

SPECIAL REPORT

National Legal and Policy Center

Common Cause With America's Enemies:

How Labor Unions Embraced Antiwar Extremism

Carl F. Horowitz

PROLOGUE: AN UNUSUAL RALLY

It was Saturday morning in Washington, D.C. on September 24, 2005, and antiwar radicals were up for battle. Some 150,000 demonstrators from around the country had descended on the National Mall to demand an end to the U.S. military occupation of Iraq. With marquee activists like Jesse Jackson and Cindy Sheehan scheduled to speak, the large turnout was not unexpected.

Making its presence felt was organized labor. Two months earlier the AFL-CIO overwhelmingly passed a resolution at its convention in Chicago calling for full troop withdrawal from Iraq. Though federation President John Sweeney wasn't on hand for the Washington rally, other labor officials were. Endorsers included members of the Sheet Metal Workers, the Service



A.N.S.W.E.R. antiwar rally

Employees International Union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the California Nurses Association. Nancy Wohlforth, an official with the Office and Professional Employees International Union and co-convenor of a group known as U.S.

Labor Against the War (USLAW), was a guest speaker. Unions, she said, have a lot work ahead:¹

"It's taken us 30 years but we are here and we're not going backwards, folks. We took a step to get the message out that Labor is against the damn war, and that the connec-



tions between the attacks on working people and the war in Iraq have to be made. The unions have to be in the forefront of that struggle."

For Wolhforth, the relationship between the war in Iraq and the "attacks" on working people here merited mention; the terrorist attacks against America on September 11, 2001 didn't. Yet she was right in one sense: For more than 30 years unions in this country *have* moved steadily leftward, forging strategic alliances with people who oppose America's rights of sovereignty and self-defense far more than they oppose war. Labor officials have tightened these relationships considerably since our initial deployment of troops to Iraq in March 2003, oblivious to the possibility that many rank-and-file members resent their dues being spent this way.

What was especially significant about the rally were its prime organizers—Act Now to Stop War and End Racism (or A.N.S.W.E.R.) and United for Peace and Justice. On the surface, these groups consist of average citizens seeking peace. But the real story is that they are at the center of an incestuous network of socialist radicals possessed of a deep desire to see America humiliated, both militarily and diplomatically.

The presence of A.N.S.W.E.R. was particularly disturbing. Founded just days after the 9/11 attacks, it functions as an appendage to a Stalinist entity, the Workers World Party (WWP), which regularly touts the virtues of Fidel Castro and Kim Jong-Il. The WWP over a dozen years ago had created a nominally separate antiwar group, the International Action Center, headed by former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who recently served as an adviser to Saddam Hussein's defense team. A.N.S.W.E.R.'s rally steering

committee included Haiti Support Network, Nicaragua Network, the Muslim Student Association, and the Party for Socialism and Liberation. Among its list of demands: "End Colonial Occupation from Iraq to Palestine to Haiti"; "Stop the Threats Against Venezuela, Cuba, Iran & North Korea"; "U.S. Out of the Philippines"; "U.S. Out of Puerto Rico"; "Bring All the Troops Home Now"; and "Stop the Racist, Anti-Immigrant and Anti-Labor Offensive at Home, Defend Civil Rights."

So why are unions consorting with this motley crew? To some extent, the reason is strategy. A political coalition, by its nature, requires that disparate member groups downplay their differences to promote a common set of goals. But that explanation only can go so far. A second and more important reason is that labor officials, if tentatively, have come to embrace the hard Left's worldview. And a fundamental premise of that worldview is that America has earned all of its enmity abroad, its imperialism having "provoked" foreign governments and terrorists to commit acts of violence against us. In other words, there are no bad anti-Americans.

Now, as the next section will explain, legitimate reasons do exist for opposing our troop presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. But antiwar Leftists have a larger ulterior motive: discrediting capitalism and its main practitioner, the U.S. The radicals believe they can expose the "real" enemy by laying bare the connections between the war and the economic interests of those who wage it. The activists despise President George W. Bush, but even more, they despise what he represents. His departure from office merely will be another episode in an unceasing campaign.

VARIETIES OF ANTIWAR BELIEF AND ACTIVISM

It may be hard to fathom in today's political climate, but "antiwar" and "anti-American" are not the same thing. Contemporary anti-Americanism is invariably antiwar, but the reverse is not necessarily true. Much of this nation's growing opposition to our military presence in the Middle East is rooted in a genuine concern for the national welfare. The loyal opposition consists of a number of related schools of thought.

One such group is the "realists." Intellectual descendants of foreign-policy titans such as Dean Acheson and Henry Kissinger, they believe that the logistics of fighting a war in that region of the world, especially in Iraq, are not conducive to lasting victory. They harbor doubts that American-style democracy can be exported to hothouses of religious and ethnic fanaticism lacking any tradition of peaceful conflict resolution.² President Bush's Iraq policy, argues prominent social theorist and born-again realist Francis Fukuyama, is "utterly unrealistic in its overestimation of U.S. power and our ability to control events around the world."³

A second and similar group is the "isolationists," or to use their preferred term, "non-interventionists." Authors as diverse as Pat Buchanan, Paul Craig Roberts, Gore Vidal and Wendell Berry—the former two on the Right, the latter two on the Left—share a common view: U.S. entanglements in foreign affairs, beyond for purposes of self-defense, are at odds with our culture and Constitution. America's more than century-long transition from republic to empire that began with the Spanish-American War, they argue, has undermined our capacity for self-governance. They don't make

exceptions for Iraq either. Texas A&M political scientist Christopher Layne, writing in Pat Buchanan's magazine, *The American Conservative*, argues, "(T)he truth remains that the United States is entangled in a strategic quagmire because the president plunged America into an avoidable war and compounded its mistake by bungling its conduct. Whatever reality the empire-builders create, history's verdict will be harsh."⁴

A third group of objectors are the moral theologians, often though not necessarily Catholic. Relying heavily on definitions of a "just war" offered by St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, they argue that the behavior of Iraq's Saddam Hussein regime, while noxious, does not justify a military response on our part. Aquinas stated that three preconditions must exist for a war to be moral: 1) a sovereign body's consent; 2) just cause, such as self-defense or restoration of territory seized; and 3) rightful intention.⁵ For some, the Iraq war does not pass muster. Calvinist theologian John J. Dwyer wrote at the time of the invasion: "Just war must...be pursued only as a last resort, after all other options are exhausted. Suffice to say this has not happened...The evil of a just war must be less than the evil to be righted. Saddam Hussein is a tyrant and a murderer, but what of the potential body count of American and Iraqi soldiers, and Iraqi civilians, not to mention unknown future reprisals by Muslims and others whose hate for America will only grow?"⁶

Finally, there are the pacifists, people who oppose the war in Iraq because they believe this war, like all others, is legalized murder. Regardless of the events leading up to armed conflict or whether a given participant is acting out of aggression or self-defense,

pacifists, now as a century ago, believe war has no justification. While there is nothing inherently anti-American about this position, its adherents often frame their appeal in a selective manner. It is invariably *America*, not its terrorist enemies, that needs to give peace a chance. As a Baghdad-based member of a Canadian Mennonite pacifist group recently opined: "I refuse to use the word 'terrorist' to describe those who resist the U.S. occupation. Those are terms used by the American government."⁷

This paper is not the place to weigh the merits of exercising the war option in Iraq. The necessity of fighting Islamic terrorism in *some* way ought not to be in dispute, the attacks of September 11, 2001 (to say nothing of previous attacks) testifying to that. At the same time, war may well not be the best response. Winning this war and then maintaining peace are far more difficult than they look. *One can be both antiwar and pro-American.*

Unfortunately, in addition to the loyal opposition, there is the *disloyal* opposition. "Disloyal" refers to the condition of holding our nation's right to self-defense in contempt. If the disloyal opposition denounces terrorism, it is only as a prelude to condemning our government's efforts to combat it. These people revel in the possibility of America defeated, their disingenuous concern for our troops notwithstanding. Down to the last man and woman, these self-styled "peace activists" view America as the world's greatest threat to peace. That's why many of their leaders have cultivated working relationships with Islamic fundamentalists. They may not necessarily like them, but they share an overriding goal: a severely diminished, if nonexistent, role for the U.S. in world affairs.

A succinct way to look at the distinction is that where the loyal opposition objects to American *foreign policy*, the disloyal opposition objects to American *interests*. The former camp seeks prudence in military decision-making; the latter camp seeks capitulation by our ruling class—that is, the capitalist system and the U.S. government that stands behind it. Even solely in the context of the Left, this distinction is necessary. There is a world of difference, substantively and rhetorically, between George McGovern (loyal) and Noam Chomsky (disloyal). And today's antiwar radicals have made clear they prefer Chomsky.⁸

The beliefs of the disloyal opposition pose enough of a danger to our interests. Making things worse is their *style*. Anti-American radicals are skilled in the art of rendering civil discourse nearly impossible. They frequently yank facts and quotes out of context—when not fabricating them outright. They attribute disagreement to bad motives; that way, they can avoid having to deal with the substance of an opposing argument. They also frequently shout down, hiss at, or even physically threaten persons expressing opposing views in public forums. In classic propagandistic fashion, their leaders manipulate large crowds by alternating between hatred (for the external "Other") and sentimentality (for one's own). Their periodic antiwar rallies tend to be suffused with a carnival atmosphere. Lacking real ideas, most of the disloyal opposition's members live for the glorious moments of submerging their individual identities in a sea of protest.

These rallies make for powerful recruiting commercials. Yet of primary concern in this report is who does the recruiting. And as one shall see, the "recruiters" constitute a closely-knit

network of political activists firmly committed to overthrowing the present American political regime.⁹ There is nothing paranoid or "McCarthyist" about this observation. As it takes organization to successfully fight a war, it takes organization to successfully oppose one. To believe otherwise is to defy common sense and experience.

Especially disturbing is the support for such people coming from labor unions. Union officials have become high-profile players in this shadowy network; they sign petitions, make speeches and steer member dues toward anti-American extremists claiming to further the cause of humanity. This is something relatively new in the annals of American labor history. It took decades of political evolution for the worlds of trade unionism and anti-Americanism to converge. Few may remember, but unions long had been a bulwark against radicalism. To understand how Labor's mainstream has become so redefined requires an explanation.

ORGANIZED LABOR AND ANTIWAR ACTIVISM

The Old Union Creed: Liberal Anti-Communism

Unions are no strangers to antiwar activism. But their embrace of *anti-American* antiwar activism is a fairly recent phenomenon. Organized labor always has stood left of center. But there is a substantial chasm between modern liberalism and radicalism. Labor's discarding of the former in favor of the latter took decades.

Modern American unionism began with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt as president in 1932. Organized labor became the muscle, literally and figuratively, of the Democratic Party. FDR's subsequent New Deal, passed

by a Democrat-majority Congress, expanded the size and scope of government intervention, thus lessening the likelihood that our country would see a working-class party similar to that of Great Britain's Labor Party. It also served to douse the flames of Communism. We were in the worst part of the Depression, with the unemployment rate reaching 25 percent.

In 1935 Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), also known as the Wagner Act, establishing the modern framework for collective-bargaining rights.¹⁰ NLRA barred employers from firing an employee for organizing or belonging to a union. Less defensibly, it granted to unions a pair of monopoly privileges: 1) exclusive representation in contract agreements; and 2) mandatory dues collections from workers as a prerequisite for keeping their jobs.

NLRA over the next few years would be tested, in the courts and at the workplace. The Supreme Court upheld the law in *NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel*.¹¹ During this time there were confrontations, some bloody, to establish unions as collective bargaining agents in heavy industry. The fledgling Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), which began as a breakaway faction of the American Federation of Labor, effectively used the sit-down strike to organize large numbers of workers at Goodyear, General Motors, General Electric, U.S. Steel and other plants.

Our entry into World War II submerged, temporarily, the adversarial character of the union-employer relationship. But after the Allied victory, the tension returned with a vengeance. The year 1946 saw America engulfed in strikes. The United Auto Workers conducted a nearly four-month walk-out against General Motors. A bitter

strike by railroad workers prompted President Truman to threaten drafting strikers into the Army. Communist organizers tried to make the most of the situation, in hopes of bringing U.S. unions under Soviet control. In response, organized labor, both out of principle and a desire to placate employers, took steps to remove Communists from their ranks. Thus, organized labor's worldview, liberal anti-Communism, was born.¹²

The American Federation of Labor sought the defeat of Communism abroad as well as here. During 1946–47, the federation supplied funds to an ex-Communist organizer and theoretician, Jay Lovestone, to break strikes by unions formed by French and Italian Communist parties. Sometimes defeating one devil called for making a pact with another. Lovestone's top agent in Europe, Irving Brown, paid about \$1 million under the table to the mobster-run French dockworkers union in Marseilles.¹³

The CIO likewise opposed Communism. Its most powerful figure, United Auto Workers (UAW) President Walter Reuther, who had spent a year in the Soviet Union back in the early 30s, now viewed Communist union officials in America as "colonial agents of a foreign government." He even allowed anti-Communist AFL members to assume top CIO leadership positions, a move that presaged the merger of the two federations in 1955.

