

Hawaii Libertarian

Monthly Newsletter of the Libertarian Party of Hawaii Vol. 21, No. 2, February 2003



From the Chair By Roger Taylor

It's too early to tell if it will last, but the ousting of the Democrats from the Governorship has brought a fresh breeze to Hawaii Politics. I would like to see the Libertarian Party evolve more toward support of common ground. One of the most difficult things for me to do is explain to people a Libertarian World. They often say, "I know what you are against, but what are you for?" It isn't enough to say take away most of the government and increase freedom. They want an image of what would fill the void. In any case I urge members to support good actions by our elected leaders in addition to keeping an eagle eye out for attacks on our basic freedoms.

Our next monthly meeting will be on March 2. We will be discussing taxes and workings of the Legislature. As time approaches we will keep you informed by email if we have any special speakers. Our convention will be at 2500 Pali Hwy on Saturday May 10 from 2 pm to 6 pm. See you there.

Hatred of America - the Socialism of Fools

By Michael Gove

The Times Online (UK) | January 14, 2003

Tony Blair appears to have set himself his toughest task yet. Neither reforming public services nor maintaining economic stability compares in difficulty to the mission he took on yesterday. For a Labour politician to confront anti-Americanism is to set himself up in opposition to the dominant ideology of the contemporary Left.

Knocking America off its superpower pedestal has long supplanted taking control of the commanding heights of the economy as the idea which holds the Left together. Forget Clause Four. That was a dead red letter. It's opposition to Uncle Sam which is the glue in the Left coalition, the brew which puts fire into bien-pensant bellies, the opium of radical intellectuals. And the crack in Osama bin Laden's pipe.

Anti-Americanism provides the dumbest beat for the protesters who march at every significant left-wing rally. Whether the protest is nominally against war, global capitalism or environmental degradation, the real enemy is Washington. Every significant Left intellectual, from Harold Pinter through Dario Fo to Gore Vidal and Noam Chomsky has made criticism of the American imperium his defining belief. But Yankee-phobia now extends far beyond the protest march and the academy.

The German Social Democrats and Greens put opposition to US foreign policy at the heart of their, successful, re-election strategy last autumn. The Liberal Democrats here have made criticism of US policy towards Iraq the single biggest dividing line between themselves and the Blair Government.

The cultural popularity of anti-Americanism, particularly among Britain's intelligentsia, is striking. The surprise publishing hit of last year was *Why do people hate America?* by Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davies, a work which set out to reassure readers that hatred of America was more than a rising sentiment, it was a moral duty. The top of the UK bestseller list is Michael Moore's *Stupid White Men*, a furious polemic against US foreign, domestic and economic policy by one of its own citizens.

The widespread prevalence of anti-Americanism, the cachet accorded to its advocates, the reflexive sniggering triggered by any favourable mention of America's President, all make opposition to this trend unpopular. But vitally necessary. For Yankee-phobia is, at heart, a dark thing, a prejudice with ugly antecedents which creates unholy alliances. And, like all prejudices, it thrives on myths which will end up only serving evil ends.

It is a myth that America is a trigger-happy cowboy state over-eager to throw its weight around, a myth that America seeks to use its undoubted military power to establish an exploitative empire, and a myth that America thrives by impoverishing and oppressing other nations.

A trigger-happy starter of wars and provoker of enemies? The truth is that the US has been painstakingly slow to involve itself in foreign conflicts. It hung back from involvement in Bosnia and Kosovo until it was clear that Europe could not manage alone. It refrained from dealing properly with al-Qaeda when that network attacked US embassies in 1998 and, even after 9/11, it waited until a huge international coalition had been assembled before striking back. In Iraq, it refrained from finishing off President Saddam Hussein in 1991 out of deference to its Arab allies. And with North Korea, it has practiced diplomacy in the face of nuclear provocation since 1994, out of respect for its regional allies. Even now, in

dealing with the dangers posed by Iraq and North Korea, the diplomatic route is followed out of deference to others.

An imperial exploiter? The truth is that America seeks to disentangle itself from anything which smacks of neocolonial occupation. It is anxious to bring the boys back home from the Balkans and Afghanistan. The real criticism of weight is that the US should do more on the ground to help failed states rebuild, as it did in Japan and Germany after the Second World War.

