they have been obstinate. They didn't behave as wisely as they should have. So we should sit by quietly and let the attack take place". This would be a loss. As for the aggression, it is likely that it will take place. If it doesn't take place it will be first and foremost due to Iraq's steadfastness. The aggressor will feel that his adventure will be extremely costly. I tell you, my personal analysis is that the aggression has been planned for a long time, but they have been postponing the zero hour, if we can call it that, because the more deeply they study Iraq's situation, they find more and more difficulties in front of them. They are trying to treat these difficulties but they are not succeeding.

I'll give you a specific example. George Bush linked the aggression against Iraq to changing the regime. But when they started to discuss how to change the regime they discovered that this goal is either impossible or at the very least exorbitantly costly and very complicated, and also not convincing for those who are supposed to take part along with them, even the British. I am not generally convinced by what the British say, but they say that they have now succeeded in convincing Bush that military action against Iraq need not have regime change as its slogan. This, I think, in my opinion, is because the British are more aware of the facts and realities than is that stupid administration in America. It is an aggressive administration, but it is also stupid at the same time; it doesn't know the realities, whether in Iraq or in the Arab world.

These are the reasons that led us to taking this decision. At the same time, we will strive every day to clarify our position to the world. When the inspectors come, they will engage in activities. Perhaps they will engage in bad activities...

FAV: That's for sure...

Tariq Aziz: But we will expose them. Not with memoranda to the Security Council, as we used to do in the past. We will expose them before Arab and international public opinion. There are lots of interested people now who will follow these events very closely indeed.

FAV: But Mr. Aziz, I want to tell you two things that I'm sure you already know, but I would like to hear your response to them.

First, there was a law passed by the American Congress in 1998 that literally stipulated, and this was in 1998, that the Iraqi regime had to be changed and that provided for the financial and organizational measures needed for such a regime change. Besides that, there was a paper issued in 1996 under the title a Clean Break that discussed the same thing.

I think that imperialist and Zionist strategic interests at this stage have come to demand the break up of this region, and they are saying this openly, so this is not just one analysis...

Tariq Aziz: Precisely...

FAV: So, do you believe that these measures [the return of the inspectors] even if they can delay the aggression, that in the end they can put an end to the clash with imperialism ?

Tariq Aziz: No. I told you we have no illusions. But in any battle you wage, you can make some non-essential concessions in order to improve your political position. The return of the inspectors to Iraq will not shake our regime. It will not lead to our giving up all the necessary preparations we've made for the aggression, when it comes. But it will give us a political opportunity that is better than what we used to have before we took this decision.

We have no illusions, and as I said in the forum*, the aim [of America in the Arab region] is a new Sykes-Picot agreement, beginning with Iraq, and ending with other countries, including Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and other countries in the region. This arrangement is needed because, the [old] Sykes-Picot that served the Zionist Entity and imperialism throughout the last century, today no longer works in the interest of the aims of imperialism and the Zionist presence in Palestine. It has come to constitute a kind of danger, despite the weakness of the regimes that surround "Israel", and the regimes that have signed agreements with "Israel". Despite their weak positions, this situation has come to pose a danger. Nowadays, for example, the number of Arabs who have university degrees is greater than the number of all residents in "Israel", and not all residents of "Israel" hold university degrees.

This is a qualitative change. The steadfastness of Iraq and the steadfastness of the Palestinian resistance, of the Palestinian intifada, have created a qualitative political and psychological change as well that wasn't there before. Today, the Arab citizen is deeply

convinced that resistance to imperialism and Zionism is possible and that it will not lead to his obliteration.

Yes, there will be sacrifices and martyrs, but this will not lead to the obliteration of the Arab nation. In 1990-1991 many believed, when America launched its aggression against Iraq, that Iraq would be obliterated, that there would be no more Iraq on the face of the earth. Iraq's steadfastness established that there would be sacrifices and losses but that it is possible for Iraq, as a country, and a people, and a leadership, to remain.

FAV: Since we agree that imperialism and Zionism have strategic interests that will inevitably lead to their undertaking aggression, sooner or later, this raises the issue of Iraq's state of readiness for such an attack. What I'd like to say is that to wage traditional-style warfare against forces that are superior militarily, technologically, and that have nuclear weapons might not be the most appropriate way to wage war in this situation. I mean, some people point to the experience of south Lebanon, and the Jenin refugee camp, recently, and other such examples, to demonstrate the principle that to fight an enemy who is superior in conventional terms, one must use unconventional methods, such as guerrilla warfare and martyrdom operations. What is your comment on that ?

Tariq Aziz: We will be fighting inside our own country. We will not fight the aggressors in open country. Someone said that the Vietnamese had jungles. I said, "we have cities and our cities are our jungles".

FAV: Jungles of Concrete?

Tariq Aziz: Exactly right! We have declared this. Even President Saddam Hussein said that we will fight them in the cities. Their aim is regime change. They can't change the regime by remote control, with missiles and airplanes. Yes, they can damage buildings and installations, but they can't topple the regime with airplanes and missiles.

So, if they really want to achieve their goal -- and their ultimate goal is to divide up the region and control the oil -- they will have to occupy the land. In that case, our points of strength will stand out, and their weak points will be exposed.

FAV: A question that is posed by lots of supporters of Iraq abroad concerns the issue of democracy. Naturally, we know that the United States uses the rhetoric of human rights and democracy as an argument justifying its political and military interference in various places around the world, not only in Iraq. But, among the forces outside Iraq, among Iraqis abroad, we note that they fall into two main types. One type cooperates with the CIA and others, and no rational person expects Iraq to cooperate with them. Personally, I believe that treason is not just another point of view, and this is the opinion of a lot of people. Anyone who holds hands with the CIA, whoever that may be, is not someone with another point of view, he is a traitor. But on the other hand there are some Iraqis in Syria, for example, and in other places... I mean we meet Iraqis who say and who consider themselves to be against imperialism and against the American plots against Iraq, but their relations with the regime in Iraq are not good. Don't you think that forces like this must be given the opportunity to take part in repelling aggression on the basis of their opposition to the Americans? I am not proposing, of course, a liberal conception of the matter. But don't you think that there should be some overtures towards these groups, like the approaches that were made towards groups that were previously opposed to Iraq, like the regimes in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait that actively attacked Iraq? [This is a question that concerns] the cohesion of the domestic front on the basis of a shared opposition to the Americans. Are you thinking along these lines? Or is the Iraqi leadership thinking along these lines?

Tariq Aziz: Since 1991, and until today, we have been ready for dialogue with any person or any group that wants to have a dialogue with us. I personally have had long discussions with people who are Marxists, Arab nationalists, and Islamists. There is, nevertheless, one problem that I must speak about plainly. When one of those people talks with you, if he wants to come to Iraq or to return to Iraq, or work with Iraq and with the rest of the Iraqis, on the basis of his position, or standing, the door is open to him. We don't force him to become a Baathist or to conform one hundred percent to our thinking. But sometimes, mostly for personal reasons, a member of the opposition comes to you -- a patriot, no doubt about that -- and with him is a group of people, and he is looking for a measure of power that he doesn't really command. But when he comes and asks to be made a partner with the Baath Party in decision making, while he doesn't have the degree of effectiveness, nor does he

bear the responsibility that the Baath Party does, such a request is, naturally, unreasonable. I mean, today, for example, when we decide to resist imperialism, we are able to put a million Baathist fighters in the field. He can put twenty or fifty or a hundred or maybe a thousand. Yet he wants, on that basis, to assume the prerogatives of Saddam Hussein himself, a man who is a builder of a country, a revolution, a society, and a party! This is a political excessiveness with a narcissistic quality. That is the problem here.

FAV: You mean they make that the precondition for their coming back and cooperating?

Tariq Aziz: No. Some don't make any conditions. And they have come back and worked in the country -- each one according to his position: in universities, in the press, in the arts.

FAV: But you don't have any problem in principle, officially?

Tariq Aziz: No, we have no problem. We aren't afraid of anything. As a party, now, let us suppose that our system had been transformed into a liberal regime. Of course, this is just a supposition. But if we had elections, we are sure that we would win more than two-thirds of the seats in parliament. We have no problem. Ours is a big party. It's been in power for 34 years and it has served Iraq. And the Iraqis who are fifty years old or older know what the Baath Party has done for Iraq. They know what the living standards, the cultural level, the social environment, the level of industry and agriculture were like in 1968, and what they are like today. That is the accomplishment of the revolution. So the citizen in the village or in the urban neighborhood will vote for the Baathist candidate to represent him.

FAV: But do you have plans in this direction for the future?