These actions proved crucial to the elections of 1948. The Republicans had been the clear winner in the 1946 Congressional elections, and the last thing the Democrats wanted was a second straight disaster. President Harry Truman succeeded in warding off a challenge by his main rival to the Left, Henry A. Wallace, who had served, respectively, as Secretary of Agriculture,



Walter Reuther, head of the United Auto Workers until his death in a private plane crash in 1970. He was the most visible symbol of the American labor Left of his time, yet was an anti-Communist.

Vice-President, and Secretary of Commerce under FDR.¹⁴ Truman appealed to the union vote, incorporating a large part of Wallace's Progressive Party platform; after securing the nomination, he would go on to defeat New York Republican Governor Thomas E. Dewey in the general election.

Yet inasmuch as union officials were anti-Communist, they were not on the Right. They sought to consolidate the New Deal, not to repeal it. In particular, they aggressively opposed the Taft-Hartley amendments to NLRA, passed by Congress in 1947 over President Truman's veto. Section 8(b) of Taft-Hartley, for example, subjected unions to unfair labor practice suits, while Section 14(b) authorized states to enact their own Right to Work laws. Organized labor also supported

large federal outlays for highway, housing and hospital construction.

Member voting patterns and party affiliation tended to mirror those of their leaders. During the 1940s and 50s union members favored Democrats to a far greater extent than did business and professional employees, white-collar workers or farmers, each of whom leaned toward the Republicans. Survey data revealed that skilled and unskilled manual workers generally, more than union members among them, preferred Republicans.¹⁵

Unions, while seeking the defeat of Communism, still sought greater state intervention in the economy; the Democratic Party was the vehicle through which both goals could be accomplished. Yet the GOP, whose standard-bearer was now President

Dwight D. Eisenhower, proved to be not that different. Liberal anti-Communism, allowing for a certain degree of variation, was now semi-official national consensus, and organized labor was a major part of it. Most union men were not about to be seduced by radical utopianism. At the end of 1950s, sociologist Daniel Bell would observe, "The workers, whose grievances were once the driving energy for social change, are more satisfied with the society than the intellectuals."¹⁶ That satisfaction would be tested by the end of the next decade.

Unions Confront the Vietnam War

During the Sixties, under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, unions maintained their anti-Communism.

In 1962, for example, the AFL-CIO, alarmed by the aggression of Fidel Castro's Cuban Communist government and its influence on the rest of Latin America, founded the American Institute for Free Labor Development. Our military involvement in Vietnam would be the point of departure from this view. At first, the unions generally were supportive. But as the war dragged on, they moved leftward for a number of reasons.

First, labor leaders grew to see opposition as in their interest. Though the war did create union jobs in munitions plants, shipyards and other Defense-related places of employment, they argued, it also diverted funds from pressing domestic needs. "(T)he Vietnam war, so long as the body count remained low, could be seen, and was seen, as a positive benefit," observed literary critic and historian Jacqueline Smetak. "By 1970, however, the economic burden the war was imposing on working-class Americans was outstripping the economic benefits."¹⁷ A Labor-sponsored full-page ad in the February 25, 1970 *Washington Post* read, in part: "As long as we are in Vietnam we will have insufficient housing, education and health care."

Second, starting in the late 60s, a growing number of unionized workers, particularly younger ones, saw in the anti-war movement an extension of their own disdain for workplace authoritarianism. Some revolted against employers outright. In March 1972, UAW members at the Chevrolet plant in Lordstown, Ohio (near Youngstown) conducted a three-week-long strike, after General Motors had mandated worker layoffs and an assembly line speedup. While the union won only modest concessions, the reverberations were significant, with revelations of high rates

of worker absenteeism, turnover and sabotage.¹⁸ The strike made national news—reporters from *Harper's*, *Life*, *Newsweek* and *Playboy* all traveled to Lordstown, writing of a new kind of worker, young and militant. One local union leader said of the workers: "They're different, all right, no damn question about it. They're better educated, make more demands and generally raise hell when something is wrong."¹⁹ A survey at the time revealed that 43 percent of young blue-collar workers called themselves "liberals," as opposed to 30 percent of the older workers.²⁰

Third, unions were experiencing their greatest growth in the public sector. As employees of government—whether federal, state and local—public sector unions have a particular interest in expanding the size of government.²¹ That is why members of a given public-sector union are prone to rally in solidarity with employees of other public-sector unions. These unions, more than private-sector counterparts, are attracted to the Left. The line between collective bargaining and political advocacy was blurred most of all among the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the National Educational Association (NEA), and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

Ironically, in the face of all this, by decade's end unions would acquire an image of a right-of-center juggernaut. It was an understandable, though distorted caricature.

Vietnam and the Myth of "Right-Wing Unions"

From the 1930s through the 60s, unions traveled 180 degrees from radicals to reactionaries—or so the argument went. American workers, and

the organizations representing them at the bargaining table, were not about to challenge an economic system that had benefited them in tangible ways.²² Workers had new enemies to fight. Originally, their wrath had been directed at the bosses who ran the factories, the mines and the shipyards—and the non-union workers who pulled down wages. Now their targets were liberal elites and antiwar demonstrators. Where workers once had been progressives fighting for social and economic justice, we were told, now they constituted an army of flag-waving, muscular "Okie-from-Muskogee" conservatives fully on board with President Nixon on Vietnam.

This notion was an exaggeration, yet it did contain a certain grain of truth. By 1965, unions and the growing ranks of the New Left had little to do with one another. The political activists were disdainful of the notion that unions could promote radical social change. They saw the glorious possibility of revolution in the Thirties become the reality of workers making peace with employers, selling their souls in the process.

New Left strategists surmised that college students were a far more fertile recruiting ground for radicalizing society. "The New Left took root not among the workers, but among the young intelligentsia on the nation's campuses," noted political scientist Jarol B. Manheim. "It developed in its early years, before being consumed by ideological warfare with the Old, as an intellectual exercise and an incubator for new programs and ideas independent of...labor influences."²³ The movement grew by leaps and bounds as U.S. troop strength in Vietnam approached 500,000. The growing strength of the Left within the Democratic Party would play a major part in President

Johnson's decision not to run for reelection in 1968, and less directly, in Vice President Hubert Humphrey's close defeat in the general election at the hands of Richard Nixon.

In 1969 Nixon began his tenure as president, the beneficiary of a widening fissure between what today would be called "Red States vs. Blue States." The Republican Nixon was a Red State person inside and out, and his supporters constituted a natural majority, if not necessarily a silent one. Two young White House operatives, Kevin Phillips and Pat Buchanan, saw a golden opportunity to redraw the political map. By attracting blue-collar workers, particularly white ethnic union members residing in and around major cities, the Republican Party could put together a permanent winning coalition. America was becoming disgusted with the Democrats and what they stood for; it was time for the GOP to catch up to this reality. The Republicans simultaneously could overthrow its sclerotic, patrician WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) establishment and siphon support away from fiery anti-establishment populist Alabama Governor George Wallace, who as a third-party candidate had won 13.5 percent of the popular vote in the 1968 presidential race. Nixon no longer could ignore the Little Guy, increasingly marginalized and denigrated.

It is true that union members and blue-collar workers felt certain grievances toward liberals of the middle class. Their non-college-bound sons were far more likely to be drafted and shipped out to Vietnam, a reality mitigated when Uncle Sam moved to a lottery-style draft in 1969. There was the sting of class snobbery, too. Union members on occasion were taunted by college-educated radicals and liberals as bunch of brutish, loutish squares.

Even if their own kids went to college, they weren't the "right" ones. Moreover, a lot of the union members were Irish, Italian, Polish and other Catholic "ethnics," who like student radicals, nursed anti-WASP grievances of their own. In 1972 sociologist Michael Novak came out with a book, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*,²⁴ a surprise bestseller that positively burned with resentment toward genteel Anglo-American manners and morals, if from a progressive-Left standpoint (he would become a conservative by decade's end and eventually make peace with WASPs)—Pat Buchanan reportedly had recommended the book to his boss, President Nixon.

But the Nixon's White House overplayed the cultural resentment card. Labor, though vociferously anti-Communist, was still at best a reluctant recruit to the New Right. Studies of political opinion and voting revealed, time and again, that union workers were not as far to the Right as other Americans. By the dawn of the Seventies, the tide of public opinion had shifted against the war, and in part it was being *led* by the working class. Political scientists Milton Rosenberg, Sidney Verba and Philip Converse found that 27 percent of white male union members considered themselves "convinced hawks" on Vietnam, while 17 percent were "convinced doves."—a solid but far from overwhelming margin that raised questions about just where the remaining 56 percent stood.²⁵ Another political scientist, Harlan Hahn, combed through the results of anti-war referenda in various U.S. cities, concluding that working-class neighborhoods were more likely than middle-class ones to have supported a referendum.²⁶ And sociologist Andrew Greeley surveyed northern whites, asking them if they

favored a withdrawal of troops from Vietnam; 40.9 percent of the middle class favored withdrawal, while 48.9 percent of the working class did so.²⁷

So why did the misperception of unionism as pro-war populist conservatism take hold? For one thing, major media tended to rely on AFL-CIO President George Meany for authoritative sound bites. And Meany, with typical gruffness, supported the war. In May 1965, two months after our initial deployment of combat troops, he declared that his federation would support the war "no matter what the academic do-gooders may say, no matter what the apostles of appeasement may say." He added that those who criticized the war were "victims of Communist propaganda."²⁸ But Meany never spoke for all of organized labor. The United Auto Workers, for one, opposed the war from the outset. A 1967 meeting, the "labor leadership assembly for peace," included more than 500 union officials, including high-ranking members of the UAW, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butchers. A similar summit meeting in 1972 drew more than a thousand delegates, including the leadership of AFSCME and three Teamsters vice presidents.²⁹

Second, the AFL-CIO declined to endorse George McGovern, the Democrats' antiwar presidential candidate, in 1972. But that in itself was misleading. The federation didn't endorse Richard Nixon either, even when it became increasingly obvious he would be re-elected by a landslide. And among individual unions, endorsements leaned toward McGovern; the United Auto Workers, the Transport Workers Union, the Newspaper Guild and AFSCME all endorsed the South Dakota Senator. Given that



George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO (1955-79), ferociously anti-Communist to the end.

McGovern rated 88 percent on the AFL-CIO's political scorecard,³⁰ this should not have been a great surprise. By contrast, official union support for President Nixon, this side of the Teamsters, was almost nonexistent. And even that might not have materialized without President Nixon's Christmas-eve pardon of Jimmy Hoffa in 1971, a product of an expensive backroom deal between Teamsters President Frank Fitzsimmons and Nixon campaign staffers.³¹ As it turned out, a post-election Gallup poll showed that Nixon received the vote of 54 percent

of union families, compared to 69 percent of professional and business people.³² And according to a pre-election Gallup poll, had Sen. Ted Kennedy, D-Mass., been the Democratic nominee, he would have defeated Nixon among blue-collar voters by 53 percent to 41 percent.³³

But the most important explanation for the popular notion of "right-wing unions" was a daytime rampage by construction workers in the streets of downtown Manhattan on Friday, May 8, 1970 that quickly came to be known as the "hard hat riot." New York City,

like the nation as a whole, was in a tense mood at the time. Only four days earlier Ohio National Guardsmen had shot to death four students at Kent State University during an antiwar protest. In New York, several protestors had set up Viet Cong flags and defiled American flags in protest along the statue of George Washington on Wall Street.³⁴ A group of nearby construction workers took umbrage, and assaulted the protestors—seemingly as many as they could catch. At nearby Pace University, workers beat up demonstrators with boots, fists, lead pipes and wire cutters. The workers also broke into at least one university building and vandalized it, smashing windows and throwing trash cans around. Some 70 antiwar demonstrators were injured, with police refusing to make arrests. The riot was followed by a series of peaceful, police-guarded rallies in support of the war almost every day after, culminating in a 100,000-plus rally on May 20. Workers in surrounding buildings showered marchers with ticker tape. The organizers of the May 20 rally, including Peter Brennan, president of the local council of the AFL-CIO's Building & Construction Trades Department, reportedly told workers to attend if they wanted to be paid for that day.

