

Listening to news pundits and government officials a theme and word seems to be always forthcoming from their mouths, "radicalized". Now any and all politicians are willing to jump on the bandwagon of this "extremist", "radical" threat that poses a "real" threat to U.S. "interest". OK, they'll throw in civilians here and there but we've all seen how much the U.S. cares about its citizens, just look at hurricane Katrina. Not to mention there's more serious "threats" (real ones) to humans as a whole besides "terrorism", one being global warming.

What seems odd to me is what these officials deem radical. Environmentalists have been called "radicals". And for what? Cause they wish to save the planet? Trees, forest and the ocean that sustains us? Anything threatening the economical, political structure of the U.S. or even trying to bring about something new can be seen as radical or terrorism. "The purpose of U.S. policy has been not to defend democracy, in fact, democracies - as in Iran (1953), Guatemala (1954), Indonesia (1965), and Chile (1973) are regularly overthrown if they attempt to initiate ~~serious~~ serious economic reforms that tamper with the existing class structure. The U.S. goal is to make the world safe for multinational corporate exploitation, to keep things as they are even while talking about the need for change" and reform". 1

I liken it to this. If you're a real-estate mogul or you own land, have businesses or anything of this nature, you're making money and here comes out of nowhere some person taking your business, customers and money. Tooth and nail you'll fight to drive them out of business or buy them out. The U.S. is like that. It doesn't wish to see its "interest" in ~~any~~ jeopardy or in danger. And with the "victory" over communism, jihadist and Islam have taken the spot of posing a threat to U.S. "interest". That interest is capitalism. Many of economic structures that "nationalize" and help out its people is deemed a threat. Corporations and 'individual' wealthy capitalist will not easily stand idle as their cash crop is taken.

I think further elaboration is needed. But just a brief one. I'll look at Chile. "In 1970 a Socialist Candidate, Salvador Allende, was elected president of Chile and began initiating reforms, that country [was] suddenly [...] the hottest news story in Latin America. From the beginning the U.S. press saw the democratically elected government as an ominous threat to democracy. ABC's Howard K. Smith observed that the new "Marxist" government had "outright Communist internal policies". Both the New York Times and Washington Post pondered whether Chile's "free institutions" could survive what the Times termed a "sharp turn to the left". And a Los Angeles Times editorial claimed to discern "totalitarian inclinations" in Chile?; what was Allende doing to deserve such a bad press? He was moving toward an egalitarian socialized society, having begun by nationalizing the copper mines owned by the U.S. multinational corporations. And, under a statute passed in 1967 by a conservative Chilean Congress but left largely unimplemented, his government was taking unused land from big estates and distributing it to landless peasants through a variety of government programs, agricultural production showed a dramatic upsurge, the inflation rate dropped by half, construction was 9 percent and unemployment down to less than 5 percent, the lowest in a decade. Beef and bread consumption increased by 15 percent in the 1971-1972 period. A government program sought to provide every Chilean child with a half-liter of milk daily. During Allende's first year, the economy enjoyed a 8.5 percent growth in GNP, the second highest in Latin America. Generally, Allende pursued policies that threatened the prerogatives of the rich, cut into profits while increasing wages, and brought a modest redistribution of goods and services in favor of the poorer strata. These were the nefarious "totalitarian inclinations" of the popular unity government." 3

Continuing further, "The democratic government was overthrown in September 1973, in a violent coup led by right-wing generals who abolished the constitution, suppressed all political parties, closed all newspapers except two right-wing dailies,



outlawed all independent trade unions, and arrested, tortured, and executed thousands of prisoners." 4

If I had a vast empire, anything that threatens my ruling I'm pretty sure I'll do any and all things to keep it going. People that cannot adapt to a maladapted, maladjusted society are labeled all kinds of things. Most "radicals" are deemed to have "mental" problems of some sort. Yet, how fucked up does your mentality have to be when you bomb civilians? How fucked up must you be in the head when you put sanctions and embargos on a country that needs supplies but can't get them therefore causing death and suffering? What backwards injustice system criminalizes people who use "drugs", yet big companies manufacture hazardous pills to "eliminate" illness?

It doesn't take much to realize that if you dare to fight for what's right, true and freedom you can expect to be labeled and vilified in some way. How "radical" were the black panthers? Somehow they became the biggest threat to the U.S. If wanting to end suffering is deemed radical, then call me a radical. If wanting to save the planet is radical then call me a radical. If wanting to save human lives is radical, then call me a radical. If I have come to prison, tortured, gained knowledge to combat falsehoods and wish to change the world means I've become radicalized, then by the very atoms that hold me together I've become radicalized.

## NOTES

① Inventing reality - The politics of the mass media. St. Martin's Press. NY (1966) Pg. 173

② Ibid. Pg. 176-177

③ Ibid. Pg. 177-178

④ Ibid. Pg. 178