Tariq Aziz: Yes, this is possible. Democracy too has to grow gradually. But it must grow in peaceful conditions.

FAV: Yes, one is reminded here that in America itself during wartime . . .

Tariq Aziz: Let's look at America: it has not been afflicted by war, but by the events of 11 September, and they have created an atmosphere of intimidation and apprehension about security to the point that they have reduced all the freedoms that they used to boast of before the world. In all the wars... in the Second World War, for example, the Labour Party and the Conservatives in Britain formed one joint government, having distanced themselves from all their social, political, class, and other differences, in order to wage war on Nazi Germany.

These are facts from the real world. But for one of them, in the present circumstances when we are facing the likelihood of aggression, to demand that we implement liberal practices and forms right now, this is not possible. It's not even a popular demand.

And here is another fact. When they call the regime in Iraq a dictatorship or fascist or Nazi, we know that the Nazi party won the elections in Germany. That is, that there was freedom for parties to operate, and when it gained power, it banned the other parties and stayed on ruling Germany by itself. That is a dictatorship. I mean, it came in a democratic system, in democratic forms, then it eliminated democracy. Augusto Pinochet came to power in a military coup against a popularly-elected democratic regime.

OK, whom did the Iraqi regime succeed? The Iraqi regime that [is represented by] the Arab Socialist Baath Party and President Saddam Hussein, came to power after the regime of President Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Aref.

President Abd al-Rahman Muhammad Aref along with ten officers ran the country by themselves. Then came the Baath Party. First, this is a party, and not ten individuals. It has an ideology and a program. Second, if you think of the number of people who take part in political decision-making, whether in the party or the trade unions, or the federations, or the National Assembly, or the people's assemblies in the villages and cities, you will find that the number of those taking part in decision making has become millions. This is democratic development. True, it is not completely liberal development, but it is democratic development. And this can proceed further. In the trade unions, for example, the Baath Party does not nominate a list of candidates in the name of the Party, even though it could impose such a list. In the lawyers, guild or the doctors, union, for example, there is a Baathist majority. If a list came down made up exclusively of Baathists, it would win a majority of votes. But we don't send down such lists. People are nominated only as individuals, and this is so that we can give room also for the independent to win on the basis of his personal merit. This is development . . .

FAV: Even the liberal model isn't necessarily the most democratic in the world.

Tariq Aziz: The liberal model is democratic in form only. In reality, however, it is clear that whoever has no money ^ whoever doesn't control the media, which can only be obtained by money ^ won't win, not even if he is the most capable and sincere person there is.

FAV: And then we could talk about true democracy... Another subject, one concerned with the Palestinian situation. In some quarters it is said that what happened to Abu Nidal was an attempt by Iraq to rid itself of old remnants, or of something that could attract condemnation. Of course, I know, as you do, that Abu Nidal was a person who killed a lot of Palestinians, and hundreds of his own group, and that he was a person who committed many crimes against the Palestinian people and against individuals who had differed with him or against people who were patriots and revolutionaries. But in spite of that, what is your response to those claims?

Tariq Aziz: First, I would reply that the forces that are threatening Iraq were not focusing on the person of Abu Nidal. You know, the focus now is on the fighters in Palestine. The name Abu Nidal at one time was reputed to be an activist in the Palestinian movement, but Abu Nidal came to an end, and in the Arab-Zionist struggle he had no role for more than twenty years now. So, he wasn't even an issue. There was no request from America saying, „Either hand over Abu Nidal or we will attack you%. No. That was not the case. Abu Nidal was expelled from Iraq in 1983, by order of the country's leadership, because he went too far and we had a confrontation. And I was one of those who confronted him. I said to him: "You are killing people now because you don't like them, even if they are patriots, even if they are Palestinians".

FAV: And his response to that was to accuse you personally of certain things.

Tariq Aziz: He accused me personally, and I confronted him, as authorized by our leadership, with facts. We supported all the Palestinian forces. We still are supporting them. But we always gave advice and insisted on maintaining the unity of the Palestinian people and the unity of the Palestinian organizations. We never supported any split within any Palestinian movement. As for killing people just because you're angry with them, and differ with them personally, this we could not accept. The other thing was that we were in a state of war with Iran. Abu Nidal carried out operations in countries that were friendly to us during that war. This was in violation of the logic of fraternal relations and of joint work, not to mention that it had no justification. So when he would carry out an operation in France... France wasn't an enemy of his for him to carry out an operation there that harmed Frenchmen but didn't do any harm to the Mossad. So we told him: "Enough. Get out!" He came back, secretly. We were surprised that he was here. The Jordanian Intelligence Division told us that Abu Nidal is in Iraq. We told them it wasn't true. Then it became clear that he had entered Iraq with a forged passport and had gone into hiding. We didn't do anything. We knew he was here, and we told him: "Welcome. As an Arab citizen you have come to live here. So stay in your house, and don't do anything that damages the security and political interests of the country". But he wasn't able to do that. He had come to have an obsession for destructive activity. I mean, we found in his house a quantity of explosives and devices, and other things. For whom were all those explosives intended? Against whom? If you want to fight the Zionist Entity, go ahead. Palestine is open, go and fight there. So his behavior became a purposeless threat to domestic and Arab national security. The struggle is not a theory similar to [the theory of] art for art's sake. The struggle is a way to attain an end. If armed activity and killing and assassinations have no goal, then this is a mockery. Therefore, when he didn't comply with our guidance and the instructions of the specialized agencies dealing with him, when he continued his wild activities, we decided to bring him to court, and he committed suicide. That is what happened. Imperialism has not thanked us "because we got rid of Abu Nidal", because he wasn't threatening them in the first place.

FAV: Your position is, of course, clear, and the position of the Baath Party is clear in your denial of any right that the Zionist enemy state might have to exist. I have read statements that you yourself have made that make it clear to everyone what your position is regarding political agreements and security coordination with the Zionist enemy. In spite of that, and against the backdrop of that political position, how do you translate that into political support for the Palestine Authority? Everyone, on the popular level in Palestine, highly esteems Iraq's position, as they do Iraq's assistance to the families of the martyrdom fighters. But on

the political level, how do you balance between rejecting any agreements with the enemy and your coordination with forces that are working for such agreements? Doesn't this require some explanation?

Tariq Aziz: Here, we must be precise. We must write of this with a fine-tipped pen, not with a broad, blunt marker. We do not officially recognize the Palestine Authority, and we have not dealt with it as the Authority. But we have preserved our relations with Yassir Arafat, but only in his capacity as Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the president of the State of Palestine that was proclaimed in Algiers [in November 1988], and as the leader of the Fateh Movement. Any minister in the Palestine Authority whom we received, we received him on the basis that he was a representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, not of the Palestine Authority. So much for the formal side of the matter. As to the subject itself, we never gave any support to the Palestine Authority, but we continued to support Palestinian institutions, and these are not entirely official. In recent times, in addition to the assistance that we gave directly to the Palestinian people, and which is well known, there arose an acute need on the part of some circles within the Palestine Authority [for assistance]. They told us: "We don't have money for salaries", so we gave them some of the funds. They told us they had a very big deficit in their educational budget. So we gave them funds for their educational budget, and this goes on until now. On another occasion, the Palestinian housing minister said that we [in Iraq] give money to those whose houses were destroyed, but the Palestinian housing ministry will also be rebuilding some of the housing of a number of Palestinians. So we cooperated with them. This is the situation.

FAV: A final, theoretical question. I heard you in your opening address to the Forum on Arab Nationalist Thought -- the End of One Century and the Beginning of Another -- in Bayt al-Hikmah, on the morning of 28 September 2002. In your lecture there you referred to an issue related to class struggle. Specifically you criticized those who have tried in the past to present class struggle as an alternative to the cause of Arab unity and the work for the sake of that unity. What I would like to ask [is]: Can we really separate the two? When imperialism came to our homeland and divided it up, and placed it within the borders of Sykes-Picot entities, it was working basically with feudal families. From the womb of these feudal families there emerged the compradores, the economic middlemen between the West and us. These export raw materials and import commodities. Then there arose other forms of compradores among us, such as the political compradore who serves as a mercenary by taking on a regional political role for the good of imperialism. Then there are the cultural compradores who serve as mercenaries by taking on a cultural role for the good of imperialism.

If we take land reform or the nationalization of oil, as examples, we find them to be an attempt to contain the social strata that support imperialism locally. At the same time they are an Arab national need and a step towards unity. So, how can we separate the class struggle and the cause of Arab unity, if the imperialist presence in our region rests upon the support of those social strata whose economic interests are tied to the West, and who on the side spread intellectual and political propaganda from which they also make a living? So, again, can we separate the two?