That any number of antiwar demonstrators behaved reprehensibly is indisputable. But the union leadership's response was highly disturbing. Construction and other unions acquired an unsavory reputation that followed them for a long time. For Peter Brennan, at least, the unfortunate series of events would prove advantageous; President Nixon appointed him Secretary of Labor in March 1973. But as the Watergate scandal already was undoing the administration, it was a case of bad timing.

Late in the decade, with Jimmy Carter in the White House, certain

conservative activists saw unions as fertile recruiting grounds for the future Reagan Revolution. In February 1978 a team of New Right leaders, including Paul Weyrich, Richard Viguerie, Rep. Philip Crane, R-Ill., and Rep. Mickey Edwards, R-Okla., traveled to Ohio to meet with laid-off steelworkers at the Youngstown Sheet and Tube plant. The two groups found much in common; Rep. Edwards was moved to remark that workers sounded just like top management.³⁵ But little came of this. The dissatisfaction with President Carter and the Democrat-led Congress, while real (and justifiable), owed more to transitory populist anger than a decisive ideological shift to the Right.

The phenomenon of "Reagan Democrats," of whom blue-collar union households were a major component, passed from political significance almost as soon as President Reagan left office. Many went back to being simply Democrats, finding Bill Clinton fitfully acceptable, or took their chances on independent presidential candidate H. Ross Perot. Union leaders meanwhile did not yield in their message that Republicans are the party of business. With declining numbers, they had little choice.

The re-imagining of blue-collar union workers as an army of proto-Red State natural conservatives was as seriously off the mark as the Communists' projection onto these workers the role of natural socialist revolutionaries. Union members may have been several steps to the right of their leaders, but on balance they still stood several steps left of center of the American population as a whole. Unfortunately, anti-Communist liberalism wasn't strong enough to ward off the New Left's brand of radicalism, especially now that blacks and Hispanics, major blocs in the Democratic Party's



AP/Wide World Photos

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland (1979-95). As George Meany's successor, he earned a special place in far-Left hell for his support of Reagan White House policies to roll back Communism abroad.

left flank, accounted for an increasing share of members.

Building Anti-War Cadres...Slowly

The real story, the leftward movement of organized labor since the late 60s, happened under the radar screen of mainstream media. Officially, the AFL-CIO remained anti-Communist, especially after Lane Kirkland took over the top reins from George Meany in 1979. Kirkland sought to cultivate a working relationship with the incom-

ing Reagan administration early in the next decade; both the federation and administration officials vocally supported the "Solidarity" movement of dissenting Polish workers against their Communist government. More than anyone else, it was Kirkland who maintained support for Solidarity, even after the Polish government had declared a martial-law crackdown in December 1981, transforming an underground movement into a victorious coalition government by decade's end. Kirkland earned a special place in Leftist hell for his unwavering support of the adminis-

tration's efforts to fight Nicaragua's Sandinista government and its Soviet and Cuban paymasters to export revolution to neighboring El Salvador.

Yet in the face of this, labor continued to move leftward. This was a product of two related factors: 1) the entry by New Left activists into unions; and 2) the growing receptiveness of union officials to their ideas. New Leftists at once borrowed from traditional socialism and set themselves apart from it. They were Communist by instinct, yet felt antipathy toward Communist parties of any kind, particularly the one running the Soviet Union. What made the New Left "new" was its critique of elites in American society and its corresponding sense of kinship with "the powerless."³⁶ Capitalism was an unjust rogue institution, but it could be reformed, so long as reformers could wrest power from the unelected, unaccountable few who set the ground rules. That required raising consciousness among the many, and building cadres of committed activists on college campuses and low-income communities.

As a political movement, the New Left began in the early 60s in Ann Arbor, off the University of Michigan campus. Its vehicle was an offshoot of the League for Industrial Democracy known as Students for a Democratic Society, or SDS. Founders Robert Alan Haber and Tom Hayden spoke of an authentic, grass-roots progressive movement, committed to dialogue and consensus-building, unguided by any central force. This political style, "participatory democracy," would mix the personal and the political. Long before First Lady Hillary Clinton spoke of "the politics of meaning," New Left leaders employed such language in their 1962 manifesto, the Port Huron Statement, writing of

"the felt powerlessness of ordinary people, the resignation before the enormity of events." The Left meant to lay bare this country's illegitimate power structure, exposing those seemingly nameless men who place profits ahead of people and thwart grass-roots democracy.

This sensibility carried an aura of menace, as if to say, "If you won't run things responsibly, we will." Late in the 60s a breakaway SDS faction known as the Weathermen, frustrated over the lack of progress in achieving social justice in our time, would launch a campaign of vandalism, property invasions and bombings. But terrorism succeeded mainly at grabbing headlines and getting people arrested or declared fugitives. Organizing, Saul Alinsky-style, with its unrelenting Machiavellian brinkmanship, would prove a far more effective path to power. That applied to unions as well.

In 1970, a founding member of SDS, Paul Booth, coordinated student support for a United Auto Workers strike against General Motors, organizing some 2,000 students in the Chicago area.³⁷ Booth in recent years has served as a top assistant to AFSCME President Gerald McEntee. During the 90s, left-of-center activists would hold key positions of influence with the Teamsters during the tenure of Ron Carey. Three in particular—Jere Nash, Martin Davis and Michael Ansara—were instrumental to their boss's undoing, coordinating an illegal fundraising and money-laundering scheme that routed \$885,000 toward Carey's 1996 re-election.³⁸ Each eventually was convicted; the election would be invalidated by federal overseers, paving the way for a new election and the rise of James P. Hoffa to power; and Carey would be tossed out of the union, though found not

guilty in federal court. More recently, Wade Rathke, who had founded the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) in 1970, became involved with Service Employees Local 100 in the South. He also helped organize Chicago's massive March 25, 2006 rally in support of amnesty for illegal immigrants.

In turn, establishment union members increasingly had come to view the New Left as more than just a collection of chanting, bomb-planting revolutionaries. Labor officials needed a new generation of leaders to carry the torch. And if unions were going to organize they had to go outside the factory, the warehouse or the store, and into the world of a progressive-Left coalition of feminists, blacks, Hispanics, community activists and environmentalists. With greater cross-cultural understanding, many union officials could expand their base and escalate their demands.

It was in this political hothouse, during the 1970s, that organized labor's most powerful weapon to date, the corporate campaign, was born.³⁹ Here, unions, typically working in conjunction with community, civil-rights, consumer and other organizations, target a corporation presumably guilty of violating the public trust. A combination of strikes, negative publicity, lawsuits, regulatory complaints, boycotts, pickets and shareholder resolutions attempt to yield surrender by the target. Whether successful or not, labor-based corporate campaigns for roughly 30 years have inflicted real damage upon company reputations—just ask BE&K, Bell Atlantic, Coca-Cola, Crown Central Petroleum, Food Lion, the Gap, IBM, Kaiser Aluminum, Kmart, Liz Claiborne, Nike, Overnite Transportation, Publix, Ryder, Starbucks, J.P. Stevens, Wal-Mart and Whole Foods.

The leftward movement of unions culminated in a changing of the guard in 1995. The previous year's Congressional elections were a disaster for the Democrats—and organized labor. With President Clinton serving as a lightning rod for conservative opposition, the Republican Party became the majority party in both the House and the Senate for the first time since the 1952 elections. Many union officials felt new leadership was critical to surviving what they saw as a coming deluge of anti-labor legislation. Left-leaning labor chieftains at the AFL-CIO forced out Lane Kirkland, replacing him with Thomas Donahue. His tenure would last only several months. John Sweeney, president of the rapidly-growing Service Employees International Union, was elected federation president at its convention in New York that October.

With Sweeney in office, the AFL-CIO launched its "America Needs a Raise" campaign to pressure Washington and the states to raise the minimum wage, block tax incentives for business, demand universal health insurance, and otherwise expand the welfare state. The federation also sought to bolster sagging member ranks through mass immigration, issuing a statement in 2000 denouncing sanctions enacted in 1986 against hiring illegal immigrants (sanctions that had proven next to useless anyway). Perhaps most significant for the long term, Sweeney oversaw the creation of Union Summer, a five-week AFL-CIO internship program for training college students as labor activists. He also stepped up federation support for accredited campus labor-studies programs, which like Union Summer internships, often have operated more as indoctrination than education.⁴⁰

Increasingly, these activists put their own unmistakable stamp of leadership on their unions. It wasn't exactly anti-Americanism, yet it mirrored the Left's critique of America as a divided country run by a rogue power elite lordling over the poor, the working class and an increasingly-strapped middle class. Roger Hickey, co-director of the union-backed Campaign for America's Future, epitomized organized labor's view of the U.S. economy in 2001: "(M)ost Americans live from paycheck to paycheck. Most of us have family responsibilities that consume virtually all of our income...(W)e have just lived through decades of real declines in wages and family incomes, during which only those families with more than one breadwinner were able to maintain their incomes."⁴¹ He called on readers to reject "the conservative, anti-government ideology."

On September 11 of that year al-Qaeda Islamic terrorists imposed their own ideology on the U.S., hijacking four commercial jetliners and crashing them into various U.S. targets, killing nearly 3,000 persons. Our response, after various appeals to Afghanistan, Iraq and the UN, was a preemptive invasion of the terrorists' strongholds. The hard Left now felt they held a winning hand by casting the war as "Bush's war." Organized labor saw an opportunity to make new friends.

CONTEMPORARY ANTI-AMERICAN RADICALS: WHO THEY ARE AND HOW THEY OPERATE

What Motivates Them

The Vietnam War transformed the American Left in ways that World War II and the Korean War had not. A couple of years into the war, this

opposition developed a ferociously anti-American streak. Some adherents established or retained ties to Communist parties and regimes. But many activists sensed, properly, that appearing closely aligned with Communism would be counterproductive, both intellectually and strategically. They sought to build a mass movement bearing the imprint of *New Left* ideas. The future was to be found on the campuses of the nation's colleges and universities. And the more recruits they won, the more brazen they got.

To some extent, the movement got too big for its own good. Antiwar activists increasingly consisted of excitable, placard-carrying demonstrators, eager to lose their identity in a crowd. The movement snowballed, moving toward full-scale revolution. And revolutions, as Crane Brinton observed in his classic work, *The Anatomy of Revolution*,⁴² progress much as a fever, going through definable stages until finally receding—after creating a lot of damage. Many activists were not simply revolting against America's involvement in the war, but against the very notion that American might have legitimate interests to defend. Some made their views known through trespassing, vandalism, assaults and bombings.

The aftermath of the Vietnam War witnessed well-documented atrocities on a mass scale committed by the new Communist regimes in Vietnam and neighboring Cambodia and Laos. That should have served notice to antiwar radicals to be wary of forging ties to our nation's avowed enemies. Unfortunately, the Left always has had a default setting called "denial." Questioning the assumptions underlying their activism would be emotionally overwhelming.

Today, as during the Vietnam years, they are casting America in the role of super-villain. Today, as then, they believe our enemies must have sound reasons for hating us. For them, the 9/11 terror attacks were sweet payback for the wrongs we and our regional proxy, Israel, had inflicted upon the Middle East.⁴³

Antiwar activism today is primarily in the hands of people who despise America far more than they despise war.⁴⁴ These activists may vary by background, but are virtually identical in beliefs. Some, like the splenetic Cindy Sheehan, are moral exhibitionists possessed of the zeal of the convert. They function mainly as antiwar movement recruiting commercials. Sheehan is a major player, heading her own organization, Gold Star Families for Peace. But even more important are the people who do the recruiting; that is, who organize rallies, solicit funds, write manifestos and issue press releases. Without her handlers, Cindy Sheehan would be just another grieving mom.

Regardless of when they came upon the scene or what prompted their arrival, these activists are selectively indignant. The actions of overtly anti-American police states and terrorist movements rarely, if ever, raise their ire. Yet the flaws of our own nation, real or imagined, drive them apoplectic. Operating on the age-old political principle, "The enemy of my enemy is my friend," these activists support anti-American governments and terrorist movements with words, dollars, and on due occasion, actions. In a few cases, "treason" would seem an apt word to describe their activity.

The Central Nervous System

Most contemporary anti-American antiwar activism at some point

travels through a trio of virtually interchangeable New York City-based organizations, the most visible of which is International A.N.S.W.E.R., or A.N.S.W.E.R., an acronym for Act Now to Stop War and End Racism. The group was founded on September 14, 2001, just three days after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. On September 29, barely over two weeks later, A.N.S.W.E.R. held a rally in Washington, D.C. against a potential invasion of Afghanistan, whose Taliban regime had provided training camps for the terrorists. After joint U.S.-British forces struck that country in October, A.N.S.W.E.R. shifted its focus to Iraq.