Announcements

General & Exec Meeting:

Sunday March 2nd, 2003, 6:30 PM

Taxes and comments about the Linda Lingle Administration/Legislature.

Convention

Saturday May 10 from 2 pm to 6 pm
2500 Pali Hwy

Join the Hawaii Libertarian Party

On Line: Visit the Hawaii Party website at <http://www.hi.lp.org>, click on the *Join LPH!* Button, and follow the instructions there. While there, look around! You'll find lots of useful info. Like links to ALL our candidate sites.✍

Which takes us to the myth of America the locust state, the predator on the poorest nations of the Earth. The truth, as the US writer Charles Krauthammer has pointed out, is that America's influence for good in suffering states is directly measurable in three very different examples. After the Second World War three devastated nations were divided. In each case one part of a culturally unified nation fell under America's political influence. And in each case — South Korea versus North, West Germany as against East, Taiwan as opposed to Communist China — the territory which took the American path enjoyed greater freedom and prosperity.

Why then do the myths of America the Hateful take such powerful hold? Because anti-Americanism provides a useful emotional function which goes beyond logic and reaches deep into the darker recesses of the European soul. In centuries past those on the Left who wished to personalise their hatred of capitalism, who sought to make it emotionally resonant by fastening an envious political passion on to a blameless scapegoat people, embraced anti-Semitism. It was the socialism of fools. Which is what anti-Americanism is now.

It should not therefore be surprising that those on the populist Right who share the Left's antipathy towards the US are those, like the Austrian Freedom Party or the French National Front, who are heirs of anti-Semitic traditions. Nor should it be remarkable that the other tie which binds these allies of new

Left and old Right together, the thread linking those such as George Galloway and Jörg Haider, is their hostility to Israel.

Both America and Israel were founded by peoples who were refugees from prejudice in Europe. Europe's tragedy is that prejudice has been given new life, in antipathy to both those states.

CHEW ON THIS

Saddam's crimes, al Qaeda massacres, Kurdish freedom, oil worth fighting for... and a few other things Seattle's potlucking peaceniks might want to think about this weekend.

by Christopher Hitchens

Dear brothers and sisters, boys and girls, comrades and friends,

The editor of this rag told me of your upcoming "Potlucks for Peace" event and invited my comments, and at first I couldn't think of a thing to say. For one thing, why should I address a Seattle audience (or even suppose that I have a Seattle audience, for that matter)? I daresay that I can claim a tenuous connection, because I have always had a good crowd when reading at the splendid bookstores of the city, and because it was in Seattle that I stayed when grounded on September 11, 2001, a date that now makes some people yawn.

I had been speaking to the students of Whitman College in Walla Walla about the crimes of Henry Kissinger and had told them that 11 September--which was then tomorrow--was a symbolic date. On that day in 1973, the civilian government in Chile had been drowned in blood by an atrocious military coup. On the same day in 2001, a group of Chilean survivors proposed to file a lawsuit against Kissinger in a federal court in Washington, D.C. I showed a film illustrating this, made some additional remarks, and closed by saying that the date would be long remembered in the annals of the struggle for human rights. I got some pretty decent applause--and this from the alma mater of Henry "Scoop" Jackson, whose family was present. On the following morning I got a very early call from my wife, who was three hours ahead of me. She told me to turn on the TV, and she commented mordantly that the anti-Kissinger campaign might have to be on hold for a while. (Oddly enough, and as recent events have shown, she was mistaken about that.) Everyone knows what I saw when I turned on the TV.

Now hear this. Ever since that morning, the United States has been at war with the forces of reaction. May I please entreat you to reread the preceding sentence? Or perhaps you will let me restate it for emphasis. The government and people of these United States are now at war with the forces of reaction.

This outcome was clearly not willed, at least on the American side. And everybody with half an education seems to know how to glibly dilute the statement. Isn't Saudi Arabia reactionary? What about Pakistani nukes? Do we bomb Sharon for his negation of Palestinian rights? Weren't we on Saddam's side when he was at his worst? (I am exempting the frantic and discredited few who think or suggest that George W. Bush fixed up the attacks to inflate the military budget and

abolish the Constitution.) But however compromised and shameful the American starting point was--and I believe I could make this point stick with greater venom and better evidence than most people can muster--the above point remains untouched. The United States finds itself at war with the forces of reaction.

