

Among Ourselves

Pacem in Terris

Restoring Human Dignity

Respecting Human Rights

Our Reality Today – Global Disorder and Religious Divide

The global media, thanks to information technology, played an extraordinary role as moulders of public opinion in the wake of the September 11 attacks in New York and Washington, the US invasion of Afghanistan and the recent Anglo-American Gulf War II. The satellite dish and the satellite phone have brought a new dimension to global geo-politics. The first three years of this new millennium and the first three months of the year 2003 have brought to the fore distorted and divergent world-views. This daily fare, depending on which side of the global and mental divide you inhabit, is manufactured to paint a certain picture. This is in order to win more adherents to justify war and on the one hand the only response to war and state violence is organised terrorism and counter-violence.

This seems to be the only way to both peace and security. What is obvious is the emergence of a new deep ‘Embedded Divide’ not just within nations but also among nations and more frighteningly among religions.

It is interesting to note that on one side of the Divide, we witnessed LIVE, Destruction of Life - the devastating atrocities of Terrorists using 757s to bring down supposed symbols of freedom and democracy. A whole nation and the whole world consoled the cries of anguish of families who had become the victim of organised terrorism. We are being reminded constantly of the horrifying acts of terrorism and the accompanying violence with suicide bombers blasting to bits innocent youth and children. People are told that this sort of terrorism can only be stopped by hunting down organised terrorists and destroying their recruits and networks. We are told that this is inevitable for the sake of long-term peace and security in the world. The people were being convinced that pre-emptive attacks were a necessary evil, without which liberation of people under dictatorships will never be possible in order for them to now live as free people in a democratic world. This was the only way to remove Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) that are a real threat to a world in search of a New World Order.

On the other side of the Divide, we also witnessed LIVE, the scenes and images of Death, of bloody wars using Smart Bombs and Uranium Depleted Missiles to flush out aides and the army of dictators and thus blatantly killing innocent women and children. This made excellent fodder to stir up pent up anger and new terrorists were born instantly, with the touch of the TV remote, surfing to catch the latest on the hate night news. What was being

CONTENTS

PACEM IN TERRIS: A Permanent Commitment	2
The Temptations In Our Desert	6
Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy, Buy One Get One Free	9
US Foreign And Defence Policies, Political And Economic Trends	16
Ushering Democracy Into Iraq - Nonviolently	22
Orientation Concept of IYCS Asia	27

con't on page 21 >

**MESSAGE OF HIS HOLINESS
POPE JOHN PAUL II
FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE WORLD DAY OF PEACE**

1 JANUARY 2003

PACEM IN TERRIS: A PERMANENT COMMITMENT

1. Almost forty years ago, on Holy Thursday, 11 April 1963, Pope John XXIII published his epic Encyclical Letter *Pacem in Terris*. Addressing himself to “all men of good will”, my venerable predecessor, who would die just two months later, summed up his message of “peace on earth” in the first sentence of the Encyclical: “Peace on earth, which all men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established and sustained only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed” (*Introduction: AAS*, 55 [1963], 257).

Speaking peace to a divided world

2. The world to which John XXIII wrote was then in a profound state of disorder. The twentieth century had begun with great expectations for progress. Yet within sixty years, that same century had produced two World Wars, devastating totalitarian systems, untold human suffering, and the greatest persecution of the Church in history.

Only two years before *Pacem in Terris*, in 1961, the Berlin Wall had been erected in order to divide and set against each other not only two parts of that City but two ways of understanding and building the earthly city. On one side and the other of the Wall, life was to follow different patterns, dictated by antithetical rules, in a climate of mutual suspicion and mistrust. Both as a world-view and in real life, that Wall traversed the whole of humanity and penetrated people’s hearts and minds, creating divisions that seemed destined to last indefinitely.

Moreover, just six months before the Encyclical, and just as the Second Vatican Council was opening in Rome, the world had come to the brink of a nuclear war during the Cuban Missile Crisis. The road to a world of peace, justice and freedom seemed blocked. Humanity, many believed, was condemned to live indefinitely in that precarious condition of “cold war”, hoping against hope that neither an act of aggression nor an accident would trigger the worst war in human history. Available atomic arsenals meant that such a war would have imperiled the very future of the human race.

The four pillars of peace

3. Pope John XXIII did not agree with those who

claimed that peace was impossible. With his Encyclical, *peace* – in all its demanding truth – came knocking on both sides of the Wall and of all the other dividing walls. The Encyclical spoke to everyone of their belonging to the one human family, and shone a light on the shared aspiration of people everywhere to live in security, justice and hope for the future.

With the profound intuition that characterized him, John XXIII identified the essential conditions for peace in four precise requirements of the human spirit: *truth, justice, love and freedom* (cf. *ibid.*, I: *l.c.*, 265-266). *Truth* will build peace if every individual sincerely acknowledges not only his rights, but also his own duties towards others. *Justice* will build peace if in practice everyone respects the rights of others and actually fulfils his duties towards them. *Love* will build peace if people feel the needs of others as their own and share what they have with others, especially the values of mind and spirit which they possess. *Freedom* will build peace and make it thrive if, in the choice of the means to that end, people act according to reason and assume responsibility for their own actions.

Looking at the present and into the future with the eyes of faith and reason, Blessed John XXIII discerned deeper historical currents at work. Things were not always what they seemed on the surface. Despite wars and rumours of wars, something more was at work in human affairs, something that to the Pope looked like the promising beginning of a spiritual revolution.