The organization's rhetoric is undiluted Leftism, on war and everything else. Concerning a pending May 17, 2006 rally for the "rights" of illegal immigrants, A.N.S.W.E.R. appealed to its own: "Join with thousands of people across the country to demand: Immediate legalization for all undocumented workers; No criminalizing people..." In an A.N.S.W.E.R.-sponsored "pro-Palestinian" march in April 2002, speakers made mention of a "supposed holocaust" of Jews during World War II and the "genocide" of Palestinians at Jenin.⁴⁵

The group's rallies follow a choreographed modus operandi. Here is one account:⁴⁶

ANSWER-organized rallies are all conducted similarly. Protestors gather at a mustering ground flanked by information and merchandise tables set up by a variety of politically left-wing and Communist organizations, which have paid ANSWER a fee for permission to distribute literature or sell merchandise. An elevated stage is arranged at the front of the rally site, complete with a massive sound system. After a musical prelude, a number of speeches are delivered—usually, over a dozen. Once this initial round of speeches is completed, the attendees march along a short route to the location of the final rally, where they encounter more literature and merchandise tables, another stage, and another round of speeches. At both

rallies and along the course of the march, ANSWER volunteers fundraise by moving through the crowd with large buckets, into which attendees deposit cash donations.

A.N.S.W.E.R., which recently underwent a split,⁴⁷ owes its existence to the International Action Center (IAC). The IAC, founded in 1992, from the start has been a hobby horse of Ramsey Clark, whose tenure as U.S. Attorney General under LBJ and campaigns for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator from New York in 1974 and 1976 seem a lost world.⁴⁸ The group's Web site (www.iacenter.org) logo wears its anti-Americanism on its sleeve: "Activism, and Resistance to U.S. Militarism, War and Corporate Greed, Linking with Struggles Against Racism and Oppression within the United States."

Ramsey Clark is a global ambulance-chaser with the unwritten motto: "In any conflict involving the U.S., always support the other side." In recent years, and with great eagerness, he has provided legal defense for Saddam Hussein,⁴⁹ Slobodan Milosevic, Nazi war criminal Karl Linnas,⁵⁰ Rwandan genocide criminal Pastor Elizaphan Ntakirutimana, and Palestine Liberation Organization members sued by family members of murdered ship-cruise tourist Leon Klinghoffer. It was Clark who recruited radical attorney Lynne Stewart to defend Omar Abdel Rahman ("the blind sheik"), the eventually-convicted mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center bombings, and the planner of would-be bombings of New York City infrastructure such as the Lincoln and Holland tunnels.⁵¹ Each of these clients (or proxy clients) had one thing in common: They were wanted by the U.S. And for Ramsey Clark, that was enough to qualify them as victims of "oppression."

How did this mild-mannered former Attorney General come to

embrace the looniest fringes of international politics? Clark has never been open about this. It is an established fact, however, that in the summer of 1979, Clark, by then already on the Left, attended a fact-finding tour in Lebanon sponsored by Arab-American University Graduates, a group with close ties to the Palestine Liberation Organization.⁵² Afterward, he held a press conference and published an article in *The Nation* condemning Israel's "genocidal" attacks against allegedly purely civilian targets. In June 1980 Clark visited Tehran during the Iranian hostage crisis, joining a forum on "Crimes of America" to condemn President Carter's (botched) rescue mission as a violation of international law. After the U.S. bombed Libya in April 1986 in retaliation for the Libyan government-sponsored bombing of a Berlin discotheque that killed three people, including two U.S. servicemen,⁵³ Clark traveled to Tripoli to condemn the Reagan administration's "crimes."⁵⁴

Clark sees a natural alliance between Leftism and Islam. "Islam has probably a billion and a half adherents today," Clark states. "And it is probably the most compelling spiritual and moral force on earth today."⁵⁵ He also offers this gem of wisdom: "Islam is the best chance the poor of the planet have for any hope of decency in their lives. It is the one revolutionary force that cares about humanity."⁵⁶

Could Clark have connections to al-Qaeda? His actions in the wake of the August 7, 1998 bombings of our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania that killed well over 200 people (some two dozen of whom were Americans), certainly raise suspicions. Authorities eventually captured four men and tried them in America; all were convicted. The prosecution estab-



An A.N.S.W.E.R.-sponsored rally. The main enemy, ever and always, is President Bush.

lished through phone records and wiretap transcripts that bin Laden had direct contact with a Nairobi (Kenya) al-Qaeda cell. One of that cell's defendants, a Saudi national named Mohamed Rashed Daoud al-'Owhali, signed a confession regarding his involvement. He was riding in the truck that carried the bomb to

the embassy, but instead of becoming a martyr, he survived and fled on foot. In addition to confessing, this man was in possession of keys that fit into a padlock on the rear of the truck bomb. During al-'Owhali's sentencing hearing, the defense called upon Ramsey Clark to testify against administering the death penalty. It certainly



Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, the godfather of contemporary anti-American antiwar organizing.

raises suspicions about why Clark would be al-Qaeda's ace in the hole.

The International Action Center and A.N.S.W.E.R. are separate in name only. IAC is headquartered at 39 West 14th Street, #206, New York, NY, 10011, and its phone number is (212) 633-6646, the identical contact information A.N.S.W.E.R. provides for itself.⁵⁷ Several other extreme-Left organizations share this address and phone number—among them, Iraq Sanctions Challenge, People Judge Bush, Peace for Cuba, U.S. Out of Korea Committee, the Korea Truth Commission, and Millions for Mumia.⁵⁸ Satellite offices overlap as well. A.N.S.W.E.R. and IAC's Los Angeles offices are both housed at 422 S. Western Avenue. A.N.S.W.E.R.'s

San Francisco office, located at 2489 Mission St., Room 30, is in the same building as the San Francisco offices of the IAC and the Workers World Party, which occupy, respectively, Rooms 24 and 28.

That brings us to the third organization in this mix: the Workers World Party (WWP). This group's presence suggests something far more sinister than matching addresses and phone numbers. The WWP was founded in 1959 by a group of Stalinists who had broken with their Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party comrades, especially over the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956—the WWP was for it. The party since 1980 continuously has fielded presidential candidates. But this feint toward establishment

respectability hasn't in the least dampened its commitment to Communism. Consider its mission statement:⁵⁹

"We're independent Marxists who respect the struggles for self-determination and progress of oppressed nations. We try to understand their problems in a world dominated by Western imperialism...Our goal is solidarity of all the workers and [all the] oppressed against this criminal imperialist system...We fight hard for a better life right now, but we know that nothing is secure...as long as capitalism exists. So our goal is a society run by the workers, not just as pawns in a capitalist political game but as collective owners of the social wealth.

True to its Marxist-Leninist moorings, the Workers World Party has supported Communist regimes the world over, backing the Soviet invasions of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan and touting Castro's Cuba and

Kim Jong-Il's North Korea as benign, if misunderstood experiments in socialism. The downfall of the Soviet Union 15 years ago, for them, was a disaster. To this day, they cannot bring themselves to condemn Josef Stalin. In the early 90s the party also sponsored an "antiwar" organization during the first Gulf War, the National Coalition to Stop U.S. Intervention in the Middle East, headed by Ramsey Clark. Clark's association with the WWP seems to have originated in 1977, when a party member, Gavriella Gemma, became a secretary in his law firm in New York. In August 1990, when President George H.W. Bush ordered troops to the Persian Gulf, Ms. Gemma and her comrades set up coalition headquarters adjacent to Clark's law offices.

It is little surprise that substantial commingling occurs among WWP, A.N.S.W.E.R. and IAC personnel. At least seven speakers at the March 15, 2003 A.N.S.W.E.R. rally in San Francisco were Workers World Party members: Brian Becker, Larry Holmes, Teresa Gutierrez, Sarah Sloan, Sara Flounders, Imani Henry and Judi Cheng. Holmes, who ran for President on the WWP ticket in 1984 and 1988, heads the party Secretariat. Gutierrez and Becker are Secretariat members. Becker serves as a co-director of A.N.S.W.E.R. and the IAC, while Flounders is a co-director of the IAC.⁶⁰

A.N.S.W.E.R. and the International Action Center, put simply, operate as fronts for the Workers World Party. And their Internet links suggest they have worked together behind the scenes. A.N.S.W.E.R., as indicated earlier, came into existence three days after 9/11. Less known is that the group had a precursor called Beat Back the Bush Attack.⁶¹ On July 21, 2001—well before the 9/11 attacks—

that particular group had registered a domain in the name of beatbackbush.org. A subsequent "whois" query (a procedure to locate a primary contact for an Internet domain, combing through domain names databases) revealed that the entity running this site was "World View," based in Jersey City, N.J. Its administrative and billing contact was Sara Flounders Kramer—i.e., the married name of Sara Flounders. And a "whois" query for www.internationalanswer.org revealed the IAC had sponsored it. The IAC Web site's contact person in turn was Sara Flounders. Talk about an incestuous network!

The plot thickens. Beatbackbush.org and internationalanswer.org each listed a contact email address, gary@riseup.net. And what is riseup.net? Its main Web page describes itself as providing "tech support for the revolution." More specifically, it is "a project of the Red Cursor Collective, a 100% volunteer effort of activists using technology for radical social change." The group provides "training, web hosting, listservs, email accounts, and any kind of tech support needed by the activist community." The contact person, using a "whois" search, is one Elijah Saxon, whose email address was part of the "ucsc.edu" domain (University of California, Santa Cruz). Saxon also had registered "revolt.org" as part of Global Update, which also has registered domain names of globalupdate.org and riseup.net; all three operate out of Seattle. At the very least, this suggests the WWP had more than a passing involvement with the anti-World Trade Organization street riots shutting down that city on November 30, 1999.

Media Matters

All Great Causes need publicity. Cranking out agitprop documentaries

is the People's Video Network (PVN), a group of "media activists" dedicated to breaking "the information blockade of big business media." PVN projects include loaded-dice looks at the Palestinians, New Orleans residents in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, and the U.S. occupations of Haiti, Iraq and elsewhere, all resting on the assumption that the U.S. government and the business interests it supports are evil, colonialist and dedicated to exterminating indigenous people of color. PVN, for the record, is located at 39 West 14th Street, #206, New York, NY 10011, and its phone number is (212) 633-6646.

Supplying PVN with funds is the People's Rights Fund (PRF), a self-described "small foundation with limited resources," that supports projects that "use literature and/or video and have mobilized both small groups and great public assemblies to protect and advance the rights of the poor, the powerless, and the oppressed." In the immediate wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, this 501(c)(3) group was focusing its energies on "racist attacks in this country" (i.e., against Arabs) and the Independent Commissions of Inquiry into U.S.-backed Israeli War Crimes.

Does this sound like a Ramsey Clark operation? The PRF's mailing address is 39 West 14th Street, #206, New York, NY 10011, and its phone number is (212) 633-6646. That alone ought to suffice as evidence. A Web search for "People's Rights Fund" and "Flounders" in 2001 showed a wide variety of contributions directly or indirectly related to IAC operations. Part of the PRF's funds has come from a donor-advised account, Fidelity Investment's Charitable Gift Fund.⁶²

Not in *Whose Name?*

Another related entity, more document than formal organization, is

called Not in Our Name (NION). It asserts that the U.S. war on terror poses "grave dangers to the people of the world," having loosed upon the world "war and repression." A principal NION spokesman, C. Clark Kissinger, had served as SDS National Secretary during 1964–65, and later would work for the Black Panther Party and the Maoist International Movement. In 1987 he founded Refuse and Resist, a group dedicated to opposing all U.S. national security initiatives.⁶³ Kissinger also writes frequently for the newspaper of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), whose platform is "Maoist/Leninist/Marxist Communism" and whose primary organizing principle is "Create Public Opinion—Seize Power." The RCP is nothing if not consistent. It endorsed murderous Maoist terror campaigns in Peru and Nepal, and now is trying to create "a future armed uprising" in the U.S., the end result of which would be a "Communist proletarian dictatorship." Kissinger, in his own words, is "doing everything to help bring about as quickly as possible, the conditions where we can begin the highest form of struggle." Toward that end, he is a convener for the Commission of Inquiry on Crimes against Humanity Committed by the Bush Administration.

United for Peace and Justice

United for Peace and Justice (UFPJ), was created on October 25, 2002 in the Washington, D.C. offices of People for the American Way. Starting with roughly 70 member organizations, it has grown to 1,500. Superficially, the New York-based group avoids the rhetorical extremism of the A.N.S.W.E.R./IAC/WWP bunch.⁶⁴ But the organization's Unity Statement reveals its veneer of mod-

eration to be rice-paper thin. After denouncing "the 'pre-emptive' wars of aggression waged by the Bush administration," the statement issues forth this declaration:

It is now clear the war in Iraq was the leading edge of a relentless drive for U.S. empire. Exploiting the tragedy of September 11, 2001, the Bush administration has sought to use aggressive military action to pursue a long-term agenda: to forcibly dominate the world and impose right-wing policies at home under the cover of fighting terrorism.

