

Chapter 1 : Yearend: Bush's defining decisions - calendrierdelascience.com

Get this from a library! Brothers at war: the unending conflict in Korea. [Sheila Miyoshi Jager] -- More than sixty years after North Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel into South Korea, the Korean War is still not over--yet it has become a forgotten episode in American history.

Tweet The War Party may have gotten its war. But it has also gotten something it did not bargain for. Its membership lists and associations have been exposed and its motives challenged. In a rare moment in U. And what would be the link in terms of Israel? Finding themselves in an unanticipated firefight, our neoconservative friends are doing what comes naturally, seeking student deferments from political combat by claiming the status of a persecuted minority group. People who claim to be writing the foreign policy of the world superpower, one would think, would be a little more manly in the schoolyard of politics. Jewish hijacking of American foreign policy. The real problem with such claims is not just that they are untrue. The problem is that they are toxic. Invoking the specter of dual loyalty to mute criticism and debate amounts to more than the everyday pollution of public discourse. It is the nullification of public discourse, for how can one refute accusations grounded in ethnicity? The charges are, ipso facto, impossible to disprove. And so they are meant to be. What is going on here? Jesse Jackson does when caught with some mammoth contribution from a Fortune company he has lately accused of discriminating. He plays the race card. So, too, the neoconservatives are trying to fend off critics by assassinating their character and impugning their motives. For this venerable slander is designed to nullify public discourse by smearing and intimidating foes and censoring and blacklisting them and any who would publish them. Neocons say we attack them because they are Jewish. We attack them because their warmongering threatens our country, even as it finds a reliable echo in Ariel Sharon. It is not working. In writing of the four power centers in this capital that are clamoring for war, Hoffman himself describes the fourth thus: And, finally, there is a loose collection of friends of Israel, who believe in the identity of interests between the Jewish state and the United States. Is it good or bad for Israel? This is a time for truth. For America is about to make a momentous decision: To avert this war, to answer the neocon smears, we ask that our readers review their agenda as stated in their words. Sunlight is the best disinfectant. We charge them with colluding with Israel to ignite those wars and destroy the Oslo Accords. We charge them with deliberately damaging U. We charge that they have alienated friends and allies all over the Islamic and Western world through their arrogance, hubris, and bellicosity. Not in our lifetimes has America been so isolated from old friends. Far worse, President Bush is being lured into a trap baited for him by these neocons that could cost him his office and cause America to forfeit years of peace won for us by the sacrifices of two generations in the Cold War. They charge us with anti-Semitism. The Neoconservatives Who are the neoconservatives? A neoconservative, wrote Kevin Phillips back then, is more likely to be a magazine editor than a bricklayer. As one wag writes, a neocon is more familiar with the inside of a think tank than an Abrams tank. Almost none came out of the business world or military, and few if any came out of the Goldwater campaign. All are interventionists who regard Stakhanovite support of Israel as a defining characteristic of their breed. Though few in number, they wield disproportionate power through control of the conservative foundations and magazines, through their syndicated columns, and by attaching themselves to men of power. Beating the War Drums When the Cold War ended, these neoconservatives began casting about for a new crusade to give meaning to their lives. And when President Bush, after defeating the Taliban, was looking for a new front in the war on terror, they put their precooked meal in front of him. Bush dug into it. How did Bennett know which nations must be smashed before he had any idea who attacked us? What had Hezbollah done? Hezbollah had humiliated Israel by driving its army out of Lebanon. President Bush had been warned. All, however, were enemies of Israel. Ledeen, however, is less frivolous. First and foremost, we must bring down the terror regimes, beginning with the Big Three: Iran, Iraq, and Syria. And then we have to come to grips with Saudi Arabia. The real issue is not whether, but how to destabilize. Creative destruction is our middle name, both within our society and abroad. We tear down the old order every day, from business to science, literature, art, architecture, and cinema to politics and the law. Our