A new awareness of human dignity and inalienable human rights

4. Humanity, John XXIII wrote, had entered a new stage of its journey (cf. *ibid.*, I: *l.c.*, 267-269). The end of colonialism and the rise of newly independent States, the protection of workers’ rights, the new and welcome presence of women in public life, all testified to the fact that the human race was indeed entering a new phase of its history, one characterized by “*the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity*” (*ibid.*, I: *l.c.*, 268). The Pope knew that that dignity was still being trampled upon in many parts of the world. Yet he was convinced that, despite the dramatic situation, the world

was becoming increasingly *conscious of certain spiritual values*, and increasingly open to the meaning of those *pillars of peace* – truth, justice, love, and freedom (cf. *ibid.*, I: *l.c.*, 268-269). Seeking to bring these values into local, national and international life, men and women were becoming more aware that their relationship with God, the source of all good, must be the solid foundation and supreme criterion of their lives, as individuals and in society (cf. *ibid.*). This evolving spiritual intuition would, the Pope was convinced, have profound public and political consequences.

Seeing the growth of awareness of human rights that was then emerging within nations and at the international level, Pope John XXIII caught the potential of this phenomenon and understood its singular power to change history. What was later to happen in central and eastern Europe would confirm his insight. The road to peace, he taught in the Encyclical, lay in the defence and promotion of basic human rights, which every human being enjoys, not as a benefit given by a different social class or conceded by the State but simply because of our humanity: “Any human society, if it is to be well-ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle, namely, that every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. Indeed, precisely because he is a person he has rights and obligations, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature. And as these rights and obligations are universal and inviolable so they cannot in any way be surrendered” (*ibid.*, 259).

As history would soon show, this was not simply an abstract idea; it was an idea with profound consequences. Inspired by the conviction that every human being is equal in dignity, and that society therefore had to adapt its form to that conviction, *human rights movements* soon arose and gave concrete political expression to one of the great dynamics of contemporary history: the quest for freedom as an indispensable component of work for peace. Emerging in virtually every part of the world, these movements were instrumental in replacing dictatorial forms of government with more democratic and participatory ones. They demonstrated in practice that peace and progress could only be achieved by respecting *the universal moral law written on the human heart* (cf. John Paul II, *Address to the United Nations General Assembly*, 5 October 1995, No. 3).

The universal common good

5. On another point too *Pacem in Terris* showed itself prophetic, as it looked to the next phase of the evolution of world politics. Because the world was becoming increasingly interdependent and global, the common good of humanity had to be worked out on the international plane. It was proper, Pope John XXIII taught,

to speak of a “*universal common good*” (*Pacem in Terris*, IV: *l.c.*, 292). One of the consequences of this evolution was the obvious need for a *public authority, on the international level*, with effective capacity to advance the universal common good; an authority which could not, the Pope immediately continued, be established by coercion but only by the consent of nations. Such a body would have to have as its fundamental objective the “recognition, respect, safeguarding, and promotion of the rights of the human person” (*ibid.*, IV: *l.c.*, 294).

Not surprisingly therefore John XXIII looked with hope and expectation to the United Nations Organization, which had come into being on June 26, 1945. He saw that Organization as a credible instrument for maintaining and strengthening world peace, and he expressed particular appreciation of its 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which he considered “an approximation towards the establishment of a juridical and political organization of the world community” (*ibid.*, IV: *l.c.*, 295). What he was saying in fact was that the *Declaration* set out the moral foundations on which the evolution of a world characterized by order rather than disorder, and by dialogue rather than force, could proceed. He was suggesting that the vigorous defence of human rights by the United Nations Organization is the indispensable foundation for the development of that Organization’s capacity to promote and defend international security.

Not only is it clear that Pope John XXIII’s vision of an effective international public authority at the service of human rights, freedom and peace has not yet been entirely achieved, but there is still in fact much hesitation in the international community about the obligation to respect and implement human rights. This duty touches *all* fundamental rights, excluding that arbitrary picking and choosing which can lead to rationalizing forms of discrimination and injustice. Likewise, we are witnessing the emergence of an alarming gap between a series of new “rights” being promoted in advanced societies – the result of new prosperity and new technologies – and other more basic human rights still not being met, especially in situations of underdevelopment. I am thinking here for example about the right to food and drinkable water, to housing and security, to self-determination and independence – which are still far from being guaranteed and realized. *Peace demands that this tension be speedily reduced and in time eliminated.*

Another observation needs to be made: the international community, which since 1948 has possessed a charter of the inalienable rights of the human person, has generally failed to *insist sufficiently on corresponding duties*. It is *duty* that establishes the limits within which *rights* must be contained in order not to become an exercise in arbitrariness. A greater awareness of *universal human duties* would greatly benefit the cause of peace, setting it on the moral basis of a shared recognition of *an order in*

things which is not dependent on the will of any individual or group.

A new international moral order

6. Nevertheless it remains true that, despite many difficulties and setbacks, *significant progress has been made* over the past forty years towards the implementation of Pope John's noble vision. The fact that States throughout the world feel obliged to honour the idea of human rights shows how powerful are the tools of moral conviction and spiritual integrity, which proved so decisive in the revolution of conscience that made possible the 1989 non-violent revolution that displaced European communism. And although distorted notions of freedom as licence continue to threaten democracy and free societies, it is surely significant that, in the forty years since *Pacem in Terris*, much of the world has become more free, structures of dialogue and cooperation between nations have been strengthened, and the threat of a global nuclear war, which weighed so heavily on Pope John XXIII, has been effectively contained.

Boldly, but with all humility, I would like to suggest that the Church's fifteen-hundred-year-old teaching on peace as "*tranquillitas ordinis* – the tranquillity of order" as Saint Augustine called it (*De Civitate Dei*, 19, 13), which was brought to a new level of development forty years ago by *Pacem in Terris*, has a deep relevance for the world today, for the leaders of nations as well as for individuals. That there is serious disorder in world affairs is obvious. Thus the question to be faced remains: *What kind of order can replace this disorder*, so that men and women can live in freedom, justice, and security? And since the world, amid its disorder, continues nevertheless to be "ordered" and organized in various ways – economic, cultural, even political – there arises another equally urgent question: On what principles are these new forms of world order unfolding?