If this Unity Statement reads like an anti-American rant, consider UFPJ's founder and leader, Leslie Cagan. Ms. Cagan, born in 1947, helped found the Committees of Correspondence, an offshoot of the Communist Party USA. More than 35 years ago she served a two-month stint as a member of the First Venceremos Brigade to Castro's Cuba. She subsequently served for seven years as director of the Cuba Information Project, leading numerous demonstrations demanding an end to the U.S. embargo and travel ban on that country. She also is a signer of the RCP's Not in Our Name Statement. True to the vision of its leader, United for Peace and Justice denounces America's "daily assaults and attacks on poor and working people, on women, people of color, lesbians/gays and other sexual minorities, the disabled, and so many others."

Peace No War

The Peace No War (PNW) Network is a self-described "collective of antiwar/peace and social and economic justice activists." Heavily funded by real estate tycoon Aris Anagnos,⁶⁵ PNW is headquartered at 8124 West Third St. in Los Angeles, an address informally known as the Los Angeles Peace Center, from which dozens of far-Left organizations operate rent-free.⁶⁶ Peace No

War is an affiliate of United for Peace and Justice and the National Immigration Solidarity Network, the latter of which supports open U.S. borders and amnesty for all "undocumented" (i.e., illegal) immigrants. There is scarcely a hard-Left cliché that PNW hasn't already mined. The group loathes "corporate greed," and characterizes pending border-security legislation as "attacks against immigrants." Following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the organization charges that the U.S. was gripped by "anti-Arab American hysteria," "immigrant bashing," "media censorship" and "trashing the environment."

Not So Pretty in Pink

For sheer headline-grabbing power, few in the radical antiwar pantheon are the equal of CODEPINK: Women for Peace, better known simply as Code Pink. The Venice, Calif.-based group, now with dozens of chapters worldwide, was formed in November 2002, four months prior to our deployment of troops in Iraq; it is so named as a spoof on the Defense Department's five-color terrorism-alert code. Code Pink works closely with United for Peace and Justice, but its unique niche is public guerrilla theater starring women dressed in pink.

From their Web site and headline photos alone, the uninitiated might think of Code Pink as a joyful, spontaneous gathering of women making a political fashion statement. Who, after all, but the most heartless right-winger could disapprove of concerned grannies, moms and daughters seeking an end to war and a redirection of national priorities toward life-affirming activities such as health care and child nutrition? That's exactly how Code Pink *wants* to shape public opinion. In reality, there is little that is

spontaneous about this relatively small organization—and little that is benign about its motives.

Code Pink's stage show has four leading ladies. One is Jodie Evans, a longtime operative within California Democratic Party circles. It was Ms. Evans who in 2003 engineered the *Los Angeles Times*' unsuccessful eleventh-hour sexual harassment accusations against Arnold Schwarzenegger to derail the actor-candidate's recall campaign against Gov. Gray Davis.⁶⁷ From her standpoint the desperation move made sense; she'd been a key fundraiser for Davis.⁶⁸ As for her politics, Evans believes the terrorist threat is insignificant compared to this country's "real" threats, such as "the corporate corruption that can result in the loss of our jobs, our pensions, our security."⁶⁹ She wrote the Personal Introduction to Cindy's Sheehan's recent book, *Not One More Mother's Child*.⁷⁰ Evans also sits on the board of directors of the Rainforest Action Network. That group's founder, Michael Roselle, also helped found Earth First!, a perpetrator of numerous acts of property destruction, often in conjunction with its eco-terror allies, Earth Liberation Front and Animal Liberation Front.⁷¹

Another Code Pink founder is Susan "Medea" Benjamin, who heads a San Francisco-based entity, Global Exchange. The group is dedicated to establishing fair trade (not to be confused with free trade), linking far-Left peace organizations worldwide, and sponsoring Potemkin Village-style "reality tours" to destinations such as Iran, Haiti and Cuba, in the latter case defying a Treasury Department cease-and-desist order. It was Benjamin, a veteran of anti-Nicaraguan *contra* protests back in the 80s, who had taken the late young antiwar activist, Marla



Code Pink's Medea Benjamin, in her element.

Ruzicka, under her wing, and coached her on the finer points of inflating U.S. war atrocities.⁷² Medea Benjamin never has made much of a secret of her love for Communism, having lived in Castro's Cuba for a half-decade.⁷³ She also sits on the advisory board of Occupation Watch, a Baghdad-based group which she, Jodie Evans and Leslie Cagan had set up explicitly for the purpose of persuading U.S. troops to declare conscientious-objector status. Benjamin, a signer of the aforementioned Not in Our Name document, has a penchant for getting arrested for public disruption, including on the

floors of the 2004 Republican and Democratic conventions.

Another Code Pink founder is Diane Wilson, a Texas Gulf Coast native and author of an autobiography, *An Unreasonable Woman*.⁷⁴ Wilson is an environmental activist, and like Benjamin, relishes opportunities for getting arrested. On December 5, 2005, she led a noisy demonstration at a Republican fundraising event at the Westin Oaks Hotel in Houston. As Vice President Cheney took the stage, Wilson, standing nearby, suddenly unfurled a banner which read: "Corporate Greed Kills—From Bho-

pal to Baghdad." She was shouting "Corporate greed kills, and Iraq kills too," as she was led out of the building by police.

Rounding out the foursome is a San Francisco Bay Area eco-feminist who goes by the *nom de guerre* "Starhawk." Born Miriam Simos in 1951, Starhawk is a Wiccan and the author of numerous books fusing religious, environmental and political sensibilities. Her mystic pagan/earth mother/Stevie Nicks persona might be entertaining, dare one say enchanting, were it not for her politics. She was an organizer of a 2003 conference, "Life After Capitalism," linking the then-pending Iraq war with capitalist (i.e., American) interests. Starhawk also is a supporter of the International Solidarity Movement, an organization that recruits college students in the U.S. and elsewhere to become activists for Palestinian terrorism.⁷⁵

Code Pink doesn't think much of property rights, if the property belongs to the wrong people. On May 18 of this year, two Code Pink members were among four protestors arrested for demonstrating in front of the home of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. The demonstrators, numbering some 200, repeatedly had been warned to stay off the property before four of them were arrested for disorderly conduct and unlawful entry.⁷⁶

Code Pink seeks to disarm supporters of the war with nurturing imagery and rhetoric. As propaganda, the group's formation was a masterstroke. Pink, after all, is a longtime metaphor for fellow-travelers of (Red) Communism. More than once, Code Pink has been dubbed "Code Pinko" by its critics. At the same time, the color pink connotes a distinctly feminine sensibility—soft, sexy and

campy, like Jayne Mansfield in her prime. If the contemporary heiress to the Mansfield mantle, Anna Nicole Smith, were to come out against the war, Code Pink probably would nominate her for President.

Lisa Fithian: A One-Woman Rent-a-Riot

Cindy Sheehan is a household name. Lisa Fithian isn't. That's pretty much the way each likes it. It was Fithian, more than anyone else, who made possible Mrs. Sheehan's meteoric rise to prominence, transforming this grieving, and aggrieved, mother of a soldier killed in action in Iraq into the illusion of the nation's moral conscience. Virtually wherever Sheehan spoke on her I-hate-George W. Bush tour last year—from Crawford, Texas and points beyond—Fithian could be seen standing by her side. Fithian is also close to Starhawk, whom she met in a Seattle jail; the two formed a collective, RANT (Root Activist Network of Trainers), that subsequently raised funds for further trips by the nomadic Fithian, a resident of Austin, Tex.

Ms. Fithian, a co-chair of United for Peace and Justice, might not call herself a Leninist totalitarian, but she certainly sounds like one. "I guess my biggest thing is that as people who are trying to create a new world, I do believe we have to dismantle or transform the old order to do that," she says. "I just fundamentally don't believe it will ever serve our interests as it's currently constructed."⁷⁷

Now in her mid-40s, Fithian has been engaged in radical demolition and reconstruction work for a good three decades. Somewhere along the way she acquired a taste for street combat. She's the person to see when barricades need storming. "(Y)ou don't go to Fithian when you want to carry a placard,"

observed the *New York Times Magazine*. "You go to her when you want to make sure there are enough bolt cutters to go around."⁷⁸ Arrested by her own count at least 30 times, Fithian wants to "create crisis," modeling protests after the Spanish anarchists of the late-19th and early-20th centuries. Under the group moniker Mobilization for Global Justice, Fithian reportedly did the lion's share of logistical planning for the Seattle anti-WTO riots. She also laid the groundwork for violent protests against trade talks in Washington, D.C.,⁷⁹ Prague, Quebec City and Genoa, plus the Republican and Democratic conventions in both 2000 and 2004.

Fithian revealed the true extremity of views in her Foreword to the updated edition of the late Abbie Hoffman's early-70s paean to anti-consumerism, *Steal This Book*. She wrote, approvingly, of the 9/11 attacks: "Planes turned into bombs. The Twin Towers collapsed. The Pentagon in flames. Two of the most powerful symbols of capitalism and militarism left gaping and destroyed in a matter of moments. The foundations of the old order were cracked open."⁸⁰ Neither Lenin nor bin Laden could have said it better.

Are They Communists?

It is clear that today's radical Left organizations are far less opposed to the Iraq war than to the possibility of the U.S. winning it. They are deceptively effective in the way they coordinate their efforts, making it appear as though antiwar demonstrations are spontaneous expressions of outrage by ordinary Americans. In fact, a sizable number of these groups advertise their Communist beliefs without apology.

In the larger sense, the entire movement is Communist—in beliefs, rhetoric and tactics. That includes

any number of previously unmentioned organizations, such as the Ruckus Society, the League of Pissed Off Voters, the Korea Truth Commission, the Middle East Children's Alliance, the National Lawyers Guild, Students Against Empire, and the International Socialist Organization. They may employ a division of labor, and some may fancy themselves as anarchists, but inevitably they take aim at the same range of targets: Wal-Mart, George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, homophobia, the Patriot Act, colonialism, "attacks on people of color," neoconservatives, sexism, "neglect of the poor," Halliburton, Israel, Rudy Giuliani, the Republican Party, and "attacks on immigrant communities."

The reader might notice at this point an apparent contradiction. On one hand, New Leftists always have prided themselves on their open, egalitarian style of decision-making, free from central guidance. Lisa Fithian, for one, claims the new antiwar movement is "nonauthoritarian" and "nonhierarchical," having no leaders at all. On the other hand, New Left antiwar groups have shown a peculiar tendency to be aligned with official Communism, operating out of the same office suites. How does one explain the contradiction? Why does the New Left, despite its affectations of spontaneity, resemble a latter-day Comintern?⁸¹

Close to a century ago, in 1911 to be exact, a German-born Italian sociologist, Robert Michels, observed in Europe political behavior similar to that which we are seeing today in America (and for that matter in Europe as well). He developed a master explanation for this phenomenon, calling it "the Iron Law of Oligarchy." Then, as now, "democratic" socialist political parties and labor unions

were betraying their rhetoric. Socialists might be "idealistic," but the closer they got to the levers of power, the more they behaved like insular bureaucrats. Michels concluded: "The socialists might conquer, but not socialism, which would perish in the moment of its adherents' triumph."⁸² A decade and a half earlier, another Italian sociologist, Gaetano Mosca, had observed similarly in his book, *The Ruling Class*, "(A)ll political regimes are of necessity ruled by...an organized minority controlling a disorganized majority."⁸³

What seems like a conspiracy, in other words, is actually the inevitability of administration asserting itself. All political associations, whether or not wedded to state power, need organization to convince large numbers of people of their rightness. As organization is a key weapon of the weak against the powerful, it is indispensable to the Left, which, after all, prides itself on mobilizing the "powerless."

Here's the rub: Most activists lack the time, money and energy to devote their lives full-time to their cause. Regular mass meetings are futile; even assuming such meetings do not degenerate into mob rule, most attendees will lose interest. "People power" is an illusion. For an oligarchy to function, *only an elite few can wield real power*. Effective leadership requires a mastery of details and social networking. Leaders may be drawn from the masses, but to remain leaders, they must operate in a rarified atmosphere. Of course Lisa Fithian claims that nobody is in charge of the Movement—that's precisely how she and her friends can remain in charge!