Tariq Aziz: First, I am a Baathist, and a Baathist is a socialist. The socialist inclines to the laboring classes and against the exploiting classes. A person is not a socialist unless he believes in that. But the real battle in the Arab homeland was and still is the battle for national liberation. In the battle for national liberation, the class struggle is not the basic aim. But if, in the course of the national liberation struggle against imperialism and against the Zionist entity, if in the midst of this struggle, if there appear groups or classes that are allied with imperialism, yes, we place them on our list of enemies. But, if there is a merchant or any wealthy person or a feudalist -- even though there is no more feudalism in our homeland -- who is not an enemy of the national movement, then we will not consider him an enemy just because he is wealthy.

I am not advocating Marxism here, in its absolute sense; I am advocating the Arab nationalist revolutionary socialist concept. Whoever stands with the anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist revolutionary national movement is an ally.

FAV: But doesn't it follow from that that the social strata that feel that their interests are threatened by this socialism will take a stand against it?

Tariq Aziz: If they stand against it, then we will fight them. I am not speaking of a stratum in the sense of class, but about individuals. Any individual can be rich but a sincere patriot [at the same time].

FAV: This is surely another question . . .

Tariq Aziz: I don't consider the wealthy patriot an enemy nor do I fight against him. But if there is really a class ...

In our homeland, there are no classes in the pure sense in which Marxism spoke of them. There are only individuals and groups and strata. Within these strata are patriots who are true to their country who assist the national movement to the extent that they can. Within these strata there are also traitors who link their destiny and their interests with imperialism and Zionism. We know them and we know their makeup and we fight them. This is what we did in Iraq. Today, the national bourgeoisie that works in the national framework in the conditions of the socialist system -- we don't fight against them. In fact, we assist them in some specific fields of work. But anyone who stands against socialism or colludes with imperialism, we will fight.

[Note by FAV to readers: It should be remembered that merchants in Iraq play an important role in penetrating and breaking down the embargo, even as they strive to increase their own profits.]

The Free Arab Voice <<http://www.freearabvoice.org/>>

RAN OTAN PLAN

NATO Used The Same Old Trick

by **Robert Fisk**

It's the same old trap. Nato used exactly the same trick to ensure that it could have a war with Slobodan Milosevic. Now the Americans are demanding the same of Saddam Hussein ^ buried well down in their list of demands, of course. Tell your enemy that you're going to need his roads and airspace -- with your troops on the highways -- and you destroy his sovereignty. That's what Nato demanded of Serbia in 1999. That's what the new UN resolution touted by Messrs Bush and Blair demands of Saddam Hussein. It's a declaration of war.

It worked in 1999. The Serbs accepted most of Nato's Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-government in Kosovo, but not Appendix 8, which insisted that "Nato personnel shall enjoy ... free and unimpeded passage and unimpeded access throughout the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia."

It was a demand that Mr Milosevic could never accept. US troops driving through Serbia would have meant, in these circumstances, the end of Yugoslav sovereignty.

But now we have the draft UN resolution which Presidents Bush and Blair insist the UN must pass. Arms inspection teams, it says, "shall have the right to declare for the purposes of this resolution... ground and air-transit corridors which shall be enforced by UN security forces or by members of the UN [Security] Council".

In other words, Washington can order forces of the US (a Security Council member) to "enforce" these "corridors" through Iraq -- on the ground -- when it wants. US troops would thus be in Iraq. It would be invasion without war; the end of Saddam, "regime change", the whole shebang.

No Iraqi government -- even a Baghdad administration without the odious Saddam -- could ever accept such a demand. Nor could Serbia have accepted such a demand from Nato, even without the odious Slobodan. Which is why the Serbs and Nato went to war.

So here it is again, the same old "we've-got-be-able-to-drive through-your-land" mentality which forced the Serbs into war and which is clearly intended to produce the same from Saddam.

America wants a war and here's the proof: if the United States truly wished to avoid war, it could demand "unfettered access" for inspectors without this sovereignty-busting paragraph, using it as a second resolution only if the presidential palaces of the Emperor Saddam remained off-limits.

Saddam can open his country to the inspectors; he can open even his presidential palaces. But if he doesn't accept the use of "Security Council" forces -- in other words, US troops -- on Iraqi roads, we can go to war. There's also that other paragraph: that "any permanent member of the Security Council may request to be represented on any inspection team." In other words, the Americans can demand that their intelligence men can return to become UN inspectors, to pass on their information to the Israelis (which they did before) and to the US military, which used them as forward air controllers for their aircraft once the inspectors were withdrawn.

All in all, then, a deal which President Saddam -- yes, Saddam the wicked, Saddam the torturer, Saddam the lover of gas warfare -- could never, ever accept.

He's not meant to accept this. Which is why the Anglo-American draft for the UN is intended to give us war, rather than peace and security from weapons of mass destruction.

The Independent; October 04, 2002, <<http://www.independent.co.uk/>>

COMPRENEZ CHICHI ET POUPOU

The French oil giant TotalFinaElf has the largest position in Iraq, with exclusive negotiating rights to develop Majnoon, a field near the Iranian border with estimated reserves of 10 billion barrels. Moscow has a \$3.5 billion, 23-year agreement for several huge Iraqi fields that gives a lead position to a Russian oil consortium led by LukOil.

LA SAGA DES FAUX JUIFS
(CF. GGB 12)

Three journeys to the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people on the Indochinese border convinced Hillel Halkin that they are descendants of the Children of Israel

By Yair Sheleg

Some of the elders of the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people, who live on the border between India and Myanmar (Burma), still remember that some time during the 20th century, before they became totally Christian, they marked "the memory of ritual circumcision." They testified to this with their signatures; some of them gave fingerprints as their signature. At the ceremony, according to their testimony, the priest would pass a knife over the sexual organ of male babies a few days old and say, "it used to be that our ancestors cut here."

In another place, translator and journalist Hillel Halkin encountered a holiday very similar to Passover, "a three-day holiday, on the first day of which they make bread from rice flour -- and this is a group that during the rest of the year eats no bread at all. They prepare the bread without yeast and without baking; they just wrap the flour in banana leaves and boil them in water. During the entire three days it is forbidden to eat rice, and only at the end of the third day they hold a festive meal for the whole village. The priest blesses the people and the bread, and only then is it permitted to eat rice -- which is also reminiscent of the prohibition on eating leavened products (the Jews and the Kuki are the only peoples in the world that observe a holiday of eating unleavened bread) and of the ceremony, held on Passover in the Temple, of waiving the Omer (a measure of produce)."

These are just two of the pieces of evidence that convinced Halkin that the Kuki-Chin-Mizo **are indeed descendants of the Children of Israel**. According to their own traditions, the identification is even more precise: They consider themselves to be descendants of the tribe of Menashe. Evidence and claims about the connection between the Kuki and the early Jewish people are not new. Rabbi Eliyahu Avichail has been in contact with them for more than 20 years, and he is active in **bringing them closer to Judaism** as it is today. His activities, however, are mostly perceived as having a messianic context.

Halkin, however, is a Western secular rationalist, a native of New York and a nephew of Shimon Halkin, a scholar of Hebrew literature. He immigrated to Israel in 1970 and gained fame for his book *Letters to an American Jewish Friend: A Zionist's Polemic* (Jewish Publication Society, 1977, out of print), in which he tried to clarify to his friends who remained behind in the United States the motivations for his immigration and his devotion to

Israel. Meanwhile, Halkin became a prolific and respected translator of Israel's best writers (Amos Oz, A. B. Yehoshua, Meir Shalev, Shulamit Hareven and even S.Y. Agnon and Haim Brenner) and a journalist. He also served as a correspondent for the weekly *Forward* in Israel. Now he devotes himself to writing articles and essays for leading American journals, among them *Commentary* and *The New Republic*.

In a recent book, *Across the Sabbath River: In Search of a Lost Tribe of Israel* (Houghton Mifflin, 2002), Halkin describes the discovery of the "children of Menashe" (as those members of the Kuki who have decided to return to Judaism call themselves) and tells how he became convinced of the veracity of their story. He also writes of his prior journey in search of "the 10 lost tribes." This is an echo of the legend that the 10 tribes who were exiled by the Assyrians in the 8th century B.C.E. -- from which time they lost touch with the rest of the Jewish people - are to be found beyond the Sambatyon River, which is a torrential, rushing river all the days of the week, apart from the Sabbath.