Do I have to demonstrate this? The Taliban's annihilation of music and culture? The enslavement of women? The massacre of Shiite Muslims in Afghanistan? Or what about the latest boast of al Qaeda--that the bomb in Bali, massacring so many Australian holidaymakers, was a deliberate revenge for Australia's belated help in securing independence for East Timor? (Never forget that the Muslim fundamentalists are not against "empire." They fight proudly for the restoration of their own lost caliphate.) To these people, the concept of a civilian casualty is meaningless if the civilian is an unbeliever or a heretic.

Confronted with such a foe--which gladly murders Algerians and Egyptians and Palestinians if they have any doubts about the true faith, or if they happen to be standing in the wrong place at the wrong time, or if they happen to be female--exactly what role does a "peace movement" have to play? A year or so ago, the "peace movement" was saying that Afghanistan could not even be approached without risking the undying enmity of the Muslim world; that the Taliban could not be bombed during Ramadan; that a humanitarian disaster would occur if the Islamic ultra-fanatics were confronted in their own lairs. Now we have an imperfect but recovering Afghanistan, with its population increased by almost two million returned refugees. Have you ever seen or heard any of those smart-ass critics and cynics make a self-criticism? Or recant?

To the contrary, the same critics and cynics are now lining up to say, "Hands off Saddam Hussein," and to make almost the same doom-laden predictions. The line that connects Afghanistan to Iraq is not a straight one by any means. But the oblique connection is ignored by the potluck peaceniks, and one can be sure (judging by their past form) that it would be ignored even if it were as direct as the connection between al Qaeda and the Taliban. Saddam Hussein denounced the removal of the Sunni Muslim-murdering Slobodan Milosevic, and also denounced the removal of the Shiite-murdering Taliban. Reactionaries have a tendency to stick together (and I don't mean "guilt by association" here. I mean GUILT). If the counsel of the peaceniks had been followed, Kuwait would today be the 19th province of Iraq (and based on his own recently produced evidence, Saddam Hussein would have acquired nuclear weapons). Moreover, Bosnia would be a trampled and cleansed province of Greater Serbia, Kosovo would have been emptied of most of its inhabitants, and the Taliban would still be in power in Afghanistan. Yet nothing seems to disturb the contented air of moral superiority that surrounds those who intone the "peace movement."

There are at least three well-established reasons to favor what is euphemistically termed "regime change" in Iraq. The first is the flouting by Saddam Hussein of every known law on genocide and human rights, which is why the Senate--at the

urging of Bill Clinton--passed the Iraq Liberation Act unanimously before George W. Bush had even been nominated. The second is the persistent effort by Saddam's dictatorship to acquire the weapons of genocide: an effort which can and should be thwarted and which was condemned by the United Nations before George W. Bush was even governor of Texas. The third is the continuous involvement by the Iraqi secret police in the international underworld of terror and destabilization. I could write a separate essay on the evidence for this; at the moment I'll just say that it's extremely rash for anybody to discount the evidence that we already possess. (And I shall add that any "peace movement" that even pretends to care for human rights will be very shaken by what will be uncovered when the Saddam Hussein regime falls. Prisons, mass graves, weapon sites... just you wait.)

None of these things on their own need necessarily make a case for an intervention, but taken together--and taken with the permanent threat posed by Saddam Hussein to the oilfields of the region--they add up fairly convincingly. Have you, or your friends, recently employed the slogan "No War for Oil"? If so, did you listen to what you were saying? Do you mean that oil isn't worth fighting for, or that oil resources aren't worth protecting? Do you recall that Saddam Hussein ignited the oilfields of Kuwait when he was in retreat, and flooded the local waterways with fire and pollution? (Should I patronize the potluckistas, and ask them to look up the pictures of poisoned birds and marine animals from that year?) Are you indifferent to the possibility that such a man might be able to irradiate the oilfields next time? OF COURSE it's about oil, stupid.