The great many, in turn, are happy to be provided with direction from a class of professional agitators. As a rational herd⁸⁴ taking instructions from highly-informed persons, they

can march, rally and chant to their hearts' content, believing they are Making History. Curiosity seekers might become converts amid all the hoopla, while True Believers affirm the inevitability of their triumph. These ritualized events bear more than a passing resemblance to a religious crusade. In the hard Left's outdoor megachurch, capitalism is indistinguishable from sin, and socialism is redemption, however discredited by the events of the last century.⁸⁵

Now it is true that political movements inevitably operate with some measure of reciprocity—between leaders and followers, and among leaders themselves. Those who lead, after all, must convince others of the need to be led; theoretically, popular support can be withheld every bit as easily as it is granted.⁸⁶ Yet antiwar radicalism is about propaganda, not persuasion per se. And propaganda has a logic all its own. It necessarily hides more than it reveals, and incites more than it enlightens. The susceptibility of young adults to mass conversion should not be underestimated.⁸⁷ Even "bohemian" writers and artists can fall prey to a need to belong to a transcendent force of history, especially Communism, as the late Nobel Prize-winning author, Czeslaw Milosz, observed in post-World War II Poland.⁸⁸

Antiwar radicalism *looks* spontaneous, as though it were the voice of the overwhelming majority, possessed of deep wisdom and conscience. In reality, it is a contrived political community born of paint-by-numbers hysteria and hatred. This community, whether attending a rally, holding a seminar or posting a blog, frames its appeal to demonize the opposition and minimize internal dissent. The antiwar Left may regard as sacrosanct its right to protest, but despises those in their ranks not



Roger Toussaint, radical head of Transport Workers Union Local 100 (New York City), and allies.

hopping on the bandwagon. Try to imagine an A.N.S.W.E.R. strategy session in which an activist announces: "I don't like the war, but President Bush isn't nearly as bad as the terrorists. America must fight Islamic radicals, even if by means other than war." Retribution against this person would be swift and severe.

The professional radicals who direct the antiwar network are Communists, at least insofar as they adhere to a Big Idea. They denounce capitalism's "injustices," blinding themselves to those of socialism, especially in non-Western cultures.⁸⁹ To them, realizing true social justice means overthrowing capitalism, and the interests that support it. That

means organizing some interests of their own—including labor unions.

STRANGE ALLIANCE: LABOR AND ANTI- AMERICAN ACTIVISTS

Now we arrive at the question: Why are prominent representatives and members of American unions expressing their solidarity with hardcore, in-your-face Communists? More than one frustrated union member probably has asked the same question, pondering the prospect of even more of his dues routed into these revolutionaries' coffers. But there ought to be no mystery. Organized labor's radicalization has been going on for more than three decades.

Key union officials have made explicit their common cause with radicalism. U.S. Labor Against the War, whom we met at the beginning of this report, is a highly vocal umbrella group. USLAW's founding manifesto, dated January 11, 2003, included the following indictments:⁹⁰

Whereas, the principal victims of any military action will be the sons and daughters of working class families serving in the military who will be out in harm's way, and innocent Iraqi civilians who have already suffered so much;

Whereas, the war is a pretext for attacks on labor, civil, immigrant and human rights at home;

Whereas, Bush's drive for war serves as a cover and distraction for the sinking economy, corporate corruption and layoffs;

The rhetoric here is barely distinguishable from any number of other overheated jeremiads from the hard Left. Note, by the way, the deep concern over the fate of "working-class families," as if middle-class families were somehow part of another universe. Note as well the alarm over possible "attacks" on immigrants, as if the Bush administration hasn't already done almost everything in its power to appease supporters of illegal immigration (and as if deporting illegal immigrants were tantamount to attacking them). Yet such language is now becoming standard among union officials.

Roger Toussaint, head of Transport Workers Union Local 100, which represents nearly 34,000 New York City bus and subway workers (and which went on an illegal strike last December), for example, sees the Iraq war as an assault against working Americans. At an April 29, 2006 rally Toussaint stated, "Everyone here needs to emphasize at every opportunity that the war in Iraq is linked to the war at home against working people."⁹¹ Michael Letwin, president of the Association of Legal Aid Attorneys, affiliated with New York City's United Auto Workers Local 2325, told *People's Weekly World* (the newspaper of the Communist Party, USA!) in 2002, "The war at home is going to be a war against labor. Workers have no rational alternative than to get involved in the movement against this war on Iraq."⁹²

There's always more. On September 10, 2002 International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) Local 10 passed a resolution denouncing President Bush's alleged use of national security concerns to undermine that union's contract negotiations and to "recruit unions to his war drive for oil companies."⁹³ On October 4,

2002, Service Employees International Union Local 1199, which represents more than 275,000 active and retired health care and hospital workers in the Northeast, denounced the military buildup and "tax cuts for the wealthy" as diverting government funding for real social needs.⁹⁴ Local 1199's seeming obliviousness to the terrorist threat is especially ironic given that any number of building operators belonging to SEIU Local 32BJ (AFL-CIO President John Sweeney's original union, no less) died while trying to rescue 9/11 victims at the World Trade Center. By the end of January 2003 various union locals, central councils and state federations had passed resolutions opposing the pending Iraq war, including the American Postal Workers Union, the California Federation of Teachers, and the Philadelphia Central Labor Council of the AFL-CIO.⁹⁵

Today's union leaders don't just simply sound like their revolutionary counterparts; they also march, strategize and make appeals together. Any number of union officials, for example, endorsed the "Million Worker March" of October 17, 2004. Among the eight signers of the "Dear Activists and Organizers" letter for the event (which was not an actual march, and which wound up drawing a crowd of around 10,000) were: Brenda Stokely, president of AFSCME District Council 1707; Chris Silvera, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Local 808; and ILWU Local 10's Clarence Thomas, who also served as march co-chairman. Also signing were Larry Holmes, Ramsey Clark and Sara Flounders. A Web site indicated for the event was www.iacenter.org. Don't be *too* stunned to know that the contact address and phone number were: 39 W. 14th Street, #206,

New York, NY 10011, (212) 633-6646.

Organized labor still has a way to go before it becomes fully integrated into the far Left. But it certainly has traveled a long journey in that direction. And in the process it has far less credibility than during the days of George Meany or Lane Kirkland. Union officials without delay must disavow *all* ties with groups such as A.N.S.W.E.R. and United for Peace and Justice. Labor leaders who dance with the disloyal opposition know fully well that their partners are thoroughly at odds with what most Americans would consider core principles of a free society. If these organizations are not themselves supporters of totalitarianism, it is fair to say that they have far less of a problem with Islamist radicals than with the Bush administration.

MAKING UNIONS ACCOUNTABLE

Accountability to Members

The embrace by unions of the anti-war hard Left is disastrous for their own organizations and for the nation as a whole. For unions to side with persons and organizations who detest this country's traditions, save for traditions of anti-capitalist protest, is a ticket to the margins of political life. It is little wonder that Labor has come to embrace mass Third World immigration (including amnesty) over the last two decades. Newcomers not sharing in an American identity, in their eyes, are better potential members and political cannon fodder than native-born workers.

Nobody is suggesting that government dictate to unions how to think about the war. By the same token, it is not for union leaders to dictate thoughts to individual members



Jesse Jackson, Cindy Sheehan, Joan Baez, top Code Pink members, and supporters. Such peace activists view American interests as the number-one obstacle to world peace.

either. Unfortunately, through NLR-sanctioned monopoly privileges, labor chieftains are doing just that. Through exclusive representation and mandatory-dues payment clauses, they are forcing members, particularly in non-Right to Work states, to subsidize the radical anti-American Left.

This raises a serious legal issue. It is established precedent that union members have a right to withhold, or demand a refund, of the portion of dues payments routed toward political purposes with which they disagree. For roughly 30 years the U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed this principle—in *Aboud v. Detroit Board of Education*,⁹⁶ *Ellis v. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks*,⁹⁷

Chicago Teachers Union v. Hudson,⁹⁸ *Lehnert v. Ferris Faculty Association*,⁹⁹ and most tellingly, *Communications Workers of America v. Beck*.¹⁰⁰ In the face of this, unions still stonewall members who request a prorating of dues payments earmarked for non-collective bargaining functions. And they continue to pull out the stops to defeat state referenda seeking to affirm this principle. In the fall of 2005, for example, public employees' unions in California launched a furious, and successful, campaign against Proposition 75, which would have required these unions to secure permission from rank-and-file members before deducting dues payments for political purposes.

Something is awry here. Union officials are supposed to be advancing the wishes and interests of members. Yet they presume that these workers are happy to subsidize Communist subversion. Members need the tools with which to fight back. Congress, or failing that, the states, must do one of two things. First, lawmakers should pass legislation affirming the *Beck* rights of all union members and fee payers. A worker should have the right to determine if and how dues payments will be spent for purposes beyond collective bargaining and related expenses. Second, and preferably, Congress should enact a national Right to Work law. Such a measure, which has been

sponsored continuously in Congress for over a decade, would delete portions of NLRA that authorize union security agreements; i.e., the firing of workers not consenting to paying dues to a certified collective bargaining agent. Currently, this is legal in the 28 states (plus Washington, D.C.) that do not have their own Right to Work law. Advocates of prohibiting the use of forced dues collections toward objectionable political activism are on the right track, but they miss the larger point. The problem is the very nature of forced dues collections. Origin matters far more than destination. If law prevented forced dues payments in all 50 states, the issue of *Beck* rights would become moot. Congress should pass currently proposed Right to Work legislation sponsored by Rep. Joe Wilson, R-S.C. (H.R. 500) and Sen. Trent Lott, R-Miss. (S. 370).

Unions answer to the workers they represent at the bargaining table. If these workers object to their leaders funneling dues into revolutionary agitprop projects, they are entitled to a refund. No union member should have to fear retaliation in making such a request.

Accountability to America

That a number of union officials gladly share the same views as Medea Benjamin, Leslie Cagan and Ramsey Clark says many things about them, none of them good. That organized labor breaks bread with brazen Communists speaks of how far organized labor has moved away from its original creed of liberal anti-Communism. Unions are doing more than selling out rank and file; they are putting our national security at risk.

The main enemy of the United States has a name: Islamic fundamentalism. That enemy declared war on

us on September 11, 2001, not the other way around. Islamic fundamentalism will never be satisfied until it creates a worldwide caliphate; those not submitting to its governance face either second-class (*dhimmi*) citizenship or death.¹⁰¹ The leading edge of this campaign is a phalanx of terrorist movements, backed by nation-state supporters and various nonprofit advocacy groups such as the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), a virtual mouthpiece for the terrorist group Hamas.¹⁰² All are working for our nation's destruction.

Our own home-grown hard Leftists don't just cheer these people on; they support them with funds, demonstrations, legal representation and paramilitary operations. They may not like Islamic fundamentalism, particularly its institutionalized mistreatment of women, but they share a common hatred of the United States of America. *What divides them ultimately is far less powerful than what unites them.*

America is fighting a war in Afghanistan and Iraq against Islamic radicals. Whether our efforts will succeed or backfire is subject to debate. What shouldn't be subject to debate is the need to resist these thugs. Over the decades the Left has shown they can be counted on to work against American interests. Gradually, unions likewise are inspiring such expectations. Their members, and America at large, deserve better. ■

Carl F. Horowitz is the director of the Organized Labor Accountability Project of the National Legal and Policy Center, a Falls Church, Va.-based nonprofit group dedicated to promoting ethnics and accountability in American public life.

NOTES

¹ Quoted in Carol Weidel and Dan Roberts, "Local Unionists March

Against Iraq War in DC," *Union Labor News*, 2005, <http://scfl.freedmind.org/?ulnid=1120>. The authors, respectively, are members of American Federation of Teachers Local 4999 and United Auto Workers Local 1981, both affiliates of the South Central (Wisconsin) Federation of Labor.

² For a critique of this view, see Peter Wehner, "The Wrong Time to Lose Our Nerve," *Wall Street Journal*, April 4, 2006.

³ Quoted in Robert S. Boynton, "The Neocon Who Isn't," *The American Prospect*, October 2005, p. 33.

⁴ Christopher Layne, "Failure Is an Option," *The American Conservative*, August 1, 2005, p. 10.

⁵ St. Thomas Aquinas, *The Summa Theologica*, Part II, Question 40, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Christian Classics, 1981.

⁶ John J. Dwyer, "Would Iraq Be a Just War?," *LewRockwell.com*, March 18, 2003.

⁷ Quoted in Steven Vincent, "Baghdad's New Anti-Americans," *FrontPageMagazine.com*, February 18, 2004.