These far-reaching questions suggest that the problem of order in world affairs, which is the problem of peace rightly understood, cannot be separated from issues of moral principle. This is another way of saying that the question of peace cannot be separated from the question of human dignity and human rights. That is one of the enduring truths taught by *Pacem in Terris*, which we would do well to remember and reflect upon on this fortieth anniversary.

Is this not the time for all to *work together for a new constitutional organization of the human family*, truly capable of ensuring peace and harmony between peoples, as well as their integral development? But let there be no misunderstanding. This does not mean writing the constitution of a global super-State. Rather, it means continuing and deepening processes already in place to meet the almost universal *demand for participatory ways of exercising political authority, even international political authority, and for transparency and accountability at every level of public life*. With his confidence in the goodness he believed could be found in every human person, Pope John XXIII called the entire world to a nobler vision of public life

and public authority, even as he boldly challenged the world to think beyond its present state of disorder to new forms of international order commensurate with human dignity.

The bond between peace and truth

7. Against those who think of politics as a realm of necessity detached from morality and subject only to partisan interests, Pope John XXIII, in *Pacem in Terris*, outlined a truer picture of human reality and indicated the path to a better future for all. Precisely because human beings are created with the capacity for moral choice, *no human activity takes place outside the sphere of moral judgment*. Politics is a human activity; therefore, it too is subject to a distinctive form of moral scrutiny. This is also true of international politics. As the Pope wrote: "The same natural law that governs the life and conduct of individuals must also regulate the relations of political communities with one another" (*Pacem in Terris*, III: *l.c.*, 279). Those who imagine that international public life takes place somewhere outside the realm of moral judgment need only reflect on the impact of *human rights movements* on the national and international politics of the twentieth century just concluded. These developments, anticipated by the teaching of the Encyclical, decisively refute the claim that international politics must of necessity be a "free zone" in which the moral law holds no sway.

Perhaps nowhere today is there a more obvious need for the correct use of political authority than in *the dramatic situation of the Middle East and the Holy Land*. Day after day, year after year, the cumulative effect of bitter mutual rejection and an unending chain of violence and retaliation have shattered every effort so far to engage in serious dialogue on the real issues involved. The volatility of the situation is compounded by the clash of interests among the members of the international community. Until those in positions of responsibility undergo a veritable revolution in the way they use their power and go about securing their peoples' welfare, it is difficult to imagine how progress towards peace can be made. The fratricidal struggle that daily convulses the Holy Land and brings into conflict the forces shaping the immediate future of the Middle East shows clearly the need for men and women who, out of conviction, will implement policies firmly based on the principle of respect for human dignity and human rights. Such policies are incomparably more advantageous to everyone than the continuation of conflict. A start can be made on the basis of this truth, which is certainly more liberating than propaganda, especially when that propaganda serves to conceal inadmissible intentions.

The premises of a lasting peace

8. There is an unbreakable bond between *the work of peace* and *respect for truth*. Honesty in the supply of information, equity in legal systems, openness in democratic procedures give citizens a sense of security, a readiness to settle controversies by peaceful means, and a

desire for genuine and constructive dialogue, all of which constitute *the true premises of a lasting peace*. Political summits on the regional and international levels serve the cause of peace only if joint commitments are then honoured by each party. Otherwise these meetings risk becoming irrelevant and useless, with the result that people believe less and less in dialogue and trust more in the use of force as a way of resolving issues. The negative repercussions on peace resulting from commitments made and then not honoured must be carefully assessed by State and government leaders.

Pacta sunt servanda, says the ancient maxim. If at all times commitments ought to be kept, *promises made to the poor* should be considered particularly binding. Especially frustrating for them is any breach of faith regarding promises which they see as vital to their well-being. In this respect, the failure to keep commitments in the sphere of aid to developing nations is a serious moral question and further highlights the injustice of the imbalances existing in the world. *The suffering caused by poverty is compounded by the loss of trust*. The end result is hopelessness. The existence of trust in international relations is *a social capital of fundamental value*.

A culture of peace

9. In the end, peace is not essentially about *structures* but about *people*. Certain structures and mechanisms of peace – juridical, political, economic – are of course necessary and do exist, but they have been derived from nothing other than the accumulated wisdom and experience of *innumerable gestures of peace* made by men and women throughout history who have kept hope and have not given in to discouragement. *Gestures of peace* spring from the lives of people who *foster peace first of all in their own hearts*. They are the work of the heart and of reason in those who are peacemakers (cf. *Mt 5:9*). *Gestures of peace* are possible when people *appreciate fully the community dimension of their lives*, so that they grasp the meaning and consequences of events in their own communities and in the world. *Gestures of peace* create a tradition and a culture of peace.

Religion has a vital role in fostering gestures of peace and in consolidating conditions for peace. It exercises this role all the more effectively if it concentrates on what is proper to it: attention to God, the fostering of universal brotherhood and the spreading of a culture of human solidarity. The *Day of Prayer for Peace* which I promoted in Assisi on 24 January 2002, involving representatives of many religions, had this purpose. It expressed a desire to nurture peace by spreading a spirituality and a culture of peace.

