

Eastman and Murphy -- Why Nader is the only choice.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-10/0664.html>

From: senhor san (*dharma_at_nwinfo.net*)

Date: 10/09/04

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 2004 03:26:12 -0700

VOTERS STRIKE!

VOTERS STRIKE FOR REAL POLITICAL CHOICE

Vote as if Democrats and Republicans don't exist.

Remember: Voting Republican or Democrat
is tantamount to crossing a picket line!!!

Vote Nader! Voting for anyone else
is suicide.

Remember:

Vote in Bush -- and you'll have a revolution.

Vote in Kerry -- and you'll have four more years of intensified Bush
policies.

Vote for Nader -- and you'll get the real America we believe in back, a
secure peace and the gratitude of the whole world.

The Formula For The Political/Psychological Chains of Monolithic Bi-partisan
Tyranny
by Dick Eastman

We are enslaved by the following mechanism of politico-psychological control:
[Too close to call] + [Anybody but] = [Constraint of voters choose
between:
GW Bush and John Kerry
Bill Clinton and Bob Dole
Bill Clinton or George HW Bush
The strategy demands that each candidate do everything to make themselves
the boogymen to the opposition -- don't even try making yourself look
particularly good after you snag the nomination of your party -- the

sci.econ: Eastman and Murphy -- Why Nader is the only choice.

Republican candidates job is to scare all of the left-progressive-populist into the Democratic corral and the Democratic candidate's job is to scare all of the "right-populist-petit-bourgeois" into the Republican coral -- even though both groups know that the "best man for the job" in the primaries and in the final race is neither the Democratic nor the Republican candidate.

That's how it works. Now add in all the details to this analysis yourself.

Proof of 9-11 frame-up -- the Pentagon 911 evidence:
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/911crimefile/message/8>
<http://www.bedoper.com/eastman>
<http://www.freedomunderground.org/memoryhole/pentagon121.swf> ;

John Murphy for Nader:

Dear Editor,

One of my friends said that she would vote for Nader if he even had a ghost of a chance of winning.

I then explained to her why Mr. Nader would win. No, of course he would not win the presidency but he would win nevertheless.

This election has nothing to do with whether or not Mr. Nader can be elected president. It was never about that. It is however, all about the conditions why he can not.

The whole point of being active and working for the just causes championed by Mr. Nader is to change those conditions. Nader and those working with him are already accomplishing this goal in just a few short months.

Throughout history the taunt of those who advocate that we should not press too hard has been "do you really think you can win?" If the slaves had let that question stop them, if the suffragettes had let that stop them, if the civil rights movement had let that stop them, if the anti-Vietnam War movement had let that stop them, if the disability movement had let that stop them, if the gay-rights movement and the antiwar movement and the anti-globalization movement lets that stop them today, then we know the answer: the whole world will lose.

With Nader and his crew pushing on so many fronts, we must reshape the question. It's not "can he win", but "how much can he win?" And the real question is, "How much can we win?"

There is nothing new or extraordinary about this plan. Its tried and true nature is the one reason why we know it can work.

We are off to a better start than most people realize. Behind the candidate trashed by the progressive media and ignored by much of the mainstream media stand a growing number of volunteers who are getting the political training of a lifetime compressed into eight short months. Ralph Nader has stood up to gale-force winds. In the process, a cadre of seasoned activists is transforming themselves into just the kind of people who can provide the stamina for a string of victories on many fronts. This is no accident. As Nader once put it, "I start with the premise that the function of leadership is to produce more leaders, not more followers."

Two hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson issued a call for a new party against the financiers, in favor of the interests of the majority of Americans.

It's a really old idea. We are not waiting for it. We have become one with it.

John A. Murphy

=====

Murphy also writes:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEACE COMMUNITY

(Please share my letter with your friends.)

"There are times when you have to obey a call which is the highest of all, i.e. the voice of conscience even though such obedience may cost many a bitter tear, and even more, separation from friends, from family, from the state to which you may belong, from all that you have held as dear as life itself. For this obedience is the law of our being."

- Gandhi

sci.econ: Eastman and Murphy -- Why Nader is the only choice.