⁸ For those unfamiliar with the legacy of Noam Chomsky, he is a linguist at Massachusetts Institute of Technology who for some 40 years has been the world's most durable and popular symbol of extreme-Left antiwar radicalism, at least within academia. His books and pamphlets, delivered in the solemn, accusatory tone of a military tribunal, are rife with ill-conceived parallels between the governments of the United States and Nazi Germany, all the better to delegitimize our own efforts at self-defense (and turn attention away from his own longstanding close ties with neo-Nazi Holocaust deniers). He has a carefully practiced moral blind spot for aggressive actions committed against us by our sworn enemies—including the 9/11 terrorists. Moreover, many times he has played fast and loose with facts to justify his preordained conclusions, not

that this has undermined his cult status with the loony Left. If this indictment of Chomsky seems harsh, then consult any of the essays in Peter Collier and David Horowitz, eds., *The Anti-Chomsky Reader*, San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004.

⁹ This paper uses the word "regime" not in the narrow sense of replacing one presidential administration with another, but far more broadly, with replacing the ruling ideas that underlie governance.

¹⁰ Formally, the foundation for modern collective bargaining had been created in certain provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) of 1933. The law created a voluntary cartel system ("codes of fair competition") with a pro-business tilt. It did not, for example, grant unions exclusive representation powers or compel employer negotiation in the face of a strike. Labor officials wanted more favorable legislation. Two things brought that result about: 1) heightened union militancy, especially a bloody 1934 strike by the Teamsters in Minneapolis; and 2) a Supreme Court decision, *A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States* [295 U.S. 495 (1935)], the so-called "sick-chicken" case, that overturned NIRA on various constitutional grounds. In response, Congress, led by Sen. Robert Wagner, D-N.Y., worked for a more union-friendly law, the end result of which was the National Labor Relations Act.

¹¹ 301 U.S. 1 (1937).

¹² The discussion here relies heavily upon Godfrey Hodgson, *America in Our Time*, New York: Vintage Books, 1978, pp. 90-92 (originally published by Random House, 1976).

¹³ This was the same union that facilitated international heroin-smuggling, as depicted in the 1971 film, "The French Connection."

¹⁴ Wallace's decision to run for President in 1948 in part was motivated by a desire to deliver payback to Truman. Four

years earlier, during the 1944 campaign, Wallace, while serving as FDR's Vice President, suddenly was bumped from the ticket in favor of Truman. President Roosevelt's health by then was failing, and the likelihood was very real that Wallace, as his running mate, would succeed him. Wallace had made clear his support for the appointment of Laurence Duggan and Harry Dexter White, respectively, as heads of the State and Treasury Departments; what he didn't know is that each was a Soviet spy. Following re-election, FDR placated Wallace by appointing him Secretary of Commerce. He continued to serve in that capacity after Roosevelt's death in April 1945. But in September 1946, Truman fired Wallace for being too supportive of the Soviet Union. Following a stint at the helm of *The New Republic*, Wallace ran for president in 1948 under the Progressive Party banner. Less known, Wallace in the early 50s declared himself an anti-Communist, effectively admitting he'd been duped.

¹⁵ Seymour Martin Lipset, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960 (Anchor Books edition, 1963), p. 304.

¹⁶ Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000 (originally published by Free Press, 1960).

¹⁷ Jacqueline R. Smetak, review of Philip S. Foner, *U.S. Labor and the Vietnam War*, New York: International Publishers, 1989, reprinted in *Nobody Gets Off the Bus: The Viet Nam Generation Big Book*, Vol. 5, Number 1-4, March 1994, www.iath.virginia.edu/sixties.

¹⁸ The real issue may have been something more basic: the Chevy Vegas that rolled off the assembly line. Chevrolet intended the car to be the successor to the ill-fated Corvair. But from the start it was plagued by slow acceleration, carburetor fires, engine overheating and (especially) premature body rust. The Vega actually sold well—some 2 million units during

its 1971-77 lifetime. But to serious auto buffs, it forever will be "the car that began rusting on the showroom floor."

¹⁹ Quoted in Andrew Levison, *The Working-Class Majority*, New York: Penguin, 1975, p. 214.

²⁰ Harold L. Sheppard and Neal Q. Herrick, *Where Have All the Robots Gone?: Worker Dissatisfaction in the 70's*, New York: Free Press, 1973, 134-44.

²¹ Leo Troy, *The New Unionism in the New Society: Public Sector Unions in the Redistributive State*, Fairfax, Va.: George Mason University Press, 1994. The author explains that public-sector unionism, rather than serving an extension of its private-sector counterpart, is a different type of unionism.

²² That material success co-opts support for socialism from its putative beneficiaries was hardly a novel observation even then. In 1908, a German essayist, Werner Sombart, famously declared, "On the reefs of roast beef and apple pie, socialistic utopias of every society are sent to their doom." See "Why Is There No Socialism in the United States?" quoted in Hodgson, *America in Our Time*, p. 67.

²³ Jarol B. Manheim, *The Death of a Thousand Cuts: Corporate Campaigns and the Attack on the Corporation*, Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001, p. 300.

²⁴ Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies*, New York: Macmillan, 1971.

²⁵ Milton J. Rosenberg, Sidney Verba and Philip E. Converse, *Vietnam and the Silent Majority: A Dove's Guide*, New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

²⁶ Harlan Hahn, "Correlates of Public Sentiments About War: Local Referenda on the Vietnam Issue," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, 1970, p. 1190.

²⁷ Andrew Greeley, "Political Attitudes Among American White Ethnics," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Summer 1972, p. 215.

²⁸ Quoted in Smetak, review of *U.S. Labor and the Vietnam War*.

²⁹ Levison, *The Working-Class Majority*, p. 205.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

³¹ At a meeting of the Teamsters Executive Board, President Fitzsimmons demanded that each member ante up \$1,000 to aid Nixon's re-election organization, known as the Committee to Reelect the President (CREEP). With the exception of St. Louis Teamster head Harold Gibbons, nobody present objected. Fitzsimmons later proceeded to pour Teamster funds—reportedly in excess of \$1 million—into CREEP's coffers. The presidential grant of clemency, signed on December 23, 1971, halved Hoffa's sentence from 13 years to six and a half years. Having accumulated time off for good behavior, Hoffa was immediately released, though the sentence would not officially expire until March 1973. The quid pro quo was that Hoffa would stay out of union affairs until March 6, 1980. Hoffa's subsequent challenge to this condition, along with his announced intent to challenge Fitzsimmons for the Teamsters presidency in 1976, led to his "disappearance" of July 30, 1975. See Joseph Franco with Richard Hammer, *Hoffa's Man: The Rise and Fall of Jimmy Hoffa as Witnessed by His Strongest Arm*, New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1987, pp. 283-96; Charles Brandt, *"I Heard You Paint Houses": Frank "The Irishman" Sheeran & The Inside Story of the Mafia, the Teamsters & the Last Ride of Jimmy Hoffa*, Hanover, N.H.: Steerforth Press, 2004, pp. 203-32.

³² Levison, *The Working Class Majority*, p. 168.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Flags had an extra symbolism here. New York City Mayor John V. Lindsay, it should be noted, ordered that all flags on City buildings be lowered to half-mast in recognition of the Kent State shootings, a move construction workers overwhelm-

ingly opposed. They threatened to storm City Hall unless the flag atop the building was raised to full mast, which it was.

³⁵ See Alan Crawford, *Thunder on the Right: The 'New Right' and the Politics of Resentment*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1980, pp. 250-53.

³⁶ Manheim, *The Death of a Thousand Cuts*, pp. 2-4.

³⁷ Booth served as vice president and then as national secretary of SDS until 1966, when he resigned over a bitter internal debate over the draft. His radicalism remained undiminished. Beyond his role in organizing the UAW strike against GM, he and his wife, Heather, went on to found the Midwest Academy, whose training manual offered the following advice for guerrillas seeking to infiltrate and topple power relationships: "Give people a 'taste of blood.' Push your opponents so hard you can see them squirm." See Manheim, p. 8; Rael Jean Isaac and Erich Isaac, *The Coercive Utopians: Social Deception by America's Power Players*, Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1983, p. 169.

³⁸ Michael Ledeen and Mike Moroney, "The White House Joins the Teamsters," *The American Spectator*, November 1998, pp. 38-42, 86-88.

³⁹ See Manheim, *The Death of a Thousand Cuts*.

⁴⁰ See Steven Malanga, *The New New Left: How American Politics Works Today*, Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2005, pp. 38-50. The labor studies program at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, for example, sponsors highly partisan radio broadcasts as part of its *Heartland Labor Forum*. The shows, prepared by union members, feature such titles as "Speak Out on Corporate Greed," "The New Tyranny of King George III: Union-Busting Executive Orders," and "Privatization: Will Bush Open the Floodgates?" (p. 49).

⁴¹ Roger Hickey, "A Movement for Economic Security in an Age of Change," *The Next Agenda*, Washington, D.C.: Campaign for America's Future, Febru-

ary 28, 2001. See www.ourfuture.org. The group is a force to be reckoned with, leading the charge to successfully persuade Congress to table the Bush administration's Social Security privatization plan.

⁴² Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution*, New York: Vintage, 1965 (originally published in 1938).

⁴³ David Horowitz, *Unholy Alliance: Radical Islam and the American Left*, Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2004.

⁴⁴ For a good discussion of the makeup and activities of far-Left organizations, see articles linked to *Discover the Networks*. The group's Web site, www.discoverthenetwork.org.

⁴⁵ The charges that Israeli Defense Forces committed "genocide" or a "massacre" at Jenin, a West Bank refugee settlement, have been thoroughly discredited as a result of an investigation by the United Nations. The actual number of Palestinians killed was not even in the hundreds, let alone thousands (as critics routinely charged), but 52. Further exonerating Israel was the fact that at least 30 of the dead had been combatants. The Israelis, in fact, went door to door in Jenin, in the face of booby traps and snipers, so as to minimize civilian casualties; that's how they managed to lose 23 of their own men. Putting this in wider perspective, Jenin was known to be the heart of Palestinian terrorist activity at the time. Israel's decision to move troops into the area was triggered by a Hamas terrorist attack on a hotel in the Israeli seaside resort town of Natanya that murdered nearly 30 Jews, and wounded about 140 others, sitting down to a Passover meal. Even to assume moral equivalence between the Israelis and the terrorists in this context is outrageous. See Sherrie Gossett, "Has the Antiwar Movement Been Hijacked?" *World NetDaily.com*, November 4, 2002; Mona Charen, "Untold Story of Gaza (and Haditha?)," *Washington Times*, June 19, 2006; David Frum, "The (Lat-

est) Israeli Atrocity That Wasn't," *Front-PageMag.com*, June 20, 2006.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ A.N.S.W.E.R. recently underwent a split. Activists in certain cities reorganized in San Francisco as the Party for Socialism and Liberation. The remaining New York faction renamed itself Troops Out Now! The dispute is over turf and strategy, not doctrine. Robert Huberty, "Update on Anti-War Groups," discoverthenetwork.org, January 13, 2006.

⁴⁸ Ramsey Clark, son of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, became Attorney General in March 1967, replacing Nicholas Katzenbach. He served President Johnson until January 1969. By all accounts, Clark won his job as part of a deal in which his father would resign from the Supreme Court to avoid a conflict-of-interest charge, and in turn Johnson would appoint Thurgood Marshall to fill the vacancy. Johnson wanted to be known as the first President to appoint a black to the Court.

⁴⁹ The Hussein-led Iraqi government retained Clark in 2002, if not earlier—in other words, prior to the U.S. invasion. The idea that the Iraqi dictator was a "victim" of an invasion that hadn't even happened yet is little short of ludicrous. Indeed, putting two and two together, the mass demonstrations led by A.N.S.W.E.R. against the possibility of a U.S. invasion of Iraq appeared to be a well-orchestrated effort to keep Hussein in power.

⁵⁰ Karl Linnas during World War II had served in a Nazi concentration camp in Estonia, overseeing the murder of some 12,000 resistance fighters and Jews. During the mid 80s, he went on trial to avoid deportation from the U.S. to the Soviet Union for war crimes. Clark eventually lost that case, but he wasn't bashful afterward about declaring his client innocent in the court of public opinion. Clark questioned the need to prosecute Nazis "forty years after some god-awful

crime they're alleged to have committed." See Gossett, "Has the Anti-War Movement Been Hijacked?"

⁵¹ Stewart on February 10, 2005 was convicted of providing material support to a terrorist conspiracy and conspiring to defraud the U.S. government. Acting as counsel to Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman, convicted in 1995 for terrorist plots, she provided material support to Mr. Rahman in the form of a press conference and allowing access by a translator. She faces up to 30 years in prison and disbarment unless her conviction is reversed on appeal. The prosecution argued that attorney-client privilege does not include communications to plot illegal activity of any kind, let alone acts of terrorism. Ms. Stewart, a leading member of the radical National Lawyers Guild, acted out of deeply held beliefs. Back in 1995 she had this to say to a *New York Times* reporter: "I don't believe in anarchist violence, but in directed violence. That would be violence directed at the institutions who perpetuate capitalism, racism and sexism, and the people who are the appointed guardians of these institutions."