The legacy of *Pacem in Terris*

10. Blessed Pope John XXIII was a man unafraid of the future. He was sustained in his optimism by his deep trust in God and in man, both of which grew out of the sturdy climate of faith in which he had grown up. Moved by his trust in Providence, even in what seemed like a permanent situation of conflict, he did not hesitate to summon the leaders of his time to a new vision of the world. This is the legacy that he left us. On this World Day of Peace 2003, let us all resolve to have his same outlook: trust in the merciful and compassionate God who calls us to brotherhood, and confidence in the men and women of our time because, like those of every other time, they bear the image of God in their souls. It is on this basis that we can hope to build a world of peace on earth.

At the beginning of a new year in our human history, this is the hope that rises spontaneously from the depths of my heart: that in the spirit of every individual there may be a renewed dedication to the noble mission which *Pacem in Terris* proposed forty years ago to all men and women of good will. The task, which the Encyclical called “immense”, is that “of establishing new relationships in human society, under the sway and guidance of truth, justice, love, and freedom”. Pope John indicated that he was referring to “relations between individual citizens, between citizens and their respective States, between States, and finally between individuals, families, intermediate associations and States on the one hand, and the world community on the other”. He concluded by saying that “to bring about true peace in accordance with divinely established order” was a “most noble task” (*Pacem in Terris*, V: *l.c.*, 301-302).

The fortieth anniversary of *Pacem in Terris* is an apt occasion to return to Pope John XXIII’s prophetic teaching. Catholic communities will know how to celebrate this anniversary during the year with initiatives which, I hope, will have an ecumenical and interreligious character and be open to all those who have a heartfelt desire “to break through the barriers which divide them, to strengthen the bonds of mutual love, to learn to understand one another and to pardon those who have done them wrong” (*l.c.*, 304).

I accompany this hope with a prayer to Almighty God, the source of all our good. May he who calls us from oppression and conflict to freedom and cooperation for the good of all help people everywhere to build a world of peace ever more solidly established on the four pillars indicated by Blessed Pope John XXIII in his historic Encyclical: *truth, justice, love, freedom*.

From the Vatican, 8 December 2002

JOHN PAUL II

THE TEMPTATIONS IN OUR DESERT

John D. Whitney, SJ

Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil.

He fasted for forty days and forty nights, and afterwards he was hungry. The tempter approached and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, command that these stones become loaves of bread."

He said in reply, "It is written: 'One does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes forth from the mouth of God.'" Then the devil took him to the holy city, and made him stand on the parapet of the temple, and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down. For it is written: 'He will command his angels concerning you and 'with their hands they will support you, lest you dash your foot against a stone.'"

Jesus answered him, "Again it is written, 'You shall not put the Lord, your God, to the test.'" Then the devil took him up to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in their magnificence, and he said to him, "All these I shall give to you, if you will prostrate yourself and worship me."

At this, Jesus said to him, "Get away, Satan! It is written: 'The Lord, your God, shall you worship and him alone shall you serve.'" Then the devil left him and, behold, angels came and ministered to him. (Matthew 4:1-11)

On September 11, 2001, the United States was led by the Spirit of God into a hard and barren desert—a place of suffering and loss, a place of sorrow and destruction. Like Jesus crossing the Jordan, we were driven from our Promised Land into a time of uncertainty and fear, when all that we thought we had and were has been called into question. The one great superpower, we had long felt protected from the scourge of terrorism and violence that had struck in Europe and in Africa, on the subcontinent of Asia and in the streets of Rome. Certainly, there had been incidents of violence and even terror in the United States—the first World Trade Center bombing, when a car has exploded in the basement of one of the towers, or the horror of Oklahoma City. But the first was largely a failure and the other—horrible though it was—was a matter of home-grown terror, relatively "easily" dealt with by the capture and subsequent execution of Timothy McVeigh.

But September 11 was different. It was not home-grown, but an insidious and startling attack from foreign nationals who had lived and worked right here among us, some for many years. It was an attack led by Saudi Arabians—citizens of that country we had long believed to be one of our "friends in the region." It was an attack whose aim was to kill as many civilians as possible and to drive into the heart of this nation a palpable sense of fear and uncertainty. Coordinating many planes from different airports, the violence of September 11 was an attack both deeply human and highly symbolic—striking at the towers which rose above the skyline of economic New York and at the building which had become synonymous with the military might of the United States.

*An Address to the Gonzaga University Community
13 February 2003*

And as we watched—over and over again—that second plane crashing into the tower, and the towers falling, one after another, into the streets of Manhattan; as we saw our fellow citizens running from the great cloud of pulverized concrete, and saw the plume of smoke rising from the wall of the Pentagon; as we heard the skies fall silent for many days, except for the roar of F-14's circling on patrol; suddenly we were changed. All our foolishness—for at least a moment—seemed to fall away, and we listened to each other and cared for each other. We wept on the street with strangers—who were no longer strangers, but fellow pilgrims, companions in pain and loss. In the desert at Ground Zero, we found a holy place—a place that chastened our spirit and focused us on the most fundamental questions of identity and mission.

Who are we, that such a thing could happen to us? Where is our safety; our security; our strength; our hope? With all the certainties upon which we had depended seemingly stripped away, we hungered for answers; we hungered to feel safe again; we hungered to understand. We longed to know why they hate us and wish to destroy us.

Like Christ in those forty days and nights, our time in this very different desert has tested us and changed us. Though some still struggle to lose themselves in the rapid mindlessness of reality television—to numb themselves with Joe Millionaire or deaden their brain stem with The Bachelor—yet, none of us rises out of bed each morning with quite the same sense as we did on September 10, 2001. We live, still in the desert, and stand like Christ hungry and waiting, unsure what next to do.