A god called Y'wa

Halkin's love affair with the story of the 10 tribes goes back to his childhood. "I grew up in Manhattan, in a largely Irish neighborhood, and the Irish kids always made trouble for us," he says. "We would run away from them, or else we would fight with them and lose. Once, one of my friends told me that there was an enchanted place called Brooklyn, where Jewish kids beat up gentiles. I decided that at the first opportunity I would run away there. Therefore, when at the age of 12 or 13 I encountered the legend of the 10 tribes, I already knew what a 'lost tribe' was. Altogether, as a romantic soul, I found this legend very attractive."

Several years ago, Halkin had an offer from an American publisher to write a book about anything he liked. At the time he was reading about Avichail's activities in search of the 10 tribes and he decided to combine his childhood longings and the book he had been asked to write. He contacted Avichail. "We agreed that if I could find funding, we would go on a journey together in search of the tribes. And then I had an offer from *The New Yorker* to write a long article about such a trip. [In the end, the article was not published - Y.S.] So in the summer of 1998 we set out on our journey."

Originally, they had not planned the trip to the India-Myanmar border, but rather to the province of Szechwan in northwestern **China**, home of the Chiang tribe, which according to British missionary Thomas Torrance, who proselytized there at the beginning of the 20th century, had its origins in the early Hebrews. Halkin was not convinced by the evidence about the Chiang. "Torrance spoke about Semitic facial features, a belief in one God, houses similar to Middle Eastern construction, sacrifices similar to those mentioned in the Bible and a god called Y'wa, reminiscent of the biblical God. Some of the things he described do exist in reality, and for Avichail this was enough to convince him that these were descendants of the Hebrews. However, in my opinion what we saw there could definitely be interpreted otherwise. We did not encounter the God Y'wa there, or Semitic physiognomies. They really do live in villages that look more like the Arab style than the Chinese, but this is not proof of Hebrew origins, and sacrifices are also something common throughout the world, especially in eastern Asia."

The trip in China did not satisfy Avichail's and Halkin's hunger, one reason being that the journey was undertaken in difficult circumstances. "Visiting those villages is prohibited by Chinese law -- apparently out of awareness of the fact that their culture is different, and they are afraid that they will be aroused to rebellion [perhaps like the Tibetan precedent - Y.S.] And in general, conducting research without a permit is itself forbidden in China, so that the whole time we lived in fear and flight from the law-enforcement authorities."

Because of the truncated trip to China, the two decided to use the time for additional visits: to the Karen tribe in Thailand and to the Kuki people on the India-Myanmar border. The Karens, too, are a people that was extensively converted to Christianity back in the 19th century, and even then it was linked to early Hebrew roots. "They have stories about early traditions that are very reminiscent of Bible stories: the Tower of Babel, a God called Y'wa, the expulsion from the Garden of Eden that is connected to a primal serpent. All this does

not prove a Hebrew origin, but it nevertheless sounded more serious than the Chiang story, and was definitely worth looking into deeply."

And then the two came to Mizoram, one of the Indian republican states, which is located on the eastern border of India with Myanmar, the home of the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people. The three names derive from the fact that these people live in three different areas: They are the dominant population in the state of Mizoram; they are also a considerable part of the population of the Indian state of Manipur (also on the border with Myanmar); and they form a significant percentage of the population of the Chin region of Burma (where Halkin could not go because the Myanmar authorities have prohibited entry into the region).

One obvious difference between the testimonies of the Kuki and other groups Avichail spoke to is that while the Chiang and the Karen were linked only by external factors to the 10 tribes, among the Kuki this was an internal tradition. During the first half of the 20th century they underwent an intensive process of conversion to Christianity by missionaries from the West, which led them largely to forget "the old religion," as they call it. However, in 1954 two inhabitants of a small village in northern Mizoram suddenly appeared and related visions they had had. In the visions, they were told that they were from the children of Israel, and their origin was in the tribe of Menashe.

"According to local Christian custom, people who have visions have to come to the elders of the community, and it is they who must confirm their authenticity. In this case, the elders not only authenticated the vision, but also recalled that even before their Christian period there were Israelite elements in their religion. Several months later there was a split in the village, and some of the people began to live according to the 'Old Testament:' to observe the Sabbath, offer sacrifices and so on. Each group shunned the other, though there were no physical hostilities between them.

"Gradually, this belief spread throughout Mizoram and Manipur, though they lived not as Jews but as 'Judaizing' Christians and adopted certain Jewish practices. By the 1970s there was already a group of 'children of Menashe' in Manipur that had made contact **with Jews in Calcutta**. They decided to dissociate themselves entirely from belief in Jesus and to live as Jews. They sent letters to various elements in Israel, and among others they reached Rabbi Avichail. In the 1980s he met with them for the first time; initially, because of the difficulty of access to those states, they met in Calcutta, and at the end of the 1980s he finally came to visit them where they lived and **became their spiritual teacher**. He brought them the Judaism of our day for the first time. Today, there are about 5,000 people living full Jewish lives, even though they have not undergone ritual conversion. [Conversion is undergone only by those who come to Israel, in Israel - Y.S.] When you go into their synagogue and close your eyes it is certainly possible to feel as though you are in a synagogue in Jerusalem or **New York**."

Children of Manmasi

During the visit to Mizoram, Avichail and Halkin began to get **more and more evidence** of the historical connection between the members of the group and the Jewish people. Halkin sensed that this time it was serious, and decided to go back there again, this time on his own. To date, he has made two additional trips, and the accumulation of evidence he heard during the three trips convinced him of the veracity of their story.

Thus, for example, on the very first trip he heard about a number of special prayers in which they call themselves "the children of Manmasi" - i.e., Menashe. Halkin noticed that the very name itself does not follow the rules of the Kuki's everyday language, "and also those prayers were recited in special circumstances, such as lunar eclipses or dangerous situations." They also mention the "old God" Ya. But despite it all, Halkin continued to suspect that these things could be attributed to influences instilled in them by the Christian missionaries, "who were familiar with the 'Old Testament' and perhaps caused them to believe that they were descendants of the ancient Hebrews."

During his subsequent visits Halkin met two people who offered testimony that was even more convincing. One was Yosi Hualngo from Mizoram, who spoke of prayers that had been known in the "old religion" (before Christianity), among them names and concepts that were clearly reminiscent of Judaism -- for example, the names of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac

and Jacob, as well as the words "His cloud that dwells on Mount Moriah" and "His cloud that dwells on Mount Sinai."

"The prayers are the most authentic source, as folktales and customs can be suspected of being influenced by later traditions, but it is harder to be suspicious of prayers, as they are sacred and it is forbidden to alter them, especially as the priests of the 'old religion,' who were responsible for the prayers, in any case were in conflict with the missionaries and it is not reasonable that they of all people would be influenced in their prayers by the missionaries."

At one point, Hualngo brought Halkin a "will" that was dictated by his uncle (who did not know how to read and write) back in 1948, when he was mortally ill and thought he was about to die. In the will the uncle, who was a priest of the "old religion," made his family swear that they would not abandon their religion and not convert to Christianity, "and there he mentions all the names known from the Bible; the names of the patriarchs and many others. The date of the writing of the will is very significant, as the belief among the members of the group that they are 'children of Menashe' began to spread only in 1954 -- that is, it wasn't influenced by that story. I took the document to a police investigator in Jerusalem and asked him to check its authenticity. He came to the conclusion that he could not determine with certainty that the document had indeed been written in 1948, but there were also no signs of forgery: the type of paper was known at that period and there are no signs of artificial aging. He also compared the handwriting of Yosi and the friend who came with him to the handwriting in the document, and came to the conclusion that they were different, that is, that they hadn't forged the document."

In Manipur, Halkin met Dr. Mi Lui Khuplam, an elderly member of the Kuki people who had studied primitive medicine back in the 1930s and for many years worked as a licensed doctor. At the same time, as someone who from childhood loved his people's folk tales, he decided to devote himself to collecting those traditions and in fact was the only person to have done so in a systematic way.

"He too collected mainly prayers, in which the names of the patriarchs are repeated, as well as the expression in which they call themselves 'children of Manmasi.' Among other things, the word 'sela' appears repeatedly -- a word that also appears in the Psalms and is a mystery to Bible scholars to this day. As in the Bible, with them too this word also appears at the end of a prayer or at the transition to a new segment.

"Khuplam explained that for them, the meaning of the word is an instruction to the priest to recite the segment again, and this could also suit the biblical meaning. After all, originally the Psalms were sung and it is possible that there too this is an instruction to repeat the segment."

