

American People Don't Support an Iraq War

by Nancy Spannaus

Forget the phony opinion polls. The vast majority of the American population opposes war against Iraq, and wants attention paid to the collapsing economy at home. This reality contrasts sharply with that of the 1991 Gulf War, and is reflected in activities ranging from the passage of resolutions, to demonstrations, to support for political figures who oppose the war.

The most crucial political figure behind the U.S. anti-war drive is the one least covered in the media, Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche. Why? Because LaRouche personally has played a catalytic role in disseminating the intelligence, and guidance, from August 2002 on, which helped build the international coalition against war, and provoke the opposition within the institution of the U.S. Presidency which threw the issue into the United Nations. Without the jam-up of the war decision in the United Nations, there would have been no opportunity for the hundreds of thousands of persons in the U.S. anti-war movement to act. LaRouche's activity was vital in *buying time* to prevent the war from breaking out, giving courage to others to also act.

To their credit, people have indeed acted.

Cities for Peace

As of this writing, at least 124 cities, plus the Maine Senate and the Hawaii House of Representatives, have passed some kind of resolution against the war. The process began in the Fall, and has been picking up steam. No, we're not just talking about San Francisco here, but major urban centers in Middle America as well—like Austin, Texas; Chicago; Denver, Colorado; and many others.

The movement for passage of these resolutions—and hundreds of more which are now pending before legislative bodies—is being coordinated by the Institute for Policy Studies—a “left-wing” think-tank—in coordination with some private foundations. IPS also works closely with the largely “left-wing” sponsors of the major anti-war demonstrations in the United States.

But the wave of opposition goes far beyond the traditional scope of activists, left- or right-wing, and it is growing daily.

A review of the resolutions contained on the website Cities for Peace, gives one a certain kind of view of what the citizens are thinking. Many of these resolutions contain direct references to the incalculable financial cost of the war, as well as to the desperate financial needs which are hitting their

localities. Don't spend money on war when we need the money at home, they say, in effect.

Exemplary of this process was the resolution passed by the Los Angeles City Council on Feb. 21—the 100th city to call on the White House not to go to war. The resolution, which passed by a margin of 9-4, was able to be pushed through as a result of the addition of an amendment pledging greater efforts to seek Federal funding for homeless people. The spending for war is seen as a direct counter to such domestic needs.

The debate which occurred at the Houston City Council meeting on Feb. 27 gives a flavor of what the base of resistance to the war is. Those supporting the anti-war resolution—a watered-down version of one previously introduced against “unilateral pre-emptive strike”—includes veterans, a black Baptist minister, a representative of the Catholic diocese's Office of Peace and Justice, and professors, as well as what might be called traditional “peaceniks.” One of the speakers was a representative of LaRouche's Presidential campaign, who not only spoke to LaRouche's economic alternative to war, but also exposed the threat of nuclear first strike now coming from the Bush Administration.

Also striking in terms of showing the depth of opposition to a war which has not officially broken out, was the resolution which was passed unanimously by the AFL-CIO Executive Board, the leadership of the major labor federation in the United States, at its Winter meeting on Feb. 27. Acting in coordination with the British Trade Union Federation, the American labor leadership argued that the Administration had not “made the case” for war, and called for maintaining action within the United Nations.

The significance of this action should not be underestimated, since the AFL-CIO has always supported whatever war the United States has entered, even Vietnam during the height of the resistance to that war. This is no “left-wing” union movement.

What's clear, however, is that the majority of the American population smells a rat. In the midst of deepening depression conditions, they are being told to forget about their welfare, and that of their children, and throw their support behind an increasingly blatantly imperialist war drive. They don't like it. The only problem is that they don't see any visible leadership in the major parties, to provide them an alternative to this disastrous course.

In fact, the only viable leadership is that of LaRouche, whom the pro-war organized-crime-linked clique at the Democratic National Committee, and the Establishment media, is trying to suppress. LaRouche offers the FDR-style economic approach which can bring the American economy and people back to sanity—a method that provides the only sure anti-war path. The degree of LaRouche's success in the immediate weeks ahead, will be the determining factor in whether the U.S. institutions, and population, actually reject a suicidal war.