And then the tempter comes. He comes with the same temptations, though matched to meet our hunger, shaped to meet our fears. And if we are not invited to change stones into bread, we are still tempted to the easy fix, the facile proof, tempted to seek whatever will allow us to return to that place before the desert, before the change—tempted to trade our national soul for the relief of our physical pain and anxiety: If you are the most powerful nation on earth, make yourself secure. With these words, the tempter invites us to set aside due process and the principles of human rights. Persons—even citizens of the United States—are imprisoned without counsel, sometimes without charge.

Secret courts are established, and processes put in place that are unreviewable by any judicial body or by any public group. In the cages of Guantanamo Bay and jail cells of Virginia, we find ourselves embracing this temptation, proving our power by selling our soul. We ignore the warning words Benjamin Franklin, spoken at the birth of our Republic:

“Those who would trade liberty for security will find neither,” and in our hunger for safety, we step closer and closer to the national security state. This is not the bread that gives us life. These are not the policies that can make our world secure.

However, I am not here tonight to speak about the decline of our civil rights or the fear that leads us to their surrender, but to speak about our possible war with Iraq. And though I believe these issues to be intimately related-to be, in fact, two expressions of the same dark spirit, two parts of the same great temptation for security at any cost-I wish tonight to look primarily at the conflagration that threatens to break upon us in these very days if we do not stand up, if we do not speak out, if we do not act now as women and men of faith, dedicated to the true spirit of peace.

Today we stand like Jesus on the parapet of the temple, and are tempted to throw ourselves down as proof of our moral resolve and our national will; as proof that we are God’s chosen people, the one essential nation, whose interests are, by definition, synonymous with the good of all humanity. We stand, like Jesus on the mountaintop, surveying all the kingdoms of the world, and we are tempted to see, in the very power we possess, a justification-indeed, a moral imperative-to control the destiny of weaker nations and fit them, willingly or not, into our national designs.

In this egoistic nationalism, this false patriotism, we are tempted to worship a politics of power, and so abandon the commitment to law and justice that has been the living grace of God among us. We are tempted to honor a false spirit, for whom power itself is justice; rather than the true God, for whom saving justice alone is the source of power.

The waging of this war is not a test of our national strength-no one doubts that the United States can on its own (let alone with the allies it will muster) defeat Iraq in any kind of military conflict. No, this war, at this time, is not a test but a temptation. A temptation to set aside the principles of justice in an act of pure power; to set aside the principles of national sovereignty in an act of aggressive force; to set aside the principles of international cooperation and law in an act of unilateralism that could have disastrous and unforeseen repercussions not only for those who actively participate in the war, but for men and women throughout the world and for years to come. While a nation may rightfully defend itself against a military power clearly poised to attack it, this so-called preemptive war against a nation that poses no imminent threat to the United States or to any other country is an attack; an attack not only on Iraq, but on the very principles of justice and morality which underpin the Christian ethic of life.

This is why the bishops of the United States and bishops’ conferences throughout the world have called for restraint and discernment. It is why the Jesuit Provincials of the United States have spoken out against military action at this time, and why the members of the Oregon Province of the Jesuits have specifically condemned the idea of a preemptive war. The call of justice and his commitment to a consistent ethic of life is why the Holy Father has declared that the Christian response must be, “No to War!” going on to tell the Vatican

Diplomatic Corps this: What are we to say of the threat of a war which could strike the people of Iraq, the land of the Prophets, a people already sorely tried by more than twelve years of embargo? War is never just another means that one can choose to employ for settling differences between nations. As the Charter of the United Nations Organization and international law itself reminds us, war cannot be decided upon, even when it is a matter of ensuring the common good, except as the last option and in accordance with very strict conditions, without ignoring the consequences for the civilian population both during and after the military operations.

What the Pope and the bishops have articulated is not a position of pure pacifism-not an unqualified denial of the use of force in some cases-but a position built on the principles of just war theory; principles that go back as far as St. Augustine and form the essence not only of Christian ethics about war, but of most international law and convention. In the just war tradition, war is recognized as an inherent evil-as something destructive of life, corruptive of morals, unpredictable in effect-but it is not seen as the greatest or only evil. Hence, while it is always to be avoided, it may at times be necessary to prevent some greater evil-some greater and more imminent threat to human life and dignity. Nevertheless, as the Holy Father notes in his comments to the diplomatic corps, any war, to be justified, must be the last available option and must be waged only after certain definite conditions have been satisfied. In the case of Iraq, these conditions have not been satisfied; and indeed, in a desire to satisfy them some proponents of this war have twisted the meaning of justification in a way both inconsistent with truth and contrary to the just war tradition.

Theorists such as George Weigel rationalize their predisposition for war by demonizing the Iraqi government, effectively asserting that its mere existence justifies war. But when we stand-as the bishops have stood, as the Holy Father stands-with eyes open and hearts desirous of peace, we can see that the conditions for justification have not been met, and that this threatened war is a temptation to injustice, a surrender to fear.

The first condition of a just war is that it be waged in a just cause. There is no doubt that the current Iraqi regime is tyrannical and murderous. The prisons of this country-and many unmarked graves-are filled with political opponents of Saddam Hussein. Further, he has been no friend of the United States-at least not recently.* He has seemingly both attempted to develop nuclear weapons and sought to purchase them, though it also seems clear that he does not possess such weapons now nor is he likely to possess them in the near future. He may have some other weapons of mass destruction, most likely a supply of chemical weapons, or at least has had these weapons in the past. Finally, in dealing with the United Nations arms inspectors, he has been at times deceptive and uncooperative.