enemies have always hated this whirlwind of energy and creativity which menaces their traditions whatever they may be and shames them for their inability to keep pace. Passages like this owe more to Leon Trotsky than to Robert Taft and betray a Jacobin streak in neoconservatism that cannot be reconciled with any concept of true conservatism. I can even [imagine] the turmoil of this war leading to some new species of an imperial mission for America, whose purpose would be to oversee the emergence of successor governments in the region more amenable to reform and modernization than the despotisms now in place. For whose benefit these endless wars in a region that holds nothing vital to America save oil, which the Arabs must sell us to survive? Who would benefit from a war of civilizations between the West and Islam? Indeed, Sharon has been everywhere the echo of his acolytes in America. Are the neoconservatives concerned about a war on Iraq bringing down friendly Arab governments? They would welcome it. Washington should give Riyadh an ultimatum, he said. What these neoconservatives seek is to conscript American blood to make the world safe for Israel. They want the peace of the sword imposed on Islam and American soldiers to die if necessary to impose it. The two agendas coincide precisely. And though neocons insist that it was Sept. Scoop Jackson, who, in , was overheard on a federal wiretap discussing classified information from the National Security Council with the Israeli Embassy. Israel can shape its strategic environment, in cooperation with Turkey and Jordan, by weakening, containing, and even rolling back Syria. Israel and the United States should "broaden the conflict to strike fatally, not merely disarm, the centers of radicalism in the region—the regimes of Damascus, Baghdad, Tripoli, Tehran, and Gaza. That would establish the recognition that fighting either the United States or Israel is suicidal. The radical Zionist right to which Perle and Feith belong is small in number but it has become a significant force in Republican policy-making circles. It is a recent phenomenon, dating back to the late s and s, when many formerly Democratic Jewish intellectuals joined the broad Reagan coalition. Right down the smokestack. Undersecretary of State John Bolton said in meetings with Israeli officials "that he has no doubt America will attack Iraq and that it will be necessary to deal with threats from Syria, Iran and North Korea afterwards. It reads as if it were the product not of sober, ostensibly conservative Republicans but of an unlikely collaboration between Woodrow Wilson and the elder Field Marshal von Moltke. For as the neoconservatives have played the anti-Semitic card, they will not hesitate to play the Munich card as well. A year ago, when Bush called on Sharon to pull out of the West Bank, Sharon fired back that he would not let anyone do to Israel what Neville Chamberlain had done to the Czechs. George Jouwlan said the United States may have to impose a peace on Israel and the Palestinians, he, too, faced the charge of appeasement. Podhoretz agreed Sharon was right in the substance of what he said but called it politically unwise to use the Munich analogy. President Bush is on notice: Should he pressure Israel to trade land for peace, the Oslo formula in which his father and Yitzak Rabin believed, he will, as was his father, be denounced as an anti-Semite and a Munich-style appeaser by both Israelis and their neoconservative allies inside his own Big Tent. Yet, if Bush cannot deliver Sharon there can be no peace. And if there is no peace in the Mideast there is no security for us, ever—for there will be no end to terror. We should help them secure these rights. As a nation, we have made a moral commitment, endorsed by half a dozen presidents, which Americans wish to honor, not to permit these people who have suffered much to see their country overrun and destroyed. And we must honor this commitment. They often collide, and when they do, U. In the s, its intelligence service, the Mossad, had agents in Egypt blow up U. During the Six Day War, Israel ordered repeated attacks on the undefended USS Liberty that killed 34 American sailors and wounded and included the machine-gunning of life rafts. This massacre was neither investigated nor punished by the U. Israel suborned Jonathan Pollard to loot our secrets and refuses to return the documents, which would establish whether or not they were sold to Moscow. When Clinton tried to broker an agreement at Wye Plantation between Israel and Arafat, Bibi Netanyahu attempted to extort, as his price for signing, release of Pollard, so he could take this treasonous snake back to Israel as a national hero. Do the Brits, our closest allies, behave like this?

Chapter 2 : Whose War? | The American Conservative

Brothers at war: the unending conflict in Korea / Sheila Miyoshi Jager. Jager, Sheila Miyoshi, (author. Place Hold.

The Kree go on the offensive with a little help from the Guardians of the Galaxy. By Jesse Schedeen War of Kings continues to be a landmark example of how to do an event storyline right. The main series is chock full of both huge, bombastic action and quality character development. The tie-ins can be read and enjoyed on their own merits, yet still work to further the events of the main series. While War of Kings and its tie-ins have mostly existed independent of each other so far, they begin to converge this month. Joining the battle are the Starjammers, who are locked in a desperate struggle to liberate Lilandra from the Imperial Guard. Luckily, they have a few good men on their side in the form of the Guardians of the Galaxy. When Groot and Rocket Raccoon are on the scene, only pure, unfiltered awesomeness can result. Granted, the Guardians appearance lacks a bit of context without having read their series lately, but it still provides just the right "oomph" I wanted. As usual, Crystal and Gladiator remain the central focus for their respective sides. We see Crystal serving as perhaps the lone voice of reason among the Inhumans. And reading Maximus is always a treat. I was initially skeptical about the way he was cast as less of a villain figure starting with Secret Invasion: Inhumans, but he really does fill a niche in his frazzled mad scientist role. Still, Abnett and Lanning do provide a nice look at the Imperial Guard in action and provide some quality time with Gladiator. My only real qualm with the story besides those mentioned involves the final few pages. Without giving too much away, a certain character makes a momentous decision. It happened too quickly and with too little fanfare. Still, it makes for a nice cap to the issue in the end. His action scenes are exciting and dynamic. Few artists at Marvel can rival him in that area. Characters lean to the exaggerated end of the spectrum, and that can either be a good or bad thing depending on your tastes.

The Paperback of the Brothers at War: The Unending Conflict in Korea by Sheila Miyoshi Jager at Barnes & Noble. 3 Momentous Decisions War Drums Endgame

We have known this for nearly a decade, well before the murderous ISIS even appeared. There was no al Qaeda-Iraq connection until the war; our invasion made it so. On the other, it is beyond depressing how little these assessments have come to matter in the discussion and debate over US foreign policy. Instead, they insisted on creating an occupation that generated nothing but chaos, mass murder and the terrorist victories of today. One of the many horrific results was the decision to support Nouri al-Maliki as a potential leader of the nation. But to focus exclusively on the administration begs an obvious question. How did they get away with it? Where were the watchdogs of the press? Much has been written on this topic. No one denies that the truth was available at the time. Not all of it, of course, but enough to know that certain catastrophe lay down the road the administration chose to travel at miles per hour. It only made the paper at all because Bob Woodward, who was researching a book, talked his editors into it. And even then, it ran on page A17, where it was immediately forgotten. Things that challenged the administration were on A18 on Sunday or A24 on Monday. There was an attitude among editors: Many in the mainstream media came clean, relatively speaking, about the cause of their mistakes when it turned out that they had been conduits for the Bush administration lies that led to catastrophe. An unsettled Kurdish situation? A difficult transition in Baghdad? These may be problems, but they are far preferable to leaving Saddam in power with his nukes, VX, and anthrax. One often reads analyses these days that grant the no-longer ignorable fact that American conservatives, especially those in control of the Republican Party, have become so obsessed by right-wing ideology and beholden to corporate cash that they have entirely lost touch both with reality and with the views of most Americans. This is no less true, it turns out, with regard to the proposed adventurism in Iraq and elsewhere in the Middle East by those who sold us the first false bill of goods back in A strong majority of Americans now agree that removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq was not worth the trillions of dollars and lives lost. The conservative foreign policy establishment, it needs to be said, is no less out to touch with reality “ and democracy “ than the tea party fanatics who control the Republican domestic agenda and are fueled by the cash of the Koch Brothers and other billionaires who stand to profit from their victories. That so many in the media pretend otherwise, after all this time, all this death and all this money wasted, demonstrates not only contempt for their audience but utter disdain for knowledge itself.

