

# Hawaii Libertarian

Monthly Newsletter of the Libertarian Party of Hawaii Vol. 21, No. 3, March 2003



## From the Chair By Roger Taylor

Our next monthly meeting will be on March 2 at 888 S. King St, Straub Doctor's Dining Room at 6 pm. We will be discussing taxes, workings of the Legislature, and any other topic you want to vent about. We may start meeting quarterly after the convention, which will be at 2500 Pali Hwy on Saturday May 10 from 2 pm to 6 pm. Michael Badnarik of Austin Texas who is seeking the Libertarian Party nomination for President of the United States is making arrangements to attend the convention. We will be looking for somebody's house for him to stay at while he is here. Alan Matsuda is working on a skit this will give us some comic relief. Other than that we will be talking about how the party should direct itself until the next election season. See you there.

## Blatant Advertising by John Orendt

**Housemates needed.** Beautiful spacious 5 bedroom house up high in the Kalihi Valley Ewa side. There are four bedrooms available. I'm only looking to rent two and the landlord will be happy. Individual month to month leases. \$400./month. Beautiful Ocean and Valley views. Foosball Table. Large, kitchen, two and one half baths. We split costs for phone, Cable TV, & Roadrunner. If you like foosball and Rock-n-Roll you will love it. Call John for info 372-1570.



View from Lani, Call John 372-1570

## Time Bomb in the Middle East: A Long Time Ticking By Ken Schoolland

As the Christmas season of peace and brotherhood passes, Americans again shift their attention back to the pressing concerns of war. Debaters fall into various camps, two of which are:

- 1) Americans have a government that must protect us from people abroad who would do us harm; and
- 2) there are people abroad who would do us harm because our government has interfered in their affairs.

There is validity in both arguments. They are intertwined. To dismiss either view is to invite greater national risk.

In the aftermath of such a tragic crisis as 9/11, people must clamor for protective measures against terrorists who have demonstrated their horrible capacity for evil. In doing so, however, we must be careful to gain real and lasting protection, not just a temporary pause in an ever-escalating conflict.

The Investors Business Daily reported last October that the U.S. government now spends about half of the world's total military expenditure (1), yet Americans still feel greatly threatened. If half of the world's military expenditure has not left us secure, then there must be some other factors to consider.

The primary function of the U.S. government is to provide security. Yet most officials in Washington D.C. will acknowledge that there have been severe shortcomings in performance. Government intelligence and security agencies, with the abundance of wealth, personnel, and technology at their disposal, came up short in a decades-long effort to root out a terrorist network with global tentacles that probably originated in some of the poorest nations of the world.

The villains had long said they wanted this attack. The villains had attempted attacks before, even on the same target. The villains are reported to have been within the U.S. government's grasp on earlier occasions, but were not pursued. (2)

## 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. ✍

If we are to have real security, not just assurances from politicians, then we have to examine the historical context of this mess to see what kind of behavior has left us vulnerable. The seeds of a genuine solution begin with holding individuals accountable, whether they be foreign or domestic. Indeed, one may find that the interventionist behavior of some of our own politicians was a betrayal of American security and of the very principles for which this country stands.

### Entangling Alliances

Our founding fathers were quite sound on foreign policy matters. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson had it right two centuries ago when they advised against entangling alliances. Jefferson declared in his 1801 inaugural address, "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations -- entangling alliances with none."

Why warn against "entangling alliances"? Jefferson worried about the trouble that comes with such alliances. What alliances in recent years might Jefferson have warned us against?

He would have warned against alliances with the very Middle Eastern nations that Americans currently consider to be the most serious threats in the war on terrorism. The two nations that top the list are Iran and Iraq, nations with which U.S. politicians have been intimately involved for many decades.

These nations are now considered the "Axis of Evil," vehemently opposed to the U.S. Thus, the fortune spent to promote the interests of U.S. politicians in those nations was obviously not money well spent. At least not for the interests of the average U.S. citizen. (3)

Equally conspicuous is the complete absence of Saudi Arabia from this list of threatening nations. Of the 19 terrorists who attacked the US on 9/11, 15 were from Saudi Arabia. Yet the Saudi government continues to receive the greatest measure of U.S. government support in the Middle East. Why? We all know the answer to that.

Thirty years ago the U.S. offended the Saudis by supporting Israel in the 1973 war. The Saudi's turned off the oil spigot, and no one wants that to happen again -- especially now that the U.S. is so much more dependent on imported oil than in 1973.