But is the possession or attempted possession of these weapons enough to justify war? Is his failure to cooperate with the United Nations? As the Catechism of the Catholic Church notes, just cause requires that “the damage inflicted

by the aggressor on the nation or community of nations is lasting, grave, and certain” . In listening, even to the latest testimony from Secretary of State Powell, one is struck by the repetition of the term “could,” e.g., “Iraq could be developing nuclear weapons. ..This plant could be used for the development of chemical weapons. ...etc.” Such speculation, while certainly enough to justify-indeed, to make morally necessary-continuing diplomatic pressure, an ongoing inspection regime, and strong sanctions on potentially dangerous material, does not offer the certainty required for going to war. Rather, to justify war on the basis of such speculation, without any clear evidence of an imminent threat, leads to a position in which the potential for aggression-at some future date-may be treated the same as actual aggression. In other words, because a nation could potentially become an aggressor, it may be attacked as though it were an aggressor. This is the road to constant war.

Likewise, in the area of legitimate authority-the second condition for a just war-the question remains far from certain that the United States is-on its own-a legitimate authority for this war. We have not been attacked by Iraq, nor are we in grave and certain danger of such an attack (especially so long as the inspectors remain in that country). Attempts to link Iraq to the attacks of September 11 remain both highly speculative and circumstantial. What, then, makes us, and not the United Nations Security Council under whose auspices the earlier Iraqi war was fought, the legitimate authority? Can it be, as some argue, that our power itself gives us authority-that the very fact of our strength makes us morally bound to go and destroy whatever government we judge to be destructive?

Such a position seems to be held by some in the government, such as Paul Wolfowitz, who hold that regime change itself legitimizes a war. But in the Christian tradition, such a position remains both illegitimate and immoral-a temptation to the “White Man’s Burden” mentality of the last century, when colonial powers ruled the peoples of the developing world “for their own good.” Such paternalism-stemming, perhaps, from the virtues perceived in our culture, but built on nothing but our power-denies the most basic aspects of human dignity and the inalienable right of all persons to self-determination.

Finally, in the Christian tradition, war can only be justified if it has a probability of success and a proportionality of effect. In other words, the war must not “produce evils and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated” (#2309). While such a position requires a high degree of speculation, can we reasonably expect that the world will be safer, terrorism less likely, the suffering of the innocent decreased by this war? Will it not tend to radicalize the Middle East, as Western military power destroys an Arab leader-regardless of the unpopularity of that leader among his neighbors and people? Will the Iraqi people, whom we have starved with embargo for twelve years and whom we have bombed consistently over that time, not hate us even more than they now hate Saddam? Has any nation ever loved an occupying power, with which it shared little common culture, more than its own leader-even if the leader was a tyrant? If we put

ourselves in the place of the Iraqi people, how would we react to the destruction of our sovereignty, the occupation of our land, the death of our fellow citizens in a war waged to protect our homeland? Considering all this, it seems far from clear that the world will be safer through war than it might be through ongoing inspection.

There is no lack of patriotism in opposing this war-for the love of country must always begin with the love of justice. There is no knee-jerk liberalism or partisan politics-indeed, both parties seem to be doing all they can to line up for war in every way that doesn’t actually require them being in harm’s way. Rather, my opposition to this war-as a Catholic, as an American, as a priest, as a person of reason and faith-emerges from my belief that our greatest strength is not our military might or our technological expertise, but our character as a people capable of justice, of hope, and of the kind of courage needed to refrain from war and violence. I stand against this war because that character is in danger of being squandered.

I began this talk with a reading from Matthew of Jesus’ temptation in the desert, and that is the image with which I would like to end. The tempter we face is not President Bush or Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld-men who may be trying to do good, even if they are wrong in this matter. To demonize them denies the possibility of a rational and faithful solution to this issue, and blinds us, even as the demonizing of Iraq may blind them. No. The tempter we face is our own fear, that dark spirit who would rob us of our hope and of our trust in God; who would call us, instead, to worship the vain idols of metal and machinery, of fire and death. My prayer is that we will forego this temptation and turn not to passivity or victimhood, but to faithful action as citizens and as believers. We must speak and act against this war, along with the leadership of our Church, and we must put our faith where it belongs, not in princes but in the Prince of peace. In the words of the psalmist: Come and see the works of the LORD, who has done fearsome deeds on earth; Who stops wars to the ends of the earth, breaks the bow, splinters the spear, and burns the shields with fire; Who says: “Be still and confess that I am God! I am exalted among the nations, exalted on the earth.” The LORD of hosts is with us; our stronghold is the God of Jacob.

Amen!

"Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy, Buy One Get One Free"

Arundhati Roy

In these times, when we have to race to keep abreast of the speed at which our freedoms are being snatched from us, and when few can afford the luxury of retreating from the streets for a while in order to return with an exquisite, fully formed political thesis replete with footnotes and references, what profound gift can I offer you tonight?

As we lurch from crisis to crisis, beamed directly into our brains by satellite TV, we have to think on our feet. On the move. We enter histories through the rubble of war. Ruined cities, parched fields, shrinking forests, and dying rivers are our archives. Craters left by daisy cutters, our libraries.

So what can I offer you tonight? Some uncomfortable thoughts about money, war, empire, racism, and democracy. Some worries that flit around my brain like a family of persistent moths that keep me awake at night.

Some of you will think it bad manners for a person like me, officially entered in the Big Book of Modern Nations as an "Indian citizen," to come here and criticize the U.S. government. Speaking for myself, I'm no flag-waver, no patriot, and am fully aware that venality, brutality, and hypocrisy are imprinted on the leaden soul of every state. But when a country ceases to be merely a country and becomes an empire, then the scale of operations changes dramatically. So may I clarify that tonight I speak as a subject of the American Empire? I speak as a slave who presumes to criticize her king.

Since lectures must be called something, mine is called: Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy (Buy One, Get One Free).