To say that he might also do all these terrible things if attacked or threatened is to miss the point. Last time he did this, or massacred the Iraqi and Kurdish populations, he was withdrawing his forces under an international guarantee. The Iraqi and Kurdish peoples are now, by every measure we have or know, determined to be rid of him. And the hope, which is perhaps a slim one but very much sturdier than other hopes, is that the next Iraqi regime will be better and safer, not just from our point of view but from the points of view of the Iraqi and Kurdish peoples. The sanctions policy, which was probably always hopeless, is now quite indefensible. If lifted, it would only have allowed Saddam's oligarchy to re-equip. But once imposed, it was immoral and punitive without the objective of regime change. Choose. By the way, and while we are choosing, if you really don't want war, you should call for the lifting of the no-fly zones over northern and southern Iraq. These have been war measures since 1991.

What would the lifting of the no-fly zones mean for the people who live under them? I recently sat down with my old friend Dr. Barham Salih, who is the elected prime minister of one sector of Iraqi Kurdistan. Neither he nor his electorate could be mentioned if it were not for the no-fly zones imposed--as a result of democratic protest in the West--at the end of the last Gulf War. In his area of Iraq, "regime change" has already occurred. There are dozens of newspapers, numerous radio and TV channels, satellite dishes, Internet cafes. Four female judges have been appointed. Almost half the students at the

University of Sulaimaniya are women. And a pro al Qaeda group, recently transferred from Afghanistan, is trying to assassinate the Kurdish leadership and nearly killed my dear friend Barham just the other day.... Now, why would this gang want to make that particular murder its first priority?

Before you face that question, consider this. Dr. Salih has been through some tough moments in his time. Most of the massacres and betrayals of the Kurdish people of Iraq took place with American support or connivance. But the Kurds have pressed ahead with regime change in any case. Surely a "peace movement" with any principles should be demanding that the United States not abandon them again. I like to think I could picture a mass picket in Seattle, offering solidarity with Kurdistan against a government of fascistic repression, and opposing any attempt to sell out the Kurds for reasons of realpolitik. Instead, there is a self-satisfied isolationism to be found, which seems to desire mainly a quiet life for Americans. The option of that quiet life disappeared a while back, and it's only coincidence that for me it vanished in Seattle. The United States is now at war with the forces of reaction, and nobody is entitled to view this battle as a spectator. The Union under Lincoln wasn't wholeheartedly against slavery. The USA under Roosevelt had its own selfish agenda even while combating Hitler and Hirohito. The hot-and-cold war against Stalinism wasn't exactly free of blemish and stain. How much this latest crisis turns into an even tougher war with reaction, at home or abroad, could depend partly upon those who currently think that it is either possible or desirable to remain neutral. I say "could," even though the chance has already been shamefully missed. But a mere potluck abstention will be remembered only with pity and scorn.

Christopher Hitchens is a columnist for Vanity Fair and the I. F. Stone Fellow at the University of California, Berkeley. His most recent book is *Why Orwell Matters*.

Is John Galt Venezuelan?

By [Thor L. Halvorssen](#)

The American Enterprise Online | January 10, 2003

On January 1 Venezuela entered into its second month of a national work stoppage. Close to 90 percent of the working population refuses to participate as producers in an economy that supports the regime of Lieutenant Col. Hugo Chavez. In a disorganized and chaotic fashion, without any single leader or political party, the people (known as "the opposition") have taken a page out of Ayn Rand's novel, *Atlas Shrugged*, and tried to answer an important question in that literary masterpiece: what would happen if the productive forces laboring under a despotic government went on strike and ceased subsidizing their own subjugation?

Chavez, a radical Marxist, was elected four years ago on a campaign promising to eradicate poverty and do away with government corruption. Since he was elected he has done away with the rule of law and private property while presiding over the greatest oil boom in Venezuela's history. Corruption and poverty have grown to levels unseen in the country's history. Chavez passed 49 decrees that expropriated private

property in the name of his "revolution." He terrorizes the opposition with his militia, the *Circulos Bolivarianos*—armed thugs financed by the government. But there is hope.

The country is united against Chavez. The labor unions and the chamber of commerce oppose him. They all speak of liberty, dignity, and the right to work for one's prosperity. They see his rule as a threat and on December 1, 2002 they discontinued their complicity. The unions orchestrated the closing of industry for one day. Then they extended it another day. And another... New Year's Day was the 30th day. But most surprising and encouraging: the government's main source of revenue, the state-owned oil company, PDVSA, has also stopped.