From the combination of testimonies he heard -- including testimony concerning the names of the stations in the people's wanderings -- Halkin constructed a picture of its history: "There is a prayer that mentions among the places the name Ulam and also the name Geled. Both are mentioned in the Book of Chronicles in the area of the tribe of Menashe in Transjordan. Geled recalls the word Gilad, which is also across the Jordan. If so, this tribe was exiled by the Assyrians as far back as the days of Tilgath-Pilneser (732 B.C.E.), when the Transjordanian tribes were exiled, and not during the main exile under Shalmaneser (720 B.C.E.), when the tribes were exiled from Samaria. Apparently they first went to Assyria, and then wandered during the course of history throughout Asia. From the testimonies I heard I understood that in fact only a small part of the current Kuki people are originally related to the tribe of Menashe. Apparently, descendants of Menashe came to the area of Manipur at some stage in history, and when the Kuki invaded there, at the end of the 15th century, they were assimilated into them, as the Kuki invaders were more numerous. And really, the further you get from a certain area of Manipur, the historical traditions linked to Menashe grow weaker."

Halkin does not think that active steps should be taken to convert the members of the group to Judaism: "After all, they don't have any real connection to the Judaism of today," he says. "I would also be careful about saving souls, because in this there is a tangle of political and cultural questions. In my opinion, they should be left to act on their own and we should see whether they themselves make the effort to come closer to Judaism. I do think, though, that if they are interested, like the 5,000 who are already interested, they should be accepted with open arms. I would make it possible for rabbis to be sent there to convert those who are

interested there already, without encouraging them to convert. This should definitely be an Orthodox conversion, because the strictness of Orthodox conversion allows for the 'filtering' of people who really want to live as Jews."

Even though he does not recommend embarking on conversion efforts, Halkin has come to several practical conclusions: "First of all, a very admiring recognition of the strength of the Jewish faith -- that with all the historical reversals, and even after the missionary efforts of the last century, this group still preserves traditions that clearly link it to ancient Jewish history. **[Ce pauvre type est dans un délire complet.]** Secondly, their story is very significant for Bible research. After all, we are accustomed to hearing claims that the stories in the Bible did not happen at the times attributed to them and they are **just a much later revision of history**, which took place before the destruction of the First Temple. Because they were cut off from the Jewish people back in the 8th century B.C.E., it's clear that the traditions that exist among them had existed in the hearts of the people even before that period."

To add another element to the "Jewish" connection of the Kuki, Halkin is helping with plans to carry out genetic testing. This is slated to be performed in the near future by a group headed by Prof. Karl Skorecki of the Technion, who for several years now has specialized in research into Jewish genetics. The team will compare genetic findings from the Kuki with those of the Jews and thus attempt to examine common genetic roots. However, Halkin stresses in advance that "even if a genetic match is not found, this would not refute my belief in this connection. The textual findings are simply too strong."

A thousand immigrants a year

About seven years ago, Rabbi Avichail began **to bring members of the Kuki-Chin-Mizo to Israel as new immigrants**; he prefers to call them the Shin-Lung. He came to an agreement with the Interior Ministry whereby he would bring at most 100 people to Israel each year from among those who returned to Judaism with him back in India. In Israel they complete their study of Judaism at the Nahalat Zvi Yeshiva in Jerusalem, and then they undergo **full Orthodox conversion**. Several hundred members of the group are already living in Israel, most of them in Jewish settlements in the territories in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, especially in Neveh Dekalim in Gush Katif (the Gaza Strip). **[C'est-à-dire dans les colonies. Ces malheureux tibéto-birmans (leur véritable origine) n'ont pas le choix et servent de chair à canon. Le cynisme juif n'a pas de limites.]**

The main establishment foe of the "children of Menashe" is not the rabbinate, as might perhaps have been expected, nor the Interior Ministry. It is the Foreign Ministry, which is afraid that Rabbi Avichail's activities will anger the Indian authorities and damage relations between the two countries. According to Avichail, Foreign Ministry opposition has already meant that for several years now he has not been able to bring even 100 people, "even though my activities don't bother the Indians themselves, because these people are known as people who in any case are living as Jews, and there is no fear that I am a missionary."

Despite the opposition, Avichail has recently been planning to step up his activities in this matter. He says he has reached an agreement with the people at the Chief Rabbinate whereby *dayanim* (religious court judges) will be sent to convert the "children of Menashe" who are living in India as Jews. He says that this will allow for an increase of the number of immigrants to **1,000 a year**. At the moment, what he is mostly lacking is funding and people who are qualified to teach Judaism at **a level sufficient for Orthodox conversion**.

Rabbi Yehiel Eckstein's Jewish Friendship Fund, which raises money **from American Christians** for immigration and welfare activities in Israel, has already expressed willingness to contribute to the project; Avichail is checking into the Christian context of the fund. He is not afraid that a sudden relaxation of the possibilities for immigration will lead to conversion of many people who perhaps would not have thought of this initially: "I will not encourage them to do this, but if they come of their own accord, even for marginal reasons, of course we have to accept them. Nevertheless, these are people who originally belonged to the Jewish people."

<<http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=210571&contrassID=2&subContrassID=5&sbSubContrassID=0&listSrc=Y&itemNo=21057>>1

(Merci à Momo, le lecteur qui nous a envoyé ce texte)

On peut sourire à la vue de ce ramassis d'âneries et de naïvetés d'Américains incultes. Mais n'oublions pas que l'histoire des Falashas d'Ethiopie a débuté exactement de la même façon et qu'elle abouti à faire émigrer 10 à 20.000 personnes (et 6000 morts), fort utiles pour remplacer la main d'oeuvre arabe et gonfler les rangs de l'armée. Il y a un utilitarisme inavoué qui se cache sous ces incroyables élucubrations, évidemment liées à un trait qui marque fortement la culture juive: sa crédulité et son acceptation des croyances les plus irrationnelles (voir le hassidisme, la cabbale, les ravs miraculeux, Sabbatai, Frank et autres Jabotinsky. On n'a jamais traduit Descartes en hébreu...)

SOLIDARITÉ

Univ. of Michigan to Host 'Zionism is Racism' Conference

Sep. 30, 2002. -- The University of Michigan at Ann Arbor is slated to play host to a national student conference late next week, one of whose "guiding principles" is that it "condemns the racism and discrimination inherent in Zionism", the *Jerusalem Post* has learned.

The Second National Student Conference on the Palestine Solidarity Movement, which is scheduled to begin on October 12, is being sponsored by pro-Palestinian and socialist groups. It aims to promote an end to US aid to Israel and to encourage divestment by universities and corporations from the Jewish state.

In the conference's promotional material, organizers refer to "apartheid Israel", and refuse to condemn Palestinian terrorism, stating, "As a solidarity movement, it is not our place to dictate the strategies or tactics adopted by the Palestinian people in their struggle for liberation."

In addition to asserting that "racism" is "inherent to Zionism", the organizers call for "the right of return and repatriation for all Palestinian refugees" as well as "an end to the Israeli system of Apartheid and discrimination."

Panelists at the conference include Dr. Sami Al-Arian, a former Professor at the University of South Florida who was fired after reports surfaced linking him to Middle Eastern terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda and Islamic Jihad.

A similar conference on divestment, held earlier this year at Berkeley, caused an uproar among American academics, leading Harvard President Lawrence Summers to criticize the divestment scheme as "anti-Semitic."

In a statement issued last week, University of Michigan President Mary Coleman appeared to distance the school from the conference, stating, "The agenda of the conference represents the views of the organizers and not the University of Michigan." She added that the university had no intention of divesting from Israel. "I do not support this divestment," she said, adding, "As a matter of University policy, we do not believe political interests should govern our investment decisions."

WAR AND GLOBALISATION

The Truth behind September 11

by Michel Chossudovsky

PUBLICATION DATE: SEPTEMBER 2002

Michel Chossudovsky is the author of the international best-seller "The Globalisation of Poverty" published in eleven languages. He is Professor of Economics at the University of Ottawa and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalisation which hosts the critically acclaimed website: <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/>>www.globalresearch.ca .

PLAN PLAN

Le document de base qui sous-tend la politique d'expansion américaine et qui explique comment les USA doivent réagir à la crise pétrolière et énergétique qui vient. Voici ce qu'en dit le Sunday Herald:

The Battle Over Oil

by Neil Mackay; *Sunday Herald*; October 07, 2002

IT is a document that fundamentally questions the motives behind the Bush administration's desire to take out Saddam Hussein and go to war with Iraq.

Strategic Energy Policy Challenges For The 21st Century describes how America is facing the biggest energy crisis in its history. It targets Saddam as a threat to American interests because of his control of Iraqi oilfields and recommends the use of 'military intervention' as a means to fix the US energy crisis.

The report is linked to a veritable who's who of US hawks, oilmen and corporate bigwigs. It was commissioned by James Baker, the former US Secretary of State under George Bush Snr, and submitted to Vice-President Dick Cheney in April 2001 -- a full five months before September 11. Yet it advocates a policy of using military force against an enemy such as Iraq to secure US access to, and control of, Middle Eastern oil fields.