⁵² John B. Judis, "The Strange Case of Ramsey Clark," *The New Republic*, April 22, 1991, p. 28.

⁵³ On April 5, 1986, terrorists launched an attack on the La Belle discotheque in West Berlin, well-known as a hangout for U.S. soldiers. They placed a bomb under a table near the DJ booth, killing a Turkish woman and two U.S. servicemen; another 230 persons were injured in the blast. Intercepted telex messages from Libya's East Berlin embassy revealed that country's government to be the sponsoring culprit. Shortly thereafter, President Reagan ordered air strikes on the Libyan cities of Tripoli and Benghazi. In 2001, four persons were convicted in a German court of murder or aiding in murder, and were given sentences of 12 to 14 years in prison. Though 15 or more civilians died in the strikes, the idea of holding President Reagan guilty of crimes against

humanity for retaliating against a clear act of war is laughable. Unfortunately, Ramsey Clark took it seriously enough to travel to Col. Khadafi's Libya.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Quoted in Gerry Daly, untitled article, *Free Republic*, September 26, 2001, www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/533185/posts.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Huberty, "Update on Anti-War Groups."

⁵⁸ "Mumia" refers to Mumia Abu-Jamal, born Wesley Cook, a black-militant radio journalist in Philadelphia who has been sitting on Death Row for shooting a local cop to death during the wee hours of December 9, 1981. Evidence presented in court provided a convincing case that Abu-Jamal was the only person who could have killed Officer Daniel Faulkner; Abu-Jamal himself was shot in an exchange of gunfire. While none of the four material witnesses saw the shooting, their accounts formed a clear and consistent picture of what happened that night near the intersection of 13th and Locust in downtown Philadelphia. Abu-Jamal, who had co-founded a local Black Panther Party chapter at age 15, subsequently was convicted of first-degree murder by a racially-mixed jury (10 whites and two blacks) on July 2, 1982. The jury had deliberated for less than six hours before reaching a verdict in the two-week trial; the next day, the jury returned a sentence of death. In 1995, more than a dozen years later, then-Pennsylvania GOP Governor Tom Ridge signed Abu-Jamal's death warrant. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court on at least two occasions rejected efforts by Abu-Jamal and his attorneys to secure a new trial. But his lawyers did manage to win a stay of execution from a state judge. And they continuously have worked (without success) the federal court system to obtain a retrial on the grounds that their client had been unfairly convicted.

In the meantime, Abu-Jamal's political-prisoner stock rose to superstar heights. In Europe as well as in the U.S., leading political, literary and entertainment figures practically lined up to demand Mumia's release. Yet his case for innocence is highly dubious. Aside from displaying highly erratic behavior in the months preceding the murder, Abu-Jamal gave what amounted to a death-row confession. A participant in the Pennsylvania Prison Society, Philip Bloch, stated that he had at least 10 conversations with Mumia. During one of them, Bloch asked him, "Do you have any regrets about killing the officer?" Abu-Jamal's replied, "Yes." Not long after the shooting of Officer Faulkner, two witnesses for the prosecution, a Philadelphia cop and a security guard at the hospital where Abu-Jamal had been taken, testified to hearing a less guilt-ridden confession. Philadelphia Officer Garry Bell testified that Abu-Jamal had uttered the following words while in the hospital: "I shot that m*****f***** and I hope the m*****f***** dies." See Buzz Bissinger, "The Famous and the Dead," *Vanity Fair*, August 1999. Radicals, of course, waged a campaign to discredit the *Vanity Fair* piece almost as soon as it hit the stands. Unfortunately, they appeared as short on evidence as Abu-Jamal's lawyers were.

⁵⁹ John Perazzo, "The Many Faces of Socialist 'Peace' Activists: The International Action Center," *Discover the Networks*, March 17, 2005.

⁶⁰ Becker also is close to the North Korean government. In March 2002 during a press interview in Pyongyang, he accused the United States of systematically conducting a campaign of genocide against Korean civilians. See Michael Tremoglie, "The 'Peace' Movement's Korean Connection," *FrontPageMag.com*, January 30, 2003.

⁶¹ This discussion draws from Gerry Daly, untitled.

⁶² See Daly.

⁶³ John J. Tierney, "The Anti-War Movement in 2004," *Organization Trends*,

April 2004, p. 4. This is a monthly publication of the Washington, D.C.-based Capital Research Center.

⁶⁴ The discussion of this organization relies on *DiscoverTheNetworks*.

⁶⁵ Anagnos has spent more than three decades bankrolling Communist causes the world over, such as the Nicaraguan Sandinistas, Marxist rebels in Chiapas (Mexico), and Castro's Cuba.

⁶⁶ See *ibid.*

⁶⁷ Her campaign to induce women to "come forward" with allegations of horror stories of Schwarzenegger's behavior was more than a little ironic given Davis's well-documented history of physical assaults against subordinates, especially women.

⁶⁸ Davis, in fact, owed his first political job to Evans' ex-husband, Max Palevsky, founder of Scientific Data Systems, Inc., which he later sold to Xerox in the late 60s. Palevsky had appointed Davis as a fundraiser for Tom Bradley's successful 1973 Los Angeles mayoral campaign.

⁶⁹ Quoted in John Perazzo, "Jodie Evans: Activist in Pink," *FrontPageMag.com*, December 8, 2003.

⁷⁰ Cindy Sheehan, *Not One More Mother's Child*, Kihei, Hawaii: Koa Books, 2005.

⁷¹ According to the FBI, the Earth Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Front as of 2003 had committed a combined more than 600 criminal acts and \$43 million in property damage. See Perazzo, "Jodie Evans."

⁷² In so doing, she set in motion the chain of events that led to Ms. Ruzicka's death at age 28 from a car bomb blast on April 16, 2005. Ruzicka already was in Iraq prior to the start of the war, a member of the Code Pink delegation; prior to that, she was based in Kabul, working with Benjamin's Global Exchange, to set up a fund for Afghan families harmed by our military's Operation Enduring Freedom. Against the wishes of Benjamin, she began

working with the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Senate Appropriations Committee. Following the fall of the Saddam Hussein regime in April 2003, Ruzicka founded the Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict (CIVIC), an organization to assist Iraqi victims of the U.S. invasion. (Apparently, victims of Islamic terror didn't merit consideration for aid.) Her impact was hardly negligible. After receiving CIVIC's first report, Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vermont, said of her: "We have whistle-blowers in industry. Maybe sometimes we need whistle blowers in foreign policy."

⁷³ In an oft-quoted statement, Benjamin said her initial encounter with Cuban Communism "made it seem like I died and went to heaven." This quasi-religious reaction among progressives seeking confirmation of Marxist police states as triumphs of the human spirit for decades was a common phenomenon. The tyrants in charge of these countries, of course, expertly choreographed such visits for maximum political gain. See Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

⁷⁴ Diane Wilson, *An Unreasonable Woman: A True Story of Shrimpers, Politicos, Polluters, and the Fight for Seadrift*, Texas, White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2005.

⁷⁵ International Solidarity Movement also manufactures "martyrs." It was ISM that recruited a young woman attending Evergreen State College in Olympia, Wash., Rachel Corrie, to its ranks. The 23-year-old Corrie in January 2003 traveled to the Gaza Strip as an activist in support of Palestinian Al-Aqsa brigades in their *intifada* against Israel. Two months later, on March 16, Corrie was killed when attempting to obstruct an Israeli Defense Forces Caterpillar D9 bulldozer operating in the Palestinian area of Rafah, a confirmed area of tunnels for Palestinian smuggling of weapons and bombs. Eyewitness accounts of her death differ, but there was no doubt

as to either Corrie's anti-American vehemence—in January she was photographed burning a U.S. flag in effigy—or her conscious decision to enter a demarcated war zone on the day of her death. Since then, cranks on both the Left and Right (in the case of the latter category, David Duke and the late Jude Wanniski) have lionized her as a victim of Israeli aggression.

⁷⁶ Allan Lengel, "4 Arrested at Rumsfeld's House," *Washington Post*, Regional Briefing, May 19, 2006.

⁷⁷ Quoted in Byron York, "Cindy Sheehan's Radical Strategist," *National Review Online*, August 29, 2005.

⁷⁸ Quoted in Austin Bunn, "Them Against the World, Part 2," *New York Times Magazine*, November 25, 2003.

⁷⁹ The anti-free-trade rally in Washington, D.C. on April 16, 2000 against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund could have wound up as violent as the Seattle riot of the previous November. Thankfully, local D.C. police the night before had confiscated riot gear, gas masks and staging locations, and arrested IAC members.

⁸⁰ Introduction to Abbie Hoffman, *Steal This Book*, New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2002. Quoted in "The Terrorist Behind the Peace Mom," www.sweetness-light.com.

⁸¹ "Comintern" is shorthand for the Communist International, a central planning body for worldwide subversion founded by Lenin in 1919 as a rival to the democracy-oriented Socialist International. Stalin publicly disbanded the Comintern in 1943. See Peter W. Rodman, *More Precious than Peace: The Cold War and the Struggle for the Third World*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994, pp. 24-27.

⁸² Robert Michels, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, New York: Free Press, 1962 (originally published in 1911).

⁸³ Gaetano Mosca, *The Ruling Class*, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980 (originally published in 1896).

⁸⁴ Psychologists use the term "rational herding" to describe the process of modeling one's beliefs on those of others widely presumed to be better informed. This phenomenon isn't limited to orators. Columnists, film critics and Nobel Laureate authors, for example, can be said to wield this sort of power. See Neal B. Freeman, "NR Goes to War," *The American Spectator*, June 2006, p. 30.

⁸⁵ Lee Harris, "Why Isn't Socialism Dead?," *TCS Daily*, May 5, 2006. The group's Web site, hosted by James Glassman, is www.tcsdaily.com. See also Rich Karlgaard, "Why Isn't Socialism Dead?," *Forbes*, June 5, 2006, p. 33.

⁸⁶ For a classic critique of the Michels thesis, see Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, *Politics, Economics and Welfare: Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes*, New York: Harper & Row, 1953, see Harper Colophon edition, 1963, pp. 227-365. A more recent, implied critique can be found in Garry Wills, *Certain Trumpets: The Nature of Leadership*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

⁸⁷ See Perazzo, "The Many Faces of Socialist 'Peace' Activists."

⁸⁸ Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind*, New York: Vintage Books, 1981 (originally published by Random House, 1953).

⁸⁹ For a superb explanation of this phenomenon, see Peter Bauer, "Hostility to the Market in Less-Developed Countries," in *Capitalism: Sources of Hostility*, Ernest van den Haag, ed., New Rochelle, N.Y.: Epoch Books, 1979, p. 85.

⁹⁰ Reprinted by Resource Center for Nonviolence, www.rcnv.org.

⁹¹ Quoted in Jarrett Murphy, "Antiwar Tent Gets Crowded," *Village Voice*, April 29, 2006.

⁹² Quoted in Tim Wheeler, "Labor Speaks Out Against Iraq War," *People's Weekly World*, October 12, 2002.

⁹³ Chris Kotalik, "Unions Lend Voice to Anti-War Opposition," *Labor Notes*, November 2002.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ For a full list, see www.alternet.org/latw; www.unitedforpeace.org. The latter Web site is operated by United for Peace and Justice.

⁹⁶ 431 U.S. 209 (1977).

⁹⁷ 466 U.S. 435 (1984).

⁹⁸ 475 U.S. 292 (1986).

⁹⁹ 500 U.S. 507 (1991).

¹⁰⁰ 487 U.S. 735 (1988). The *Beck* decision remains the Supreme Court's clearest affirmation of worker liberty, concluding that NLRA-covered private-sector employees have the same right not to subsidize activity unrelated to collective bargaining as do railway, airline and public employees. In a related decision a decade later, the Court ruled in *Air Line Pilots v. Miller* [523 U.S. 866 (1998)], that nonmembers cannot be required to use union-established arbitration procedures when challenging the amount of compulsory fees deducted for collective bargaining.

¹⁰¹ See Daniel Pipes, *Militant Islam Reaches America*, New York: W.W. Norton, 2002; Robert Spencer, *Islam Unveiled: Disturbing Questions About the World's Fastest Growing Faith*, San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2002.

¹⁰² Joe Kaufman, "CAIR for Governor?," *FrontPageMag.com*, May 30, 2006.