Dear Fellow Members of the Peace Community,

I want to see George Bush removed from office. He is one of the worst presidents in my 58-year life and I see his administration as a threat to my hopes for the United States and the health of the planet. However, it is important that we remove him while standing for what we believe in -- and educating others about our view -- so we can expand the populist base seeking common sense solutions to our common problems.

The coming election is not taking the shape of a referendum on the American empire, but rather a contest in management skills. Kerry claims he would be a better steward of the empire. He would be better at pacifying Iraq, better at forcing U.S. solutions on the Middle East, better at getting the world to submit to U.S. will.

Perhaps he would. But ought we in the peace community to help him? What is our stake in improving the quality of management of the empire? Many of us do have a stake and that may be the problem.

The "any body but Bush" argument today is self-interest masquerading as high-mindedness. When we say that anyone is better than Bush, what is left unsaid is that we, too, have a stake in the success of U.S. world domination. Bush's mismanagement is a threat to us because it threatens to bring down the empire and with it the relatively sheltered lifestyle of those who manage to live well inside the beast.

But can we honestly say that a better managed American imperialism makes the world a better place for others, too? Does it help the people of the world that most of the huge "research" budget of American universities has something to do with developing more effective ways to kill people? Will an American victory in the war in Iraq help Americans who can't afford seeing a family doctor?

On Election Day, we have a choice. We can vote our complicity with imperialism or our solidarity with its victims.

I do not argue that "the worse the better." If I did, I would have to advocate voting for Bush. All I say is that I do not know whether a Bush or a Kerry presidency would be better for those who have no rights. I do not know, partly because this isn't an election issue. Both contenders are committed to extending and wielding U.S. military and financial power without consideration to its victims, both at home and abroad.

The "strategic vote" is, therefore, limited to "strategic from the standpoint of my own narrow interest." The conflict about whether to vote for "the lesser of two evils" is mis-framed as a conflict between pragmatism and idealism - "something is better than nothing" vs. "all or nothing." It is rather a conflict between narrow self-interest and ethics.

Let those who support imperialism debate how best to run an empire. The right thing to do is to use our power to vote, symbolically, to signal our refusal to contribute to a civic conversation about the quality of imperial management and domination. It is almost a futile gesture, but not completely so; it is an act of solidarity with the disenfranchised.

If we fail to stand for what we believe in -- equal rights for all, peace and justice, elimination of corporate political power, environmental and economic stewardship as well as expansion of human rights around the globe, then we fail to create the electoral and political movement necessary to create the paradigm shift needed in the United States.

We are a nation at war - internationally and domestically - and that war wounds us every day, draining our budget, enriching war-corporations, undermining our values and Constitution, making us less safe and creating enemies of much of the world. For me, the litmus test for 2004 is whether the candidate we support threatens or feeds the bloated military industrial complex.

George Bush is the war president who has demonstrated that he will give the military industrial complex as much as it can consume. John Kerry is the candidate who supported the bombing of Afghanistan, voted for the Shock and Awe Iraq invasion, voted for the Patriot Act, sponsored Plan Colombia (the war approach to drug addiction) and the candidate who is calling for 40,000 additional, new soldiers. Both agree there should be no right of return for

sci.econ: Eastman and Murphy -- Why Nader is the only choice.

Palestinians, give the green light to assassinating Palestinian leaders and that Israel should be allowed to keep illegal settlements in occupied land. Ralph Nader is the only peace and justice candidate in the November presidential elections. The question is whether the peace and justice community will stand with him.

The only way to have a debate on the war in this presidential race is for the peace and justice community to support the peace candidate.

John Kerry cannot seriously be considered an improvement over George Bush. Mr. Bush is driving our nation into a brick wall at 90 miles an hour. Kerry might slow it to 89.99 miles an hour. But we don't need to slam into the wall at a slower pace; we need to change direction.

Before he announced his candidacy, Ralph Nader sent a detailed letter to both political parties. He raised urgent issues: the below-living-wage of tens of millions of American workers, the expanding number of people lacking health insurance, the roadblocks to workers organizing trade unions, the record deficit that is a tax on our children, the inequality in education, jobs and opportunity based on race, gender and sexual orientation in contrast to the gluttonous expanding wealth of the wealthiest as well as racial profiling and other forms of prejudice in our nation. Nader highlighted the central problem of our corporate-government where corporate domination of our political system walks hand in hand with a largely unprosecuted corporate crime wave, massive corporate welfare dependency and omnipresent corporatization where even our children grow up corporate.