The drama of the oil stoppage illustrates the magical realism that South America is famous for. Beyond the 40,000 laborers, engineers, and technicians that left the refineries and oil fields, the stoppage climaxed at sea. Dozens of oil tankers, part of the merchant marine, suddenly dropped their anchors and declared solidarity with the opposition. One ship, the *Pilin Leon*, was headed for Cuba (Chavez supplied free oil to Fidel Castro's government). Some companies use names of kings and heroes, others use names of presidents or business leaders, in Venezuela, oil tankers are named after the country's second greatest export: beauty queens. *Pilin Leon* was the Venezuelan beauty queen who became Miss World 1981. The drama surrounding the *Pilin Leon* became the focus of the struggle. Miss Leon herself, in London judging the Miss Universe contest that had recently been moved from Nigeria, sent the ship's crew a message that she was proud of them and hoped they would stand firm. They did.

Days later, The tanker was taken over in a commando-style raid by Venezuela's armed forces after Chavez decreed the lethal use of force in order to protect the "energy supply of the revolution." Other tankers were also forced back to port but most remain anchored—Chavez does not have the manpower with the expertise to sail them at full capacity. Oil facilities use less than 10 percent of their capacity.

The governments of the hemisphere have abandoned the liberty-loving producers of Venezuela (Brazil's government, now headed by Chavez sympathizer Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, has shipped tankers with gasoline to break the work stoppage) and the U.S. Ambassador here has blithely mouthed platitudes about the importance of democracy while disregarding the crimes of the government. He even failed to condemn the televised murder of opposition members by Chavez thugs, instead engaging in moral equivalency and blaming "two sides."

Perhaps the U.S. government's policy on Chavez (nefariously influenced by President Clinton's former Ambassador to Venezuela who is now Condoleezza Rice's National Security Council advisor for Latin America) is betting on the chance that Chavez can weather the work stoppage and get the oil flowing soon (for an Iraq war timetable?). Venezuela supplies the U.S. with 15 percent of its oil imports.

As in Rand's novel, things get progressively worse and government rhetoric cannot alter the reality. Chavez calls the

country's workers "Traitors who have stabbed their country in the back." His ministers publicly suggested that lethal force be used to compel the workers to return to their posts.

There is no fear in Venezuela. There is resolve, indignation, and determination. The oil workers have daily meetings, massive gatherings taking place at amphitheaters, universities, and even ballrooms. Their will is unshakeable in the face of the tyrant. The wheels of production have stopped turning. For now Atlas has shrugged.

—*Thor L. Halvorssen has served as a political strategist and campaign consultant in two Venezuelan presidential elections. He lives in Philadelphia.*

Thinking About Iraq (II)

By THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN

In my column on Wednesday I laid out why I believe that liberals underestimate how ousting Saddam Hussein could help spur positive political change in the Arab world. Today's column explores why conservative advocates of ousting Saddam underestimate the risks, and where we should strike the balance.

Let's start with one simple fact: Iraq is a black box that has been sealed shut since Saddam came to dominate Iraqi politics in the late 1960's. Therefore, one needs to have a great deal of humility when it comes to predicting what sorts of bats and demons may fly out if the U.S. and its allies remove the lid. Think of it this way: If and when we take the lid off Iraq, we will find an envelope inside. It will tell us what we have won and it will say one of two things.

It could say, "Congratulations! You've just won the Arab Germany — a country with enormous human talent, enormous natural resources, but with an evil dictator, whom you've just removed. Now, just add a little water, a spoonful of democracy and stir, and this will be a normal nation very soon."

Or the envelope could say, "You've just won the Arab Yugoslavia — an artificial country congenitally divided among Kurds, Shiites, Sunnis, Nasserites, leftists and a host of tribes and clans that can only be held together with a Saddam-like iron fist. Congratulations, you're the new Saddam."

In the first scenario, Iraq is the way it is today because Saddam is the way he is. In the second scenario, Saddam is the way he is because Iraq is what it is. Those are two very different problems. And we will know which we've won only when we take off the lid. The conservatives and neo-cons, who have been pounding the table for war, should be a lot more humble about this question, because they don't know either.