What was the US intervention in Iran and Iraq? It isn't a secret. The masterminds wrote books about it. Yet fewer people in the US than in the Middle East are aware that the CIA, in a 1953 mission code-named Operation Ajax, overthrew the first democratically elected leader of Iran. (4)

In 1953, the popularly elected Dr. Mohammed Mossadegh had asked the British government's oil concessionaires for a larger share of revenues, a share that American oil companies had already granted in Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. When the British government refused this split in revenues, Mossadegh did to Iranian oil what the British government had long before done to British oil: he nationalized it. In response, and worrying that Mossadegh would cozy up to the Soviets, western intelligence agencies engineered his overthrow and replaced Mossadegh with Shah Reza Pahlavi.

Iran's oil revenues were then evenly split between U.S. and British oil companies. Ah, nice for them! And Shah Pahlavi maintained his dictatorial rule for the next quarter century through the support of the CIA. The CIA even trained SAVAK, the Shah's secret police who were responsible for torturing or killing as many as 10,000 Iranian political dissidents. Not nice for U.S./Iran relations and not so nice for the dead.

The same U.S. government schools that neglected to teach students how to locate Iran and New Jersey on the map, also neglected to reveal to American students much of what U.S. politicians were doing over the decades since World War II. If government schools had been doing an effective job of preparing America's youth, they might have paused on this question: Would America's George Washington have approved of overthrowing the first democratically elected leader of another country, the "George Washington" of Iran?

### Hostilities

After 25 years of U.S. supported dictatorial rule, Shah Pahlavi was finally overthrown by a fundamentalist revolution in 1979 in Iran. Understandably, suspicion and hostilities were then very great between the governments of the US and Iran. Soon thereafter, the governments of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait feared the spread of religious fundamentalism against their own autocratic regimes and provided as much as \$20 billion of support to Saddam Hussein in his 8-year long Iraqi invasion of Iran. The war left more than a million people dead on both sides.

The U.S. usually condemns such invasions, but not this one. On the contrary, the U.S. supplied at least a billion dollars of military support to Saddam Hussein's invasion of Iran. (5) In those days, Saddam Hussein's murderous tactics were known and excused.

When the Iranians tried to block the oil trafficking that was financing Saddam's war machine, the US sent a naval fleet to guarantee "freedom of the seas," a policy that even resulted in an airborne Iraqi attack that killed 37 American sailors on the USS Stark.

The killing of American sailors was excused because, at that time, Saddam Hussein was the ally of US politicians and their desire to crush Iran. Now, American sailors are being asked to risk their lives to enforce a blockade against Iraq, the opposite task for which the 37 American sailors died in the 1980s. It was also during this time that the U.S. government was secretly supplying the Iranians during the infamous Iran-Contra affair.

Saddam Hussein was "America's ally," like Noriega, Mobutu, Suharto, Papa Doc, Samosa, Pinochet, Marcos, and others before him. It is doubtful that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson would have approved of any of these alliances. Why? Not only were these alliances immoral, but they increased, not diminished, the risk to American security. It brings to mind the quip of Will Rogers: "When you get into trouble 5,000 miles from home, you've got to have been looking for it."

#### On the Brink

So now what? Isn't it all water under the bridge? No. Many Americans are in denial about the messy role their own politicians have played in foreign policy with their tax money. It is important to realize that seemingly benign foreign policy actions on one day can have dangerous repercussions for Americans twenty or thirty years down the road.

It isn't a "blame America first" conspiracy to challenge these policies. It is holding politicians accountable for their own behavior because they are the ones who claim

to act on our behalf, as our representatives, spending our money, endangering our security. Americans must be as skeptical of politicians on foreign policy matters as they are of politicians on domestic matters. At this moment in time, it seems that nothing can be said in this forum that will have any affect on the likelihood of war in Iraq in the near future. I would say that the outcome, on the side of either war or peace, is beyond our immediate control.

God-speed to those brave soldiers who are called upon to disarm this time-bomb. If only that tyrant Saddam Hussein had not been so generously armed in the first place. If only wiser policies over the past half century had made it less likely to place those good soldiers in harm's way.

And, of course, good luck to the innocent civilians who may well fall as "collateral damage," as in all such wars. Good luck at tracking down that former U.S. ally of the 1980-88 war in Afghanistan, Osama bin Laden and his terrorist comrades. And may wiser policies not contribute in any way to a generational wave of terrorists in the future...as seems to be the case in Palestine/Israel today.

If we are to be a part of a long term solution, however, it is critical that we expose the folly of past foreign policy alliances. Good luck to us at holding all the responsible parties accountable, at least in the history books if in no other way, for their role in this sorry mess.

#### The Long View

How could the future find a new course? What would Washington and Jefferson do? What innovation might be considered?

1) Announce that the provisions in the U.S. Constitution for Letters of Marque and Reprisal would be activated to bring privateers and bounty hunters to hunt down Osama bin Laden and his entourage. (6) This would engage the full force of market innovation and efficiency in supplementing the nation's security measures.

2) Prepare to repeal U.S. taxpayer subsidies for companies operating abroad. If, for example, oil companies have to bear the full insurance and protection costs of operating abroad, they will be much more careful where they operate and with whom they do business. By building the full insurance and protection costs of these products into the price of oil, consumers will have incentives to use alternative foreign and domestic sources of energy.

3) Announce that U.S. interventionism in the affairs of foreign nations would come to an end. This would not only end the perpetual manipulation of foreign

governments by skullduggery and bribery, but would also bring nations the prosperity of open trade.

4) The above measures would increase domestic security while making possible the announcement of a grand reduction in both government expenditures and taxes -- just the medicine an ailing economy needs.

Regardless of the specific proposals, our nation would do well to hold firm to the fundamental principles freedom and responsibility. Jefferson's advice is still sound: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations -- entangling alliances with none."

### References

(1) "World Defense Spending," Investor's Business Daily, October 18, 2002

(2) Ijaz, Mansoor, "Clinton let bin Laden get away," Honolulu Advertiser, December 7, 2001

(3) "How Americans See The 'Axis of Evil'," Investors Business Daily, February 13, 2002

(4) "Iran coup mastermind Kermit Roosevelt dies," Honolulu Advertiser, June 11, 2000, see also, Solberg, Carl, Oil Power, pp. 196-7

(5) Representative Henry Gonzales, Chairman of the House Banking Committee, made these revelations in a televised interview, "The Chairman," 60 Minutes, CBS, November 11, 1992, Also, Dobbs, Michael, "U.S. Had Key Role in Iraq Buildup Trade in Chemical Arms Allowed Despite Their Use on Iranians, Kurds," WashingtonPost.com, December 30, 2002

(6) Gvosdev, Nikolas K. & Cipriano, Anthony, "Patriotism and profit are powerful weapons," Honolulu Advertiser, July 21, 2002, also see the Fred Foldvary article on this at:

<http://www.progress.org/archive/fold232.htm>

Ken Schoolland is a member of the Board of Directors of the International Society for Individual Liberty. See its Web site at: <http://www.ISIL.org>

## Senate Democrats Should Stick to Voting on Local Issues

Democrats, with Exception of Sen. Cal Kawamoto, Debate War With Iraq, Ignore Problems Proliferating Around Them

**By Don Newman**

Once again Hawaii's Democrats proved that perceived political oneupsmanship takes precedence over doing the people's business. The only drawback for them is just how transparent this effort is. There is absolutely no reason for the Democrats in the Hawaii State Senate to concern themselves

with whether or not our president should await United Nations' approval before protecting the interests of this nation. Especially with all of the problems Hawaii residents are facing locally. But that is exactly what they did yesterday during their floor session. After a 45-minute debate started by Sen. Carol Fukunaga, D-Makiki, 17 Democrats voted to support a Senate resolution that demands President George W. Bush await approval from United Nations before attacking Iraq. The five Senate Republicans, and Sen. Cal Kawamoto, D-Waipahu, a former fighter pilot, spoke in favor of military action in Iraq and supported the president.

None of the Democrats acknowledge dealing with this issue is the president's job -- the job he was elected to do -- to protect this nation in whatever manner he deems best, regardless of what the United Nations may say. The job of local legislators, on the other hand, is to deal with local interests, not to arrogantly insert themselves into national issues for possible political gain, the only reason they could possibly be doing so in this case. The nominal reason for why the Senate Democrats say they are expressing opposition to President George W. Bush (which what this in fact was, opposition to the president) is the effect the war would have upon Hawaii's economy.

But have our legislators so quickly forgotten the effect the 9/11 terrorist attack on Hawaii's economy? What if such an event, on any scale, were actually repeated in America? What would be the effect upon Hawaii's economy then? Suppose for a moment that President Bush is right and Saddam Hussein actually does possess weapons of mass destruction, and Saddam does have connections to Al Qaeda terrorist who can assist in delivering one of those weapons to an American city. Which do you suppose would do greater damage to Hawaii's economy, a war against Iraq or another terrorist attack? What is the price for failing to act in that case? The fallacy of the argument will be revealed when the United Nations finally does give its approval for a war, which it must or it will lose all credibility as an international institution, the one thing it cannot allow to happen.