One of the most telling passages in the document reads: 'Iraq remains a destabilising influence to ... the flow of oil to international markets from the Middle East. Saddam Hussein has also demonstrated a willingness to threaten to use the oil weapon and to use his own export programme to manipulate oil markets.'

Lisez-le. Vous n'aurez pas perdu votre temps.

<http://www.rice.edu/projects/baker/Pubs/workingpapers/cfrbipp_energy/energycfr.pdf>

OPPORTUNISMES

A strange case of Jared Israel

By Israel Shamir

The Masters of the Discourse would not be what they are unless they were cunning. Many people arrive to the conclusion that they are misled by the media, experts and politicians. But what is the true reality? The Masters provide a huge choice of traps and misleading explanations of reality, partly true, partly false. Only careful reading allows us to notice the hidden trap.

The site **Emperor's Clothes** has all the qualities to pass for an opposition. They object to the present policies of Bush administration. They can disapprove of Israeli high-handedness. They show very well some of the lies permeating the media and politics of the politics in the US. And only sometimes their words express their true agenda. A letter from a reader Mr Golub alerted me to one of the traps.

A recent exchange of remarks

<<http://emperors-clothes.com/letters/joan.htm>>

between Jared Israel, one of the *Emperor's Clothes* most active voices, and a reader provides us with unique opportunity to see through the fake opposition. A reader asks Jared Israel, does not he see a connection between the war axe grinding of Bush administration and the Jewish lobby.

And the fake opposition voice immediately denies it: "I know many Jewish people and I can tell you that, regarding Israel, they are mostly convinced that the aftermath of 9-11 has made things much worse for that country. Most U.S. Jews do *not* want war with Iraq".

If you believe that one day you will buy Brooklyn Bridge. Most US Jews THAT MATTER push for the Doomsday. Among them Richard Perle, the chairman of the Pentagon's Defence Policy Board, an ex-employee of an Israeli weapon manufacturer Soltam, and the great supporter of the war, Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Defence Secretary, a leading Zionist Douglas Feith, a representative of an "Israeli Armaments Manufacturer", Dov Zakheim, Under Secretary of Defence, Edward Luttwak, of the National Security Study Group of the Department of Defence at the Pentagon, Lewis Libby, Vice President Dick Cheney's Chief of

Staff and a lawyer for the thief Mark Rich, Robert Satloff, the U.S. National Security Council Advisor, and the executive director of the Israeli lobby's "think tank," Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Elliott Abrams, National Security Council Advisor, and many, many others. For sure, there should be some Jews against the war, but they keep their quiet.

It is not classified information, spread by obscure sites: an honest Jewish voice, Philip Weiss, admits in the NY Observer[i], "Holy or Unholy, Jews and Right in an Alliance" and they push for War. "What about the natural proclivity of Jews to be liberals? asks Weiss, and replies: liberals have yielded authority in the debate. The refusal of liberal American Jews to make an independent stand has left the American left helpless. American liberalism has always drawn strength from Jews. Liberal Jews often have private conversations about the Middle East in which they acknowledge the absence of leadership in the Israeli government and the desperation of the Palestinians, but they generally do not wish this to become a public conversation with other American citizens". Intra-Jewish discourse became coarsely racist, and the Jewish Press published an attack on "The Plague of Jewish-Arab Marriages", concludes Weiss.

So much for the first lie of Jared Israel. But he does not stop here. He has to dissuade his readers that it is Israel and the US Jews who push for war. In a stupefying piece of disinformation, he writes: "There is *nothing* worse for Israel than war in the Middle East. Israel is a tiny country with very hard-to-defend borders, surrounded by Muslim-dominated countries with about 50 times Israel's population . The worst thing for Israel is a war in Iraq because it can only fan the flames of Muslim fanaticism, which will then be directed at Israel. The U.S. and England attack; Israel pays".

Well, Israel is surrounded by 'Muslim-dominated countries', but this 'tiny country' with the third nuclear potential in the world is fully supported by the 'Jew-dominated country', which happens to be the world's only superpower. Though Jared Israel thinks the war against Iraq is the worst thing for Israel, probably he has in mind some other Israel, as all senior politicians of the Jewish state, its prime-ministers and ministers for defence, its spokesmen, official and unofficial, publicly and privately call for war. An ex-Mossad agent Victor Ostrovsky[iii] asked his superiors why they were trying to cause a war between the US and Iraq. The reply was that Israel does not have the manpower and aircraft carriers to do the job. First thing said by Ehud Barak and Bibi Netanyahu on 9/11 was their demand to destroy Iraq (followed by Iran and Libya). Ariel Sharon pushes for war relentlessly and even now went to Moscow in order to bring President Putin to support the war.

Yes, the war is against true interests of Jews living in Israel. But we have no voice: our politicians are fully integrated in the Judeo-American establishment, they get their financial support from the American Jews, they dance to their fiddle. Our true interests can emerge only if and when the American Jews will lose their commanding heights in the American discourse.

The third lie of Jared Israel is even more brazen: "The U.S. and England attack; Israel pays". What nonsense! Israel NEVER pays. Whatever happens, Israeli Army's redeployment or violent attack on Palestinians, the settlements on the occupied territories or murder of children, everything is paid for by the people of the United States and Europe. They paid for Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon and from a part of Golan heights, they pay now for food for the starved Palestinians, they will pay for any 'peace settlement' Israel would agree to sign. When Israeli 'peace camp' promotes an idea of some compensation for the Palestinian refugees, they never offer to pay for the stolen lands and houses they live in: it is always one condition: "all will be paid for by the world community". The bill of Israel is not paid by the US Jews, either: they are not that silly. **The US Jews pay their politicians or threaten them into political oblivion, unless they pay with the money of Goyim.** If political considerations cause them to desist, they force the Goyim of Germany or Swiss to foot the bill.

How can a reader become aware of the hidden agenda of a liar with the straight face? There are telltale signs. He throws "Nazi" at everybody, from brothers Dulles to your truly. **He needlessly invokes the Jewish holocaust.** And whenever pushed he immediately refers to 'conspiracy theories'. Jared Israel writes to his reader: "If you see an Israeli plot in Fleischer being Jewish, why not see an Israeli plot in *my* being Jewish as well?" Well, that is what they said when all the luminaries of the Jewish America AND of the state of Israel, from

If you've got it on tape I strongly suggest you take another look at it, with the pause and frame-forward buttons at the ready. If you don't have it taped you can purchase the documentary in which it appears on video and DVD. It's called simply '9/11'.

When seen at full speed, you might first of all think that there isn't a great deal to see. There's half a second or so when we see the plane flying through the air then it smashes into the tower, creating an explosion and leaving a great gash across the building. Notice though that immediately before it hits the building the plane emits a brief, bright flash. Notice too that the scar it leaves on the building is rather larger than seems appropriate for the size of the aircraft.

Now pause the sequence at the beginning and advance it **frame by frame**. Firstly, look at the plane. Does that look like a Boeing jet to you? Is its wingspan wide enough? Does it have engines attached to its wings? These however are but minor details compared with what comes next. Watch carefully what happens as the plane approaches and crashes into the tower. I leave you to come to your own conclusions about what you see (watch it over and over again, backwards and forwards), but I'll tell you what I see. Immediately before the plane strikes it fires a missile that blows a hole in the building's façade. This is the cause of that brief flash. The plane then begins to disappear neatly into this hole, leaving no wing impressions. (A plane disappearing into a hole? Where have I heard that before; wasn't there something about a plane at the Pentagon?) Just before it disappears however it fires two more missiles from somewhere near its tail. One goes to the left, one to the right (and up a bit) and it is the blast holes from these three separate missiles that form the great gash across the building.

http://mail.yahoo.com/config/login?wtc1_explosion.jpg

There's more. Keep an eye on the adjacent east side of the building, which is also visible. See how, a few frames into the explosion, a white jet of smoke erupts out of the east side at the same level as the plane. The jet comes straight out of the wall at right angles to it, not angled in accordance with the trajectory of the plane. Also it's just white smoke and dust, no orange flames or anything like that. It is clearly a bomb going off, creating the gash that appears on the east wall.

I know what I am describing sounds incredible. **I suggest only that you look at the footage yourself** and come to your own conclusions about what you see.

The plane that hit the North Tower was not American Airlines Flight 11. It was not a Boeing 767. It was a military plane carrying three missiles that created the impression of a plane crash without leaving any wreckage. In order for it precisely to strike the correct part of the tower (in line with the bomb already planted in the east wall) it must have been flown remotely using cruise navigation. I believe a similar plane was used to strike the Pentagon.