Mr. Nader raised the critical need to protect our environment from its deadly reliance on fossil and nuclear fuels, the need for greater efficiency in housing, offices and automobiles and to protect our air, water and natural resources so we do not bring our species, or others, to extinction. And, of course, he raised the issue of ending the Iraq War and converting our military industrial budget to one that focuses on human needs first and wages peace around the world.

The responses were what we should have expected. The Republicans said they supported the Bush agenda, the Democrats said they opposed the Bush agenda. The two corporate political parties do not take our concerns seriously - issues needing urgent attention, they ignore. Bush can energize his faith base by supporting a homophobic constitutional amendment; Kerry can play to his base with his Bush-scare songs and both can assure the corporate paymasters who support their campaigns - Bush by promising to make permanent his tax cuts for the rich, Kerry by promising corporate tax cuts disguised as his jobs program - both will continue to fatten the bloated and redundant military industrial complex.

So where does that leave us? It highlights our failure to organize beyond a small sliver of left progressives. It highlights the need for us to build new electoral and political vehicles that cut across the political spectrum and represent our common sense populist values. It shows the need for us to build a broader movement that can elect people who share our values.

If we do not recognize our failures and politically organize in a deadly serious way there is no reason for people to join our cause. We cannot promise African Americans, Latinos, Muslims and Arabs a fair shake in the United States if we cannot start to elect people who stand for our values. We need to begin to elect women to political office, women who stand for equal rights, peace and justice. A political paradigm shift is needed.

When Ralph Nader announced that he was going to run as an Independent, I was disappointed. As a Green Party activist I saw him as the strongest potential Green candidate. But as I have worked for his campaign, I have discovered that the Independent run has allowed many more people to hear his message. Activists with the Reform and Libertarian Parties, as well as Independents, have told me that they agree with much of Nader's agenda but that they would not have even considered it if he had run as a Green. Running Green, Nader was categorized by many voters who closed their minds and ears to his ideas. This is not to say that Nader has broken with the Green Party. He supports their values and agenda, has helped them to grow and will be supportive of serious Green candidates. In fact, he said he would have welcomed their

sci.econ: Eastman and Murphy -- Why Nader is the only choice.

endorsement if they decided not to run a candidate.

Many of Ralph's positions on the deficit, the loss of jobs due in part to bad trade agreements, corporate welfare, corporate crime, the need for electoral reform, the unfair tax system, the failure of the drug war and protection of the environment - are issues that many Americans agree with. They cut across a broad swath of the electorate - especially independents and third party members.

Nader continues to stand for the same issues he has always stood for. But, the problems the United States is facing have grown and become so obvious that more people are seeing things more clearly. Americans across the political spectrum do not like to hear that one-third of full-time workers don't earn enough to live on - under \$10 per hour. They don't like to see businesses close in the US as jobs are shipped to China, India and Mexico. They don't like seeing Americans sent to war on misinformation, distortions and falsehoods.

Thus the Nader/Camejo campaign presents an opportunity for the peace and justice movement to continue to stand firmly for - peace and justice. It is an opportunity to show people who did not see themselves as progressives that in fact they support progressive issues. It presents an opportunity to build a bigger movement of concerned citizens who can work together to change the paradigm - to create a government responsive to their needs. The electoral challenge of 2004 is an opportunity to grow our movement to new levels so that we can become politically effective.

The progressive wing of the Democratic Party seems beaten back by the DLC corporate wing of the Party. Progressive leaders - Kucinich and Sharpton - were soundly defeated in the primaries and Howard Dean shouted himself down and showed he was not the ally we hoped when he criticized Kucinich for urging cuts in defense spending. By joining the Nader coalition we provide a counterbalance to the pull of the corporate Democrats. Senator Kerry will not be able to take the progressive base of the Party - workers, African Americans, Latinos and women - for granted. He will have to work for their vote - promise them something so he has a mandate for more than merely being 'anybody but Bush' should he be elected

When we are put in the position of voting for "anybody" but Bush, we have been given a false choice. In 2004 we need to find a way to stand up for what we believe. On Election Day, we have a choice. We can vote our complicity with imperialism or our solidarity with its victims.

Peace,

John A. Murphy: Spoiler