Does that mean we should rule out war? No. But it does mean that we must do it right. To begin with, the president must

level with the American people that we may indeed be buying the Arab Yugoslavia, which will take a great deal of time and effort to heal into a self-sustaining, progressive, accountable Arab government. And, therefore, any nation-building in Iraq will be a multiyear marathon, not a multiweek sprint.

Because it will be a marathon, we must undertake this war with the maximum amount of international legitimacy and U.N. backing we can possibly muster. Otherwise we will not have an American public willing to run this marathon, and we will not have allies ready to help us once we're inside (look at all the local police and administrators Europeans now contribute in Bosnia and Kosovo). We'll also become a huge target if we're the sole occupiers of Iraq.

In short, we can oust Saddam Hussein all by ourselves. But we cannot successfully rebuild Iraq all by ourselves. And the real prize here is a new Iraq that would be a progressive model for the whole region. That, for me, is the only morally and strategically justifiable reason to support this war. The Bush team dare not invade Iraq simply to install a more friendly dictator to pump us oil. And it dare not simply disarm Iraq and then walk away from the nation-building task.

Unfortunately, when it comes to enlisting allies, the Bush team is its own worst enemy. It has sneered at many issues the world cares about: the Kyoto accords, the World Court, arms control treaties. The Bush team had legitimate arguments on some of these issues, but the gratuitous way it dismissed them has fueled anti-Americanism. No, I have no illusions that if the Bush team had only embraced Kyoto the French wouldn't still be trying to obstruct America in Iraq. The French are the French. But unfortunately, now the Germans are the French, the Koreans are the French, and many Brits are becoming French.

Things could be better, but here is where we are — so here is where I am: My gut tells me we should continue the troop buildup, continue the inspections and do everything we can for as long as we can to produce either a coup or the sort of evidence that will give us the broadest coalition possible, so we can do the best nation-building job possible.

But if war turns out to be the only option, then war it will have to be — because I believe that our kids will have a better chance of growing up in a safer world if we help put Iraq on a more progressive path and stimulate some real change in an Arab world that is badly in need of reform. Such a war would indeed be a shock to this region, but, if we do it right, there is a decent chance that it would be shock therapy.

Special Thanks to **Hawaii Reporter,**
Freedom to Report Real News.

<http://www.hawaiireporter.com>

Libertarian Party of Hawaii Officers

Chair	Roger Taylor	545-3007	roger-taylor@RR**
Vice Chair	John Orendt	843-0617	hi-lp@despammed.com
Secretary	Jerry Murphy	941-3281	gsm425@hotmail.com
Treasurer	John Spangler	734-2925	jspan@hotmail.com
At Large	Ken Lindsay	293-5277	kenlindsay@RR**
	Guy Monahan	485-5015	monahang001@RR**
	Aaron Anderson	965-0300*	originfree@yahoo.com

Contacts:

Maui	Jocelyn Morse		cadence@cmaui.net
Big Isle	Aaron Anderson	965-0300*	originfree@yahoo.com
Kauai	Jeff Mallan		jeff@artful-expressions.com
Molokai	George Peabody	558-8253*	molokaiman@flex.com

* Preceded by 1-808

** RR = hawaii.rr.com

*** NS = netscape.net

Published Monthly by the Libertarian Party of

Hawaii <http://www.hi.lp.org>

625 Keawe St, Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 537-3078

Libertarian Party USA

(800) 682-1776

<http://www.lp.org>

Council of Ex-State Chairs

(Sr. Advisers to Exec. Committee)

Mile Rossell (808) 532-7300

Ken Schoolland (808) 676-0825

Tracy Ryan (808) 534-1846

Hawaii Libertarian

(January 2003 Issue)

John Orendt, Editor (808) 843-0617

Contributors: Roger Taylor, [Michael](#)

[Gove](#), Christopher Hitchens, [Thor](#)

[L. Halvorsen](#)



Libertarian Party of Hawaii

625 Keawe St.

Honolulu, HI 96813

Address Service Requested

Non-Profit
U. S. Postage
Paid
Honolulu, HI
Permit No. 2349