The 'Conspiracy Theorists' have got it dead right this time. The true Flights 11, 175, 77 and 93 were indeed substituted with other planes when the transponders were switched off. Someone hijacked the hijackers to make sure the job was done properly.

The 'Fireman's Video' is Bush's true smoking gun. It is in the public domain and it is even available on DVD. It is probably sitting in the video shelves of thousands and thousands of homes across the world. It is vitally important that the American people see this video frame by frame so they can make their own minds up about what really happened on September 11.

There has been a silent coup in America but few have noticed yet. The Bush Administration is clearly very sinister indeed and God only knows what it has in store for us next. There is a clue though in the things of which it accuses Saddam Hussein: building and using weapons of mass destruction (nuclear and biological) and killing his own people. **When Bush describes Saddam he is describing himself.**

We have entered the Age of the Conjuror and it is going to be a tricky time. The 9-11 stunt was a huge magic trick and we all bought it at first. Magicians can be very convincing. You have to look very hard to see the trick and not be fooled. On this occasion slow motion exposes the sleight of hand, but remember how the magician works: he can make almost anything seem real if he can make his audience look in the wrong place at crucial moments.

Only the American people can now stop the imminent slaughter and the imposition of a global fascist police state, but they are currently sleepwalking into their own enslavement. It may already be too late. But maybe if enough Americans get out their videos and their

Muammar Gadafy, in 1996. A book, *Forbidden Truth*, published this summer claims that British intelligence was in contact with "Osama bin Laden's main allies" who were opposed to Colonel Gadafy."

The *London Evening Standard* article was entitled 'Calls for secret Shayler trial' -- again, it has now been removed. Luckily I saved the text to a Word file and printed the article:

[UPDATE - After pressure, this article is now back online! But for how long? Save it to your hard drive.]

Before you read this, it is important to understand the issue at hand. We're talking about MI6 cooperation with bin Laden, arms to Iraq and, as reported today in the *Scotsman*, claims that, 'secret services ignored warnings that might have prevented bombings in the London in 1993 and 1994.'

Shayler has evidence that MI5 wilfully failed to stop the bomb attack on Israel's London embassy in 1994 and the IRA's 1993 Bishopsgate bombing, which killed one person.

Here it is in Shayler's own words plus the actual MI6 Gaddafi plot document -- MI6 Plot to assassinate Colonel Gaddafi: Police enquiry confirms Plot is not "fantasy". Here is the *London Evening Standard* report I managed to rescue.

[Update! Take a look at the scans of the article I printed off - why was it removed? Judge for yourself...]

London evening standard on line

Calls for secret Shayler trial

By Patrick McGowan, Evening Standard

THE Government has been accused by lawyers of trying to interfere in the trial of former MI5 officer David Shayler by insisting that part of the proceedings are held in private.

Ministers are demanding that trial judge Mr Justice Alan Moses agree in advance that the case go into private session without saying why and without hearing arguments to the contrary from the defence.

Shayler's trial, on charges under the Official Secrets Act, was beginning at the Old Bailey today. He is being prosecuted following newspaper interviews he gave five years ago and the trial is expected to last for at least four weeks. On Friday Home Secretary David Blunkett and Foreign Secretary Jack Straw signed identical public interest immunity certificates under which the press and the public will have to leave court if sensitive security issues are raised.

The certificates do not specify what information they are trying to keep secret on the grounds that to do so would cause the very damage the Government is seeking to avoid. They claim:

"Publication of information of the kinds referred to would be likely to assist those whose purpose it is to injure the security of the United Kingdom and whose actions in the past show that they are willing to kill innocent civilians, both inside and outside the UK, in pursuance of their aims."

Mr Blunkett and Mr Straw also claim present and future intelligence operations would be compromised. PII certificates signed by Conservative ministers were controversially used during the arms-to-Iraq trials in the Nineties.

Normally the judge in a trial would read documents in the case and, after hearing arguments from both sides, decide whether they should be disclosed. Now he is being asked to make his decision in advance. Shayler, 36, faces three charges. They allege he disclosed information, disclosed information obtained by interception of communications and disclosed documents.

The Crown Prosecution Service has already given notice that it will apply for some parts of the trial to be held in camera. This will apply to evidence on "**sensitive operational techniques** of the Security and Intelligence Services".

It is expected that the court will also be asked to keep the identities of MI5 agents secret and allow them to give evidence from behind screens. Today Geoffrey Robertson QC, representing civil rights group Liberty, will oppose the Government's move. Michael Tugendhat QC, appearing for various national newspapers, is expected to argue that the Government has provided no evidence that national security will be threatened by the trial and will underline the importance of open justice.

During the arms-to-Iraq cases Mr Justice Moses was prosecuting counsel and Mr Robertson was counsel for the defence when three directors of the machine tool company Matrix Churchill were accused of selling equipment to the Iraqi regime. Shayler will be defending himself during the trial.

He is expected to claim that British secret service agents paid up to £100,000 to al Qaeda terrorists for an assassination attempt on Libyan leader Colonel Gaddafi in 1996.

He is seeking permission to plead a defence of "necessity" - that he acted for the greater good by revealing wrongdoing by the security service. Although much of the trial may end up being held in camera, the arguments about which parts should be kept secret will be held in public. Only after they are concluded is the jury expected to be sworn in so the trial proper can begin.

[UPDATE: The London Evening Standard have published a shorter, watered down, version of this story. It does not mention MI5's £100,000 transfer to Al-Qaeda. **Yet more evidence of a top down cover-up** - read the new whitewashed piece here and compare it to my scanned original that was pulled along with all the others!]

The Scotsman also released a report which remains online but both the title and the article has been amended!!! The new article talks about new MI5 head Eliza Manningham-Buller, only mentioning the Shayler case in passing. It certainly does not include information concerning the Labour MP's involved and government prior knowledge of terrorist bombings in London. I archived the original at

<http://www.propagandamatrix.com/renegade_mi5_agent_to_face_jury.htm>

The report was originally entitled 'Renegade MI5 agent ready to face jury' it is now called 'Has MI5 really emerged from shadows?' This is the report with the most damning information (the one they erased).

David Irving comments:

I AM indebted to friends in Canada who emailed this story back to me. Focal Point Publications has mirrored it on its California website.

The uncensored versions of this article was posted on the *Propaganda Matrix website*, which writes today: We can't let it disappear down an Orwellian memory hole. Please E-mail all three publications and asked them why they removed or altered their reports. E-mail the London Guardian, the London Evening Standard and The Scotsman. Even local papers such as the Leicestershire Mail and the Derby Evening Telegraph have removed the story from their websites!

They were entitled 'SHAYLER AT OLD BAILEY FOR TRIAL' and 'SHAYLER ARRIVES FOR TRIAL.'

Now they are gone. As is a London Independent article that was entitled 'MI5 faces accountability test as new chief takes reins.' As of 4am UK time, you can still see the original titles of the reports as stored on Google's Beta News Search (these will probably also be deleted in the coming hours).

[UPDATE: It is now confirmed that all details relating to the Shayler case cannot be reported.]

The UK government have successfully gagged the cowardly pathetic mainstream media, but I will continue to track this story. The Guardian reports -- 'Shayler hearing' 'An Old Bailey court yesterday heard legal arguments relating to the trial of David Shayler, the former MI5 officer charged with breaking the Official Secrets Act. The judge ruled that they cannot be reported. Mr Shayler's trial is now expected to be heard before a jury next week.'