Will a war that has United Nations' approval be any less damaging to Hawaii's economy than one that lacks United Nations' approval?

This is the fallacy the Democrats fail to understand -- the effect will be the same in either case, so why oppose the war now? The answer is clear -- because they aren't opposing war, they are opposing a Republican president for purely political reasons. This goes back to why this abdication of the people's business that the Democratic Senators indulged in was so offensive and wrong. It was an attempt for political gain at the expense of the people of Hawaii whom they are supposed to represent.

It is political posturing on the people's dime. It is the exact opposite of what their responsibilities are supposed to be.

Whether they have a resolution opposing the war or not will not benefit Hawaii one way or the other.

Sooner or later there will either be war, or another terrorist attack. The only question is which will be worse for our nation, and for Hawaii. From the president's point of view there is only one answer to that question.

He is right, of course, and Hawaii's Democratic Senators are wrong.

Don Newman is a free-lance writer living in Waikiki and can be reached via email at: [newmand001@hawaii.rr.com](mailto:newmand001@hawaii.rr.com)

## **Greens' Join 'Reds' to Oppose War by Alan Caruba**

**Summary:** Contrary to their pious calls to protect the environment and for what they call grassroots democracy, neither exist in Iraq. Greens and Reds have joined to support the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein and denounce the intention of the United States and its partners to end his threat to the region and the world. In doing so, they are deliberately ignoring his past ecological crimes and crimes against human beings.

[CAPITALISM MAGAZINE.COM] It should be obvious to anyone watching the anti-war demonstrations held during the President's Day weekend that environmental groups, Greens, have joined in solidarity with socialist organizations, Reds, to present a united front against regime change in Iraq.

Contrary to their pious calls to protect the environment and for what they call grassroots democracy, neither *exist* in Iraq. Greens and Reds have joined to support the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein and denounce the intention of the United States and its partners to end his threat to the region and the world. In doing so, they are deliberately ignoring his past ecological crimes and crimes against human beings.

A Feb 12, 2002 statement on the Internet site of the World Socialists, the International Committee of the Fourth International, states "Rarely has a war crime been set out as openly before the eyes of the entire world as the imminent war against Iraq." The statement says, "there is no credible evidence" for Iraqi weapons of mass

destruction. Everyone knows that Iraq has great stores of chemical and biological weapons, in addition to the missiles and other devices to use them. His efforts to secure nuclear weapons is common knowledge.

The Greens/Green Party USA have issued a joint statement charging President Bush with making "warmongering threats that make him a far greater danger to world peace than Saddam Hussein." The statement called the plans for regime change "war crimes being planned by the White House."

On February 14, Greenpeace posted a statement that it is "fundamentally opposed to war" and cited its "peaceful" efforts in Great Britain, Belgium and Australia to physically block movements of military hardware and call attention to its opposition to the U.S. and coalition nation's intention to disarm Iraq.

The irony of the Greens opposition to the U.S. and its coalition of other nations can be seen in the ecological devastation perpetrated by Saddam Hussein during Desert Storm. At that time, Iraqi troops set fire to more than 700 oil wells in several Kuwaiti oil fields as they evacuated, creating an ecological disaster zone.

Even before the fires Iraq intentionally released an estimated eleven million barrels of oil into the Arabian Gulf from January to May 1991, causing damage to more than 800 miles of Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian coastlines. CNN reported that the amount of oil released was categorized as 20 times larger than the Exxon Valdez spill in Alaska and twice as large as the previous world record oil spill.

Alan Caruba writes a weekly column, "Warning Signs", posted on the Internet site of The National Anxiety Center.

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

<http://www.hawaiireporter.com>

### Libertarian Party of Hawaii Officers

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

#### Contacts:

<b>Maui</b>	Jocelyn Morse		<a href="mailto:cadence@cmaui.net">cadence@cmaui.net</a>
<b>Big Isle</b>	Aaron Anderson	965-0300*	<a href="mailto:originfree@yahoo.com">originfree@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Kauai</b>	Jeff Mallan		<a href="mailto:jeff@artful-expressions.com">jeff@artful-expressions.com</a>
<b>Molokai</b>	George Peabody	558-8253*	<a href="mailto:molokaiman@flex.com">molokaiman@flex.com</a>

\* 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 (March 2003 Issue)

John Orendt, Editor (808) 843-0617

Contributors: Roger Taylor, Ken

Schoolland, Don Newman, Alan

Caruba



### Libertarian Party of Hawaii

**625 Keawe St.**

**Honolulu, HI 96813**

Address Service Requested

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