Transcript:

Way back in 1988, on the 3rd of July, the U.S.S. Vincennes, a missile cruiser stationed in the Persian Gulf, accidentally shot down an Iranian airliner and killed 290 civilian passengers. George Bush the First, who was at the time on his presidential campaign, was asked to comment on the incident. He said quite subtly, "I will never apologize for the United States. I don't care what the facts are."

I don't care what the facts are. What a perfect maxim for the New American Empire. Perhaps a slight variation on the theme would be more apposite: *The facts can be whatever we want them to be.*

When the United States invaded Iraq, a New York Times/CBS News survey estimated that 42 percent of the American public believed that Saddam Hussein was directly responsible for the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. And an ABC News poll said that 55 percent of Americans believed that Saddam Hussein directly supported Al Qaida. None of this opinion is based on evidence (because there isn't any). All of it is based on insinuation, auto-suggestion, and outright lies circulated by the U.S. corporate media, otherwise known as the "Free Press," that

hollow pillar on which contemporary American democracy rests.

Public support in the U.S. for the war against Iraq was founded on a multi-tiered edifice of falsehood and deceit, coordinated by the U.S. government and faithfully amplified by the corporate media.

Apart from the invented links between Iraq and Al Qaida, we had the manufactured frenzy about Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction. George Bush the Lesser went to the extent of saying it would be "suicidal" for the U.S. not to attack Iraq. We once again witnessed the paranoia that a starved, bombed, besieged country was about to annihilate almighty America. (Iraq was only the latest in a succession of countries - earlier there was Cuba, Nicaragua, Libya, Grenada, and Panama.) But this time it wasn't just your ordinary brand of friendly neighborhood frenzy. It was Frenzy with a Purpose. It ushered in an old doctrine in a new bottle: the Doctrine of Pre-emptive Strike, *a.k.a.* The United States Can Do Whatever The Hell It Wants, And That's Official.

The war against Iraq has been fought and won and no Weapons of Mass Destruction have been found. Not even a little one. Perhaps they'll have to be planted before they're discovered. And then, the more troublesome amongst us will need an explanation for why Saddam Hussein didn't use them when his country was being invaded.

Of course, there'll be no answers. True Believers will make do with those fuzzy TV reports about the discovery of a few barrels of banned chemicals in an old shed. There seems to be no consensus yet about whether they're really chemicals, whether they're actually banned and whether the vessels they're contained in can technically be called barrels. (There were unconfirmed rumours that a teaspoonful of potassium permanganate and an old harmonica were found there too.)

Meanwhile, in passing, an ancient civilization has been casually decimated by a very recent, casually brutal nation.

Then there are those who say, so what if Iraq had no chemical and nuclear weapons? So what if there is no Al Qaida connection? So what if Osama bin Laden hates Saddam Hussein as much as he hates the United States? Bush the Lesser has said Saddam Hussein was a "Homicidal Dictator." And so, the reasoning goes, Iraq needed a "regime change."

Never mind that forty years ago, the CIA, under President John F. Kennedy, orchestrated a regime change in Baghdad. In 1963, after a successful coup, the Ba'ath party came to power in Iraq. Using lists provided by the CIA, the new Ba'ath regime systematically eliminated hundreds of doctors, teachers, lawyers, and political figures known to be leftists. An entire intellectual community was slaughtered. (The same technique was used to massacre hundreds of thousands of people in Indonesia and East Timor.) The young Saddam

Hussein was said to have had a hand in supervising the bloodbath. In 1979, after factional infighting within the Ba'ath Party, Saddam Hussein became the President of Iraq. In April 1980, while he was massacring Shias, the U.S. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski declared, "We see no fundamental incompatibility of interests between the United States and Iraq." Washington and London overtly and covertly supported Saddam Hussein. They financed him, equipped him, armed him, and provided him with dual-use materials to manufacture weapons of mass destruction. They supported his worst excesses financially, materially, and morally. They supported the eight-year war against Iran and the 1988 gassing of Kurdish people in Halabja, crimes which 14 years later were re-heated and served up as reasons to justify invading Iraq. After the first Gulf War, the "Allies" fomented an uprising of Shias in Basra and then looked away while Saddam Hussein crushed the revolt and slaughtered thousands in an act of vengeful reprisal.

The point is, if Saddam Hussein was evil enough to merit the most elaborate, openly declared assassination attempt in history (the opening move of Operation Shock and Awe), then surely those who supported him ought at least to be tried for war crimes? Why aren't the faces of U.S. and U.K. government officials on the infamous pack of cards of wanted men and women?

Because when it comes to Empire, facts don't matter.

Yes, but all that's in the past we're told. Saddam Hussein is a monster who must be stopped *now*. And only the U.S. can stop him. It's an effective technique, this use of the urgent morality of the present to obscure the diabolical sins of the past and the malevolent plans for the future. Indonesia, Panama, Nicaragua, Iraq, Afghanistan - the list goes on and on. Right now there are brutal regimes being groomed for the future - Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Pakistan, the Central Asian Republics.

U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft recently declared that U.S. freedoms are "not the grant of any government or document, but...our endowment from God." (Why bother with the United Nations when God himself is on hand?)

So here we are, the people of the world, confronted with an Empire armed with a mandate from heaven (*and*, as added insurance, the most formidable arsenal of weapons of mass destruction in history). Here we are, confronted with an Empire that has conferred upon itself the right to go to war at will, and the right to deliver people from corrupting ideologies, from religious fundamentalists, dictators, sexism, and poverty by the age-old, tried-and-tested practice of extermination. Empire is on the move, and Democracy is its sly new war cry. Democracy, home-delivered to your doorstep by daisy cutters. Death is a small price for people to pay for the privilege of sampling this new product: Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy (bring to a boil, add oil, then bomb).