<<http://www.focal.org/website/online/std/dings/squaregrey.gif>>

Focal Point <<http://www.focal.org/ar/Shayler.html>>

CHIENNERIE

Oriana Fallaci est poursuivie en France par les ligues de vertu pour un livre ignoble, *La Rage et l'orgueil*. Nous sommes hostiles à ce genre de poursuites, et encore plus hostile à cette pauvre conne qui a toutes les caractéristiques du, ou de la journaliste. Mais il est amusant

Laurent Rucker apporte, sur cet épisode et toute l'Histoire des relations complexes entre l'URSS et le monde juif, un éclairage précieux en ces temps d'amnésies et de simplifications en tout genre. La position soviétique -- pro-israélienne, donc -- était motivée à cette époque (1947-48) par les objectifs de lutte "anti-impérialiste" contre la Grande-Bretagne, d'autant que les sympathies "socialistes" d'une frange des pionniers d'Israël contrastent avec le caractère "réactionnaire" et "féodal" du monde arabe et palestinien à cette époque. L'URSS changera de position lorsque deviendront évidentes l'orientation pro-occidentale de l'état sioniste et l'intérêt de soutenir une révolution arabe naissante d'orientation anti-impérialiste voire socialiste. Il n'empêche que ce soutien de Staline à Israël -- si hétérodoxe en apparence -- s'inscrit aussi dans le prolongement de la lutte contre le nazisme et de l'influence qu'y exerça une autre création de Staline, le Comité antifasciste des intellectuels juifs soviétiques, chargés de rallier les Juifs du monde occidental, notamment américain, à la cause de l'URSS contre Hitler. Faut-il rappeler l'immense prestige de l'armée rouge, en 1945, parmi les Juifs et le reste de l'opinion occidentale ? Ce que l'on sait moins, et que montre Rucker, ce sont les liens noués à cette époque entre les Soviétiques et les traditionnels ennemis sionistes, les curieux débats qui s'esquissent, tel celui d'une éventuelle république juive soviétique en Crimée, resuçée d'un projet des années vingt abandonné au profit de la région autonome juive du Birobidjan. L'action du Comité antifasciste juif et le rapprochement URSS-Israël auront des effets encourageants pour le sionisme en URSS, auquel Staline réagira avec la plus extrême violence, usant dans les dernières années de son règne d'un véritable antisémitisme d'état pour défaire non seulement l'influence sioniste mais, surtout, les diverses oppositions communistes à sa dictature, en Europe centrale et orientale.. La plupart des intellectuels du Comité antifasciste seront fusillés.

Des origines à la fin de l'URSS, Laurent Rucker retrace ainsi, en finesse, les rapports mouvementés, nullement univoques, et violents qui ont pu exister entre les trois tentations du monde juif au 20ème siècle: le sionisme axé sur le "retour en Palestine", le bundisme revendiquant l'autonomie culturelle (mais non territoriale) pour les communautés juives en Russie, le communisme prônant leur assimilation au sein du nouveau peuple internationaliste, après que 1917 eut effectivement libéré les Juifs des discriminations tsaristes. L'un des paradoxes de cette Histoire est que les communistes soviétiques (où les Juifs étaient nombreux et influents au départ), après avoir écrasé leurs oppositions politiques juives comme toutes les autres, leur ont aussi emprunté des éléments : l'autonomie culturelle fut réalisée avec l'essor de la culture yiddish dans l'URSS des années 20-30, une sorte de "sionisme" se fit jour sous la forme du territoire juif du Birobidjan. Aucune de ces réalisations n'épargna au judaïsme et aux Juifs soviétiques les rigueurs des répressions staliniennes avec, en prime, le retour en force d'un antisémitisme hérité du christianisme et des tsars. I.P.

Samorevue 1.

The Israeli Holocaust Against the Palestinians

by Michael Hoffman and Moshe Lieberman, 110 pages. \$12.95

Compiled by two elite scholars with impeccable credentials -- Hoffman, a former reporter for the New York bureau of the Associated Press, and Moshe Lieberman, a former Hebrew University researcher -- the authors combine their sleuthing skills and erudition to bring the reader an irrefutable dossier of Israeli war crimes in Palestine, profusely illustrated with harrowing photos of the death and destruction which the Zionist war machine has administered as collective punishment upon the entire Palestinian nation.

Nothing like this book has ever seen print. The authors marshal a dossier of massive evidence and stunning documentary photographs, proving conclusively that **the Israelis themselves are guilty of a holocaust.**

Hoffman and Lieberman make a devastating case for Israeli criminality, while exposing the ferocious Talmudic racism that fuels the Israeli identification of the Palestinian people as "Amalek," and targets them for the final solution of "total eradication." The authors argue that to pretend that Zionist atrocities have not been systematically perpetrated in Palestine

as part of a coherent dogma of eliminationism, constitutes nothing less than "holocaust denial."

Reader Comments:

This book had two main objectives. First, to rally the general public against the slow motion genocide of the Palestinians. Secondly, this book establishes a basis for **future war crime trials** against the soldiers, Army commanders, and Israeli/U.S. politicians who have facilitated these crimes against humanity. It is interesting that the authors generously provide George Bush, Jr., his only legal defense in the next to last paragraph of the book; i.e., President Bush is not responsible for his actions because he is acting under duress, his Zionist handlers will assassinate him if he disobeys orders. Much of the book is a catalog of Israeli war crimes committed during March-April 2002. Reading this catalog of war crimes set my teeth on edge and depressed me so much that the book was difficult to read. I wish the book had a short history of Israel starting with the Balfour agreement that dragged the U.S. into WWI. From its inception, Israel has been a Frankenstein monster. I hope the authors write a sequel to this book (when Israel "transfers" the Palestinians into Jordan) and include a chapter called "The Jew Haters that Created the state of Israel." One example of a Jew Hater that helped to create the state of Israel is Dr. Joachim Prinz, a Zionist rabbi who in Germany of 1934 (after Hitler started systematic oppression of the Jews) wrote a book, *Wir Juden* (We, Jews) celebrating the rise of Hitler and Nazi ideology. Dr. Joachim later immigrated to the U.S., where he rose to become vice-chairman of the World Jewish Congress. The authors think their book may launch a ground swell of revulsion about what is being done to the Palestinians. This seems an almost naive hope to me. The sheeple in the U.S. and Europe are too well indoctrinated and the politicians too well bribed or paid off for anything to happen soon. However, this book will help facilitate a war crimes trial in the future.

To order this book e-mail ReporterNoteBook@aol.com your snail mailing address and I will send a copy out for next day delivery. Will bill you 12.95 plus 3.50 shipping.

Michael Santomauro, Editorial Director, 253 west 72nd st #1711, New York, NY 10023, USA
Tel (1) 212-787-7891

<<http://www.RePorterNoteBook.com>>

On peut aussi le commander: Independent History and Research Company, PO Box 849, Coeur d'Alène, IDAHO 83816-0849, USA.

NN

Un site qui met en ligne les classiques des sciences humaines, y compris Descartes, Comte, Toqueville, Marx et Engels, Freud, etc. 319 bouquins, pour l'instant, réalisés par des bénévoles. Un grand coup de chapeau !

<http://www.uqac.quebec.ca/zone30/Classiques_des_sciences_sociales/html/biblio_liste.html>

Il faudrait y ajouter un proscrit, le philosophe Georges Palante (1862-1925), rejeté par la Sorbonne:

<<http://perso.wanadoo.fr/selene.star/>>

Toutes les revues branchées, les mecquetons à la mode, les rastignaculés, les trémoussantes, les futures gloires qui cognent à la porte:

<<http://frkc.free.fr/revuec/miseaupoinc.htm>>

Le "christianisme d'origine" retransmis par l'Eglise orthodoxe:

<<http://www.top.ca/users/thabor/>>

Un tour sur le forum romain, reconstruction de synthèse. C'est le soir, mais il n'y a personne. Voyez le temple du divin Jules:

<<http://www.uq.net.au/~enhdemid/forum2.html>>

Celui du divin Jospin n'est pas encore ouvert au culte.

Livres arabes sur l'islam

Dar al-Kotob al-ilmiah (Publishing House)

Tel & Fax : (+961-5) 804810 / 11 / 12 / 13

P.o.box : 11 - 9424 Beyrouth - Liban

web: <<http://www.arabic-islamic-books.com>>

e-mail : marketing@al-ilmiah.com

La malhonnêteté du dossier Blair sur l'Irak, par Robert Fisk

<<http://argument.independent.co.uk/commentators/story.jsp?story=336404>>

La cassette se termine 3 minutes trop tot:

Flight93, the Three-minute discrepancy in tape

<<http://www.philly.com/ml/dailynews/4084323.htm>>

US Government Refuses to Release Communications From 9/11 Planes

<<http://www.thememoryhole.org/911/foia-communications.htm>>

<<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/cms.dll/articleshow.asp?artid=22569589>>

Les fachos du truc interdit, "unité radicale" sont sur le net, à Kildare, en Irlande, probablement au pub du coin:

<<http://www.voxnr.com/>>

La Guerre du Pétrole, Oil War !

Une collections de liens sur ce thème:

<<http://www.oilwars.com/>>

+++++

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. section 107, this material is distributed without profit or payment to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving this information for non-profit research and educational purposes only.

Chi NON DESIDERA ricevere nostre segnalazioni ci invii una mail a >gazettegb@yahoo.fr<

Si vous désirez recevoir OU NE PAS RECEVOIR la Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues, faites-le savoir à >gazettegb@yahoo.fr<

If you wish to receive OR NOT RECEIVE the Gazette, please drop a note to >gazettegb@yahoo.fr<

Les anciens numéros sont en ligne à

<<http://ggb.0catch.com>>

Former issues are on line at the above URL.