Chapter 4 : War of Kings #3 Review - IGN

WAR DRUMS: Trump warns of 'major decisions' in coming hours Apr 9, | 0 | President Trump on Monday called the suspected chemical attack in Syria over the weekend "atrocious" and said the United States will make "major decisions" about its response over the next 24 to 48 hours.

Includes bibliographical references and index. Liberation and division ; Two Koreas ; Momentous decisions ; War for the South ; Uncommon coalition ; Crossing the 38th parallel ; An entirely new war ; Quest for victory ; The stalemate ; "Let them march till they die" ; Propaganda wars ; Armistice, at last -- Pt. Legitimacy wars ; Old allies, new friends ; War for peace ; End of an era -- Pt. After the Cold War. North Korea and the world ; Winners and losers -- Epilogue. War drums ; Endgame -- War for the South: Desperate days ; War for the North ; Savage war -- Uncommon coalition: Integrating an army ; Common cause -- Crossing the 38th parallel: Lessons of history ; Pilgrimage to Wake ; "If war is inevitable, let it be waged now" ; First strike -- An entirely new war: The general and the statesman ; Spring offensive ; Magnificent Glosters ; Victory denied? Truce talks ; Voluntary repatriation -- "Let them march till they die": Tunnel war ; American bugs ; Koje-do -- Armistice, at last: August purge ; Military line ; The blue house raid and the Pueblo incident ; Confessions -- Old allies, new friends: Tensions between allies ; Opening to China -- War for peace: Withdrawal ; Backlash ; To Seoul -- End of an era: Kwangju uprising ; Students and the politics of legitimacy -- Pt. North Korea and the world: Shutdown ; Defueling crisis ; Accord -- Winners and losers: More than sixty years after North Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel into South Korea, the Korean War is still not over--yet it has become a forgotten episode in American history. Now, Sheila Miyoshi Jager combines international events with previously unknown personal accounts to create a comprehensive new history of that war. From American, Korean, Soviet and Chinese perspectives, she explores its origins, development and global implications. Drawing on newly available diplomatic archives in several nations, this is the first account to examine both the military and the social, cultural, and political aspect of the war and its impact.

Chapter 5 : Obama's Road to War - calendrierdelascience.com Original

Momentous Decisions 44 War Drums 3# Endgame 3%. War for the South 33 Desperate Days 2% War for the North 1# Savage War 14 4. Uncommon Coalition 01 Integrating an Army \$\$\$.

It was a four-wheeled, Silver, invertable robot that was armed with a powerful spinning drum. War Drums did well in the competition, reaching the quarterfinals before losing to Spatula. War Drums would continue competing for years, even entering RoboGames. However by early it was completely outclassed, and was retired. War Drums first match was against Spatula. This fight started with Spatula immediately coming out of its square, and slamming into War Drums, flipping it. Spatula then slammed War Drums into the wall before charging at its spinning drum. This used the power of War Drums own weapon against itself as War Drums was sent flying by this hit, War Drums only had half of its drive at this point so Spatula slammed into it again, flipping it once more. Now upright, War Drums then landed a hit on Spatula that sent it flying through the air, however it was still having drive issues, and this allowed Spatula to take it to the wall. In doing so however Spatula got itself stuck under the wall, and the match had to be paused to free Spatula. Once the match resumed it was clear that War Drums weapon was not working, and Spatula took it into the wall again, Spatula then pushed War Drums around the arena as the final seconds ticked down on the clock. War Drums tosses Mace into the air. As soon as this fight started Mace was only able to move in circles, this allowed War Drums to come in, and send it flying. War Drums then slammed into the wall before delivering another blow to Mace, this time flipping it. War Drums continued doing this several times until it got another hit, this time ripping the right wheel off of Mace. War Drums then delivered a final hit to Mace, sending it flying once more, before Mace tapped out. War Drums delivers a large hit to Spatula. However AFWW was not moving at all, and tapped out. This win by knockout meant that War Drums was now in the second quarterfinal round where it faced Spatula again. War Drums then drove over the top of Spatula which then rammed it, this flipped War Drums, and Spatula delivered two more slams, stopping the weapon of War Drums. Shortly after this attack War Drums stopped moving, and tapped out. This meant that War Drums was eliminated from the tournament.

Chapter 6 : Geoff Emerick obituary | Music | The Guardian

No matter who won the election in , there was going to be a new president in , and McConnell argued that Americans should have a chance to select who that president was going to be before allowing such a momentous decision to go forward.

The Problems of Independence While the momentum of the Spanish colonial system carried the frontier provinces along peacefully and enjoyably for approximately a decade, numerous very serious problems faced independent Mexico if peace and prosperity were to be preserved past the period of grace when the momentum was used up. One of the problems faced by Mexico, and particularly in the frontier companies, soon became the replacement of skilled and experienced officers. While Mexico was extremely fortunate in having its pre-independence officer corps nearly intact, it had to solve the problem of replacement beginning immediately. There had been a few officers who remained loyal to their king and returned to Spain, creating vacancies which had to be filled. Next there was the fact that however much the creoles may have resented the Peninsular-born officers constantly sent to New Spain to fill high positions, those officers had supplied a significant proportion of the top commanders. With independence they came no longer, so those top command posts had to be filled by promoting junior officers—one of the goals of the revolution. Institution of republican forms of government siphoned more well-known officers off into the national and state legislatures, along with bishops and similar experienced leaders. These promotions and departures created vacancies for junior officers, and their promotions created gaps in the lower ranks for which new officers of less experience and frequently less ability had to be recruited. There had, moreover, always been a stream of emigration from Spain or other colonial possessions to New Spain which included a significant number of upper class Spaniards whose gentlemanly class status allowed them no career outside the armed forces, big business or the church. Now as Mexico barred loyal subjects of the Spanish king in order to safeguard its newly won independence, it necessarily shut off this traditional source of officers. The net effect of this attrition of trained officers, while it may have been democratizing was also a gradual deterioration of quality in the presidial officer corps. As good republicans as their successors may have been, they lacked the long experience in presidial management possessed by the members of the provincial elite. They lacked the virtually inbred military abilities of the elite officers and certainly the cultural inheritance of military technique and social graces and command presence which were taught the infants born into the provincial elite group almost automatically as part of their familial and group culture. In other words, post independence commanders and subalterns were simply not as effective as their predecessors and the top-flight officers were spread thinner and thinner. The Problem of Succession. The real miracle of the revolution which created the United States of America was that which provided an orderly method of peaceful succession in political office by electoral procedures. The miraculous quality of this method of succession is acutely accentuated by a comparison with the unhappy and anything but peaceful experience of the French and Mexicans in attempting to solve the same problem of transferring political power from one man to another or from one political party to another. This problem was very acute in Mexico at the national level. The first solution after independence was a five-man regency which lasted from the end of September of Bancroft. This attempt at solving the problem of succession endured less than a year for Iturbide was forced to abdicate on March 19, *ibid.* Adopting the forms of republican government after the overthrow of Iturbide, the Mexican political leaders were unsuccessful in achieving the reality of peaceful electoral succession. Although experienced officers were spread thinner and thinner on the frontier, there were entirely too many high ranking officers in the vicinity of the City of Mexico who thought they were capable of ruling if not actually entitled to do so. The juxtaposition of such ambitions and the means to effectuate them in the form of troops all too often precipitated changes in governments or abortive attempts to change governments which absorbed the attention of the government in power in putting down revolts and preventing them from tackling other problems facing the country. These caudillos also, in effect, increased the number of officers and troops in the central areas of the country far above the colonial levels, thus weakening the frontier forces and preventing their effective

reinforcement. Most of the states suffered the same problems of determining political succession without resort to arms that the nation suffered, and Sonora was foremost among those plagued by men on horseback. A brief resume of the rapid rise and fall of national governments will make the point sufficiently for purposes of this report. The task of formulating a permanent form of government was completed with the publishing of a national constitution on October 4, and the election of a constitutional president *ibid*. This first elected administration struggled through three years with fair success, but in December of the vice-president revolted against the president *ibid*. The rebels were easily defeated, the vice-president impeached and the rebel leaders exiled *ibid*. Cabinet minister Manuel Gomez Pedraza won the election *ibid*. The defeated candidate, Vicente Guerrero, revolted *ibid*. Guerrero took office in April, the new constitution having been successfully ignored and precedent set for rule by revolution rather than constitutional election *ibid*. Hardly had the new administration executed the ex-president when it in turn had to begin putting down new revolutions *ibid*. On January 2, , however, the Vera Cruz garrison demanded dismissal of the government ministers *ibid*. Bustamante resigned on September 19 *ibid*. Taking command of government troops in person, Bustamante won a resounding victory on September 18 *ibid*. Santa Anna went over to the offensive from Vera Cruz *ibid*. This was the chronicle of futile struggles for personal power at the national capital during the period of grace on the northern frontier, the sad tale of wastage of national military and financial resources on a lavish scale in internecine party warfare of Mexican against Mexican. In these political wars the power needed in Sonora and the other frontier states to hold the Indian frontier was dissipated. The political struggle at the national center continued long after the vindication of Gomez Pedraza. The vice-president was inaugurated on April 1, *ibid*. The energetic reforms proposed by the vice-president aroused opposition among extremists who resorted to armed force as was becoming habitual, so on June 3 Santa Anna took the field, leaving administration again to Gomez Farias *ibid*. After the extremists were defeated through little action on his part, Santa Anna took office again June 18 but turned it back to the vice-president on July 5 *ibid*. In October Santa Anna once again took office after defeating rebel forces, only to turn it back to Gomez Farias on December 16 *ibid*. Gomez Farias abided by constitutional forms even though he had evidence that the president planned to do away with them, which he proceeded to do by ruling as dictator without a congress, cabinet or even state legislatures *ibid*. Barragan had to deal with the military problem raised by revolt of the North American immigrants in Texas, and died in office on March 1, Anastacio Bustamante came back to win election as president in after his return from exile *ibid*. As usual, revolts soon broke out all over the republic *ibid*. On the 28th of that same month he turned over the administration to the president of the council *ibid*. Manipulating affairs from behind the scenes, Santa Anna secured his indirect election to the presidency on January 2, , although he stayed in seclusion on his estate for another six months *ibid*. He departed again after the death of his wife later in August *ibid*. The dictator was arrested in flight toward the coast and exile early in January of *ibid*. In the fall of a new election put General Herrera in office as constitutional president, inaugurated on September 16th *ibid*. He won widespread support, and the constitutional president surrendered office December 30th, Paredes entering the capital city on January 20 *ibid*. No sooner did Paredes achieve supreme power than new disputants appeared *ibid*. He landed at Vera Cruz with the connivance of blockading United States ships *ibid*. December 23 he was chosen ad interim president with Gomez Farias as vice-president and acting chief executive *ibid*. Anaya president November 9th and he took office on the 12th *ibid*. Many Mexicans regarded conclusion of peace with the United States as treason despite the apparent impossibility of carrying on the struggle, and personally ambitious men as usual revolted, but this time the government won *ibid*. During opposition to Arista appeared throughout the nation and on January 5, , he resigned, turning the government over to a new Chief Justice, Juan Bautista Ceballos *ibid*. Under his new administration the Treaty of Mesilla or the Gadsden Purchase was concluded December 30, *ibid*. Whereas during colonial times a brilliant officer could hope for action on the frontier which would bring him to royal notice and promotion-even though there was a strong tendency even then to prefer assignments in or near the capital city for social reasons-during republican times this situation radically altered. The truly momentous political decisions were made at the capital, whether by force of arms or peaceful maneuvering. In any event the ambitious officer was drawn to the capital as a moth to the flame. The provinces offered him little or no opportunity for advancement or

national fame—these were won by success in the constant struggles for power at the centre although the national struggle was duplicated on a smaller scale in nearly every state. This continuous resort to arms to resolve the succession in office in effect produced multiple armed forces where only one had existed in colonial times, so that more officers and troops were actually deployed in or near the capital than before, to the detriment of the frontier commands. The problem of succession in office in the State of the West and later Sonora was hardly less acute than that at the centre, and pulled able officers and large numbers of troops into the vicinity of Hermosillo and Ures where contests were generally decided. Ambitious officers were no more willing to accept the results of popular or legislative elections in Sonora than in the City of Mexico if they had sufficient troops under their control to make an issue of any selection which left them slighted. Thus officers who were not sucked into the vortex of combat at the national capital could not escape being drawn into the provincial conflicts, even if they happened to desire nothing more than to be left alone to fight the Indian enemy on the frontier. Contestants for state office required troops to win, so they repeatedly levied upon the frontier garrisons under their control Bancroft Thus frontier posts suffered a serious deterioration in leadership, a diminution in manpower and frequent interference from higher echelons. The Problem of Finances. One of the immediate effects of independence was a disruption of the flow of funds to and from the frontier provinces. Under that system the Frontier Provinces had not fared badly inasmuch as royal ministers were always motivated to expand or at least try to maintain intact the royal geographic patrimony. After independence, the tax collection system lost in efficiency when control passed to politicians who were not always as thorough and impartial about collections as the agents of the king had been. Further, the funds which flowed into the City of Mexico were not budgeted for expenditure in the frontier provinces with the generosity of colonial times. In addition, the intermittent struggles over succession in high office not only were costly in themselves, but created frequent opportunities for dishonest manipulations and outright robbery from the public monies, so that the taxes which flowed into the capital tended never to leave it again, at least for the frontier military posts. This financial situation merely increased the desire of capable officers to migrate to the centers of decision-making in the states or the City of Mexico. They were motivated not only by ambition but by financial necessity! It required a very dedicated officer or a dullard to remain in the frontier posts such as Tubac. The only surprising feature of the whole situation was that the momentum of colonialism carried the frontier through more than a decade without serious hostilities from the southern Athapascans, and that the frontier military units did not deteriorate more rapidly than was the case. One of the effects of the deterioration in government financing was to terminate the effectiveness of the Apache reservation system originated by Viceroy Galvez. The cost of the food, liquor, clothing, arms, munitions and other rations and gifts issued to the Peaceful Apaches to keep them satisfied was tremendous. This subsidy program was one of the first casualties of the independent Mexican government, subject as it was to budgetary control by politicians committed to local interests and self-interest rather than a concept of the public good which allowed them to pour large sums into maintaining peace on the distant frontiers. The frontier commanders who recognized the necessity for maintaining the ration system if peace were to be preserved managed to scrounge Apache rations out of their other allotments, but the colonial system jerked and strained, and late rations of poor quality did not keep the Apaches happy. Even so the Peaceful Apaches coasted along for a considerable period following habits developed during a long period of pacification, making out as best they could and undoubtedly hoping for improvement. Only gradually as conditions worsened without any realistic prospect for improvement did the Peaceful Apache bands reluctantly return to raiding as an economic necessity, thus accelerating the deterioration of the frontier settlements. The year seems to have been the critical turning point when the habits of colonialism were finally abandoned in a widespread defection of Peaceful Apache bands Velasco O: The Problem of Ethnic Self-Determination. Another Indian tribe created a military problem for independent Mexico, and for Sonora in particular, which was no less serious than Apache hostilities although it was somewhat more sporadic. The Yaqui Indians on the Yaqui River almost at the eventual line of partition between Sinaloa and Sonora had stopped the military forces of colonial Spain cold in the early years of the seventeenth century. Still undefeated, they had requested Jesuit missionaries who arrived in their country in and quickly reformed Yaqui society on strongly theocratic lines. Thereafter this proud people settled down to

mission village life and the acquisition of many selected traits of Hispanic culture, with almost no resort to arms through the colonial period. Even though the Yaqui missions were secularized upon the expulsion of the Jesuit Order from New Spain, the reformulation of Yaqui culture and socio-political forms had been achieved in so thoroughgoing a manner that this enclave of perhaps 50, people remained a separatist subordinate subcultural society, with a considerable degree of actual self-government within the colonial system, and fairly effective protection of their homeland against non-Indian settlement and exploitation. When the Spanish monarchy disappeared with independence, and republican Mexicans cast covetous eyes toward the Yaqui country, tribal war drums began to beat and a collective Yaqui cry for ethnic political independence went up. Avaricious Mexicans eager for personal profit moved in on the Yaquis, incapable of assessing the long-term cost to themselves and their new country of their preoccupation with personal goals. By the Yaquis had received sufficient proofs of their likely fate under republican Mexican rule. They struck for independence. The Yaqui revolt was the first adverse result of independence in Sonora and marked the beginning of the deterioration of the military, economic, and political situation in that state and its northern frontier. Sixty bloody years passed before the Mexicans eventually defeated the Yaquis decisively long after Tubac and the rest of the Gadsden Purchase area had passed from Mexican sovereignty.

Chapter 7 : Why War? The Cultural Logic of Iraq, the Gulf War, and Suez by Philip Smith, an excerpt

Our new desktop experience was built to be your music destination. Listen to official albums & more.

August 28, Obama is keeping his eye on the prize – the Nobel Prize, that is, as a reward for brokering a Middle East "peace" deal. The news out of the negotiations with the Israelis is that Bibi gets everything, and Obama gets to make an announcement that the perpetually stalled talks with the Palestinians will resume. By "everything," I mean to include what the Guardian describes as "a partial freeze" on settlement construction – an oxymoron that could only exist in the context of an agreement between Israel and the US. With Congress getting ready to impose strict economic sanctions on Iranian energy exports, the stage is set for a military strike. That a US President has agreed to go to war in exchange for a Nobel Peace Prize is an event that could only occur in Obama-world – which is apparently situated somewhere very close to Bizarro World. The announcement of this "breakthrough," as the Guardian calls it, is slated for the last week of September – and you can count on the war drums to start beating around the same time. On the Afghan front, the news is grim: As conservatives tentatively and hesitantly reassess the interventionism-run-amok of the Bush years, and liberals begin to wake from their dreams of a perfectly "progressive" president, the outlines of a new anti-interventionist coalition are taking shape. Suddenly Afghanistan is in the news, and commentators on the right as well as the left are taking note. Tony Blankley, former chief aide to Newt Gingrich and editor of the Washington Times, joins Nation editor Katrina vanden Heuval and Pat Buchanan in comparing Obama to LBJ – a chief executive with an ambitious liberal domestic program dragged down by his commitment to a losing war. What is it worth to the country? That same day, President Johnson spoke with Senator Russell, a friend and confidante, asking his advice on the Vietnam matter. We know, now, what he really believed: To have gone ahead with such a momentous decision based on a purely political calculation is nothing less than monstrous. The subversive question Blankley raises is: He has argued consistently that the war in Afghanistan is necessary to deny al-Qaida a base of terrorist operations and to stop the Taliban insurrection from destabilizing nuclear Pakistan. But serious doubts are being raised by many policy experts and an emerging majority of the American and British publics as to whether we have a strategy and the materiel to succeed. Even the optimists believe that a successful counterinsurgency in Afghanistan and needed as much in Pakistan will require several years of sustained commitment. He also no doubt knows his base will have a hard time following him into the wilds of Waziristan. Blankley avers Republican support for the war will be muted and even tending toward reversal on account of partisan considerations. Whether or not it turns out to be a historic tragedy remains to be seen. As Blankley puts it: Notwithstanding his prior and current commitment to prosecute the war in Afghanistan – and notwithstanding the ambiguous political effect of his decision – he owes it to both himself and the many young service members who soon may be shipping out to make a new, cold calculation of whether he believes that he has a reasonable chance of successfully leading us in this new stage of the war. The result has been the promiscuous interventionism of the Clinton era, and, more recently, the rise of the "national security Democrats" – a school of foreign policy and military analysts dedicated to proving that Democrats can be just as bloodthirsty as their partisan opponents, albeit in a "pragmatic" and impeccably PC way. Gathered around the Center for a New American Strategy and the Center for American Progress, which have supplied the Obama administration with civilian Pentagon officials dedicated to pursuing a "smart" strategy in Afghanistan, these reincarnations of "the best and the brightest" may yet convince Obama that he can damn the torpedoes and go full speed ahead. Who, after all, is there to stop them? The "progressives" are too busy smearing the "tea-baggers" as "terrorists" to bother with the impending disaster – and, besides that, they could use a "good war" to divert attention away from the snowballing domestic failures of this administration, and their own apparent powerlessness in its inner councils. No doubt the partisan instincts of a good number of rank-and-file conservatives will kick in, as the more intellectually precocious among them begin to wake up to the domestic uses of war as Obama pursues his bid to vastly expand the power of government on the home front. Yet the neoconservative leadership of that once proud movement is dedicated to militarism as a high principle. Slaughter is their religion. For

"balance," no doubt: He and his foreign policy advisors are merely debating which war to fight first, with the more pro-Israel faction voting for a strike against Iran, and the more pragmatic types wanting to finish the job in Kabul and environs before tackling Tehran. I suspect the latter types will win out, just as they did during the Bush years. Whether this gives the antiwar movement time and the chance to attract enough support from both sides of the political spectrum to make an attack on Iran impossible is a tantalizing "but still highly speculative" question. What is certain, however, is that by the time the Obama-ites get around to fulfilling their pledge to Netanyahu to take on Iran, Americans "left, right, and center" will be thoroughly war-sick, if not thoroughly sick of Obama. Good lord, talk about feeling the effects of the recession! The danger of Antiwar. That includes me, by the way. The copyeditors, the free-lancers, the regular columnists "and yours truly: Every penny is accounted for, and pre-budgeted. A loss of a couple thousand "and out comes the knife. Read more by Justin Raimondo.

Chapter 8 : Brothers at war : the unending conflict in Korea - NOBLE (All Libraries)

Are they ready for such a momentous decision, though? We certainly hope so. Russia Beats War Drums, Then Accidentally Rips Hole in Only Aircraft Carrier.

Philip Smith brilliantly fills this gap. No one, after reading his groundbreaking book, will ever think the same about war. His decision to team up with America and push the apocalyptic wheelbarrow was to cause perhaps the greatest crises and embarrassments of his lengthy administration. In the United Kingdom, in contrast, Blair had to confront to the full the inertial weight of a low mimetic genre that was well entrenched in the civil discourse even of his own party. There eventuated relentless questioning, calls for hard evidence and common sense, and talk of war as a last resort. These ponderous efforts became the millstone that burdened this usually confident swimmer of political waters and left him struggling to stay afloat. Elected in against a Tory force led by the "grey" John Major, the youthful and modestly charismatic Tony Blair had been the savior of the British Labour Party. The lesson had been taken from Margaret Thatcher that market friendly policies encouraging capitalist investment and rewarding individual choice, achievement, and effort were the route to economic prosperity and electoral success. Taking this path had required Blair to engage in some momentous policy decisions that amounted, in effect, to a U-turn in the identity of his own party. During the Thatcher years Labour had been kept out of power partly by the efficient Conservative machine and partly by its own rifts and vulnerabilities. The traditional Left wing, what was often referred to in the press as a "Loony Left," had continued to advocate unilateral nuclear disarmament, nationalized industries, tax hikes, and close alliances with so-called militant trades unions. It had also opposed all wars, including a broadly popular one against an Argentine military dictatorship over the Falkland Islands see P. These were not electable policies. The Labour Party lost the support of the upwardly mobile working and lower middle classes as Thatcher transformed them into homeowners and shareholders, winners and investors in the game of life rather than losers and grumblers—a much more attractive subject position. Considerable blame for this electoral failure could also be placed on the press, which had crucified the Labour leaders. The intellectually gifted but politically rather inept Michael Foot was lampooned as a feckless, absent-minded, donkey-jacket wearing, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament-loving, head in the sand, disheveled professor type. His successor, the simultaneously affable and earnest Neil Kinnock, was dismissed as an anorak-wearing, pompous Welsh windbag. Neither was understood as having the strength of character needed to tame the Loony Left. Looking disciplined and professional like the Tories, with their pinstripe suits and Saatchi groomed profile came to be seen as equally important for retaining power as having low-tax, pro-achievement policies. Building on the work of his immediate predecessor the potentially electable John Smith who had died while leader of the opposition Blair moved the party to the Right. He endorsed the Third Way and gave top priority to relations with the media and image control. For a time this approach seemed to work. A romantic narrative gave Blair an extended political honeymoon. An upbeat Britain became, for a brief spell, a "Cool Britannia" of energy and chic. Blair and his Third Way policies were touted as the fresh face of socialism throughout Europe. This early Blair was seen as an ethical man. This romance started to falter around Critics noted that Blair had failed to deliver on basic promises with respect to improving efficiency in public services and that his administration was seemingly more concerned with style than substance. This view found its analogue in two collective representations. The first was the Millennium Dome, a white elephant project designed to celebrate the arrival of the year that looked good from a distance but whose exhibits were universally derided as vacuous and patronizing when scrutinized. Opportunities for parallels with New Labour were too tempting for commentators to resist. The second icon was Peter Mandelson, a shadowy figure and so-called master of spin said to have great influence with the prime minister but little public accountability. Mandelson was deeply unpopular with the electorate and eventually resigned after a scandal. As Blair entered his second term these kinds of accusations grew and symbolic pollution in terms of the Discourse of Repression started to set in. Many came to see him as too presidential and too slick. There was a growing tide of feeling that the still popular Blair and his Third Way philosophies had less to do with the stated agendas of New Labour and more to do with retaining personal

power at all costs Begg It was a cultural environment that saw his claims microscopically examined for both spin and sincerity. We find him sitting in Congress as an honored guest at George W. This was the very moment when the U. Blair repeatedly made claims on these only to see them repeatedly disputed. Events during and took the following form. Blair or one of his ministers would make a statement, which they would say was based on intelligence that was a little murky but which generally indicated evil doings and bad intent. They would call for trust given that all the intelligence could not be revealed and ask for support for war given the Pascalian wager at hand. Not convinced, skeptics asked for a smoking gun showing irrefutable proof of an immediate danger. This would be attacked as inadequate and the cycle would continue. And so it was that with the all the brio of a farmer walking over a wet clay field in Wellington boots, Blair plugged on with efforts to spread a message of truly apocalyptic gloom and an associated clarion call to arms. This is most clearly stated in a section of his speech to the House of Commons of March 18, The "threat is chaos," he said, that originates in "tyrannical regimes with WMD and extreme terrorist groups who profess a perverted and false view of Islam" Hansard, March 18, There were already "terrorist cells now operating in most major countries," and "countries or groups within countries that are proliferating and trading in WMD, especially nuclear weapons technology. Millions of lethal doses are contained in one liter of Anthrax. There was a need to act decisively against "tyrannies and dictatorships and terrorists," to stand firm, to transform the UN into something more than a "talking shop" and to liberate the Iraqi people. Blair under Siege If widely accepted this vision was never truly hegemonic. On February 15, , over a million people marched in London against the war. On February 26, , Labour MPs went against their leader after a heated debate on the war. A total of MPs voted for an amendment that the case for war was "as yet unproven. The situation became worse for the prime minister. Although a motion for war passed in the Commons by to , some Labour MPs voted against their party. Three ministers resigned, including the Leader of the House, Robin Cook. Familiar Labour survivors of the "loony left" mavericks made their mark. George Galloway spoke of imperialism and Anglo-American aggression and called British arms workers to acts of sabotage. The charismatic veteran Tony Benn flew to Baghdad and conducted a television interview with Saddam Hussein. Cabinet Minister Clair Short threatened to resign and suggested that a war without UN sanction was "reckless. What was the narrative genre of these critics? Operating from a low mimetic perspective they were concerned about the United Kingdom following international law, about the availability of evidence and information, about the proper consultation of parliamentary and military opinion, and about the need to take measured and prudent steps. It is neatly captured in the Commons debate of February 26 Hansard. There was disquiet expressed at the seeming inevitability of the conflict. War drums are rolling and I approach the next few weeks with a deep sense of foreboding. Some even understood Blair in a more satiric mode. He was the well-intentioned man who was a little out of touch with the harsher realities of life. In this collective representation Blair was depicted as confused and bumbling. Symptomatic here is an article in the Guardian that contrasted a potential war in Iraq with Suez and noted a key difference: A year later a different story would be told. Despite such critique in early , many supported Blairâ€”some of them outside his own party. It is leaving him there that is inhumane," it wrote February 16, The Conservative MP Sir Patrick Cormack echoed this pattern so familiar from Suez and the Gulf War of the need to uphold the "credibility of the international order" and to "stand up against evil" Hansard, February 26, The war itself was an easy victory and one can imagine an alternate history in which Blair basked in glory. It had been a comparative cakewalk without costly military engagements. The doomsayers had been seemingly proven wrong. Indeed poll data showed Blair enjoying a brief "Baghdad Bounce. Blair had a 49 percent approval rating in April â€”a significant gain from frosty lows in the 30s he had endured in Februaryâ€”and 64 percent of respondents said that it had been right to take military action Times, April 14, So Blair might have been understood as making the right call and averting an eventual apocalypse at very low cost. This did not happen. Here is the irony: There had been no evidence of WMD, no sign of a powerful military or desperate Baathist regime. Saddam Hussein had kept a low profile and then disappeared. Opposition had, for the most part, melted away. When the hunt for WMD turned up nothing, Blair had to endure a horribly bumpy ride. This can be understood as a kind of postmortem asking how an avoidable war had happened and why an incorrect interpretation had been made and then so enthusiastically

endorsed. In America Bush could still be emphatic about the apocalypse around the corner and was permitted by public opinion to continue to tell scary stories. Blair by contrast had to make concessions to the entrenched low mimetic genre because he was playing off the back foot to a rather skeptical audience who knew well his reputation for spin management. His defensive posture required him to add the weight of facts to his discourse of crisis, in effect to painstakingly explain what clues he had had and how he had interpreted them. Blair revealed more openly than Bush that the picture was not fully transparent and that he had taken a measured guess or wager rather than made a definitive reading. Bush did not tell us he was interpreting what was happening, he told us what was happening. So Blair told us he had to guess in order to do his job, albeit in a way informed by clues of sorts. As Robert Reich, the U. Secretary of Labor under Clinton, perceptively observed op-ed, *The Observer*, August 3, , these differences were revealed in press conferences delivered at the end of July Bush spoke of fighting tyranny, hunting down Saddam Hussein, and the fact that the war would be vindicated by history. Only two of the following questions concerned the accuracy of prewar intelligence. Consider his speech at the Labour Party Conference, held that year in the genteel seaside resort of Bournemouth.

Chapter 9 : Tubac Through Four Centuries: An Historical Resume and Analysis

Obama's Road to War. and you can count on the war drums to start beating To have gone ahead with such a momentous decision based on a purely political.

The announcement that Steve Bannon was being removed from the National Security Council concerned me. The timing was suspicious considering recent events in Syria. Bashar al-Assad is being blamed for a chemical weapons attack against the forces of Al-Nusra Front in Idlib. Maybe he did it, maybe not. A warehouse that had been identified as a munitions storage depot for Al-Nusra Front seems a strange target for use of a sarin gas bomb. The only thing in dispute is what type of bomb was used. Last I checked, and those that know my background also know that I am an expert on these issues; sarin gas delivery mechanisms are not really useful for leveling buildings. These allegations against Assad are suspicious; eerily similar to the chemical weapon used in Ghouta, Syria. Again, the timing is strange as Secretary of State Tillerson had announced less than a week earlier that Assad could remain President of Syria as long as he continued to support U. But now, all that has changed. The war drums are beating. I find this a curious selection of individuals to say the least. It is possible that his opinion would not be welcome in a room of war hawks and NEOCONs determined to overthrow yet another country that dared to challenge U. He was also critical of our policies leading to the destruction of Libya and Syria. I find it remarkable that all that could change in the blink of an eye over the alleged use of a chemical weapon by someone that only a week earlier we had publicly announced could remain President of Syria. You see, it just makes no sense that Assad would use chemical weapons to level an Al-Nusra Front munitions building. It makes no sense that Assad would risk his relationship with a new US administration that was showing support for him. I would certainly hate to see these events result in our nation and Russia engaging in open conflict. Something here just does not add up. Is President Trump so impetuous as to risk war with Russia over what could just be a Syrian bomb striking a chemical munition in a known Al-Nusra Front munition warehouse? One other theory has also surfaced. The theory involves the source of friction between Steve Bannon and Mr. To avoid spreading gossip, I will not repeat the details because as far as I know this theory is just wild speculation. I will say that it would be a shame if Steve Bannon knew the truth about these matters and failed to inform the public before U.