But then perhaps chinks, negroes, dinks, gooks, and wogs don't really qualify as real people. Perhaps our deaths don't qualify as real deaths. Our histories don't qualify as history. They never have.

Speaking of history, in these past months, while the world watched, the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq was

broadcast on live TV. Like Osama bin Laden and the Taliban in Afghanistan, the regime of Saddam Hussein simply disappeared. This was followed by what analysts called a "power vacuum." Cities that had been under siege, without food, water, and electricity for days, cities that had been bombed relentlessly, people who had been starved and systematically impoverished by the UN sanctions regime for more than a decade, were suddenly left with no semblance of urban administration. A seven-thousand-year-old civilization slid into anarchy. On live TV.

Vandals plundered shops, offices, hotels, and hospitals. American and British soldiers stood by and watched. They said they had no orders to act. In effect, they had orders to kill people, but not to protect them. Their priorities were clear. The safety and security of Iraqi people was not their business. The security of whatever little remained of Iraq's infrastructure was not their business. But the security and safety of Iraq's oil fields were. Of course they were. The oil fields were "secured" almost before the invasion began.

On CNN and BBC the scenes of the rampage were played and replayed. TV commentators, army and government spokespersons portrayed it as a "liberated people" venting their rage at a despotic regime. U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said: "It's untidy. Freedom's untidy and free people are free to commit crimes and make mistakes and do bad things." Did anybody know that Donald Rumsfeld was an anarchist? I wonder - did he hold the same view during the riots in Los Angeles following the beating of Rodney King? Would he care to share his thesis about the Untidiness of Freedom with the two million people being held in U.S. prisons right now? (The world's "freest" country has the highest number of prisoners in the world.) Would he discuss its merits with young African American men, 28 percent of whom will spend some part of their adult lives in jail? Could he explain why he serves under a president who oversaw 152 executions when he was governor of Texas?

Before the war on Iraq began, the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance (ORHA) sent the Pentagon a list of 16 crucial sites to protect. The National Museum was second on that list. Yet the Museum was not just looted, it was desecrated. It was a repository of an ancient cultural heritage. Iraq as we know it today was part of the river valley of Mesopotamia. The civilization that grew along the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates produced the world's first writing, first calendar, first library, first city, and, yes, the world's first democracy. King Hammurabi of Babylon was the first to codify laws governing the social life of citizens. It was a code in which abandoned women, prostitutes, slaves, and even animals had rights. The Hammurabi code is acknowledged not just as the birth of legality, but the beginning of an understanding of the concept of social justice. The U.S. government could not have chosen a more inappropriate land in which to stage its illegal war and display its grotesque disregard for justice.

At a Pentagon briefing during the days of looting, Secretary Rumsfeld, Prince of Darkness, turned on his media cohorts who had served him so loyally through the war. "The images you are seeing on television, you are seeing over and

over and over, and it's the same picture, of some person walking out of some building with a vase, and you see it twenty times and you say, 'My god, were there that many vases? Is it possible that there were that many vases in the whole country?'"

Laughter rippled through the press room. Would it be alright for the poor of Harlem to loot the Metropolitan Museum? Would it be greeted with similar mirth?

The last building on the ORHA list of 16 sites to be protected was the Ministry of Oil. It was the only one that was given protection. Perhaps the occupying army thought that in Muslim countries lists are read upside down?

Television tells us that Iraq has been "liberated" and that Afghanistan is well on its way to becoming a paradise for women-thanks to Bush and Blair, the 21st century's leading feminists. In reality, Iraq's infrastructure has been destroyed. Its people brought to the brink of starvation. Its food stocks depleted. And its cities devastated by a complete administrative breakdown. Iraq is being ushered in the direction of a civil war between Shias and Sunnis. Meanwhile, Afghanistan has lapsed back into the pre-Taliban era of anarchy, and its territory has been carved up into fiefdoms by hostile warlords.

Undaunted by all this, on the 2nd of May Bush the Lesser launched his 2004 campaign hoping to be finally elected U.S. President. In what probably constitutes the shortest flight in history, a military jet landed on an aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, which was so close to shore that, according to the Associated Press, administration officials acknowledged "positioning the massive ship to provide the best TV angle for Bush's speech, with the sea as his background instead of the San Diego coastline." President Bush, who never served his term in the military, emerged from the cockpit in fancy dress - a U.S. military bomber jacket, combat boots, flying goggles, helmet. Waving to his cheering troops, he officially proclaimed victory over Iraq. He was careful to say that it was "just one victory in a war on terror ... [which] still goes on."

It was important to avoid making a straightforward victory announcement, because under the Geneva Convention a victorious army is bound by the legal obligations of an occupying force, a responsibility that the Bush administration does not want to burden itself with. Also, closer to the 2004 elections, in order to woo wavering voters, another victory in the "War on Terror" might become necessary. Syria is being fattened for the kill.

It was Herman Goering, that old Nazi, who said, "People can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders.... All you have to do is tell them they're being attacked and denounce the pacifists for a lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country."

He's right. It's dead easy. That's what the Bush regime banks on. The distinction between election campaigns and war, between democracy and oligarchy, seems to be closing fast.

The only caveat in these campaign wars is that U.S. lives must not be lost. It shakes voter confidence. But the

problem of U.S. soldiers being killed in combat has been licked. More or less.

At a media briefing before Operation Shock and Awe was unleashed, General Tommy Franks announced, "This campaign will be like no other in history." Maybe he's right.

I'm no military historian, but when was the last time a war was fought like this?

After using the "good offices" of UN diplomacy (economic sanctions and weapons inspections) to ensure that Iraq was brought to its knees, its people starved, half a million children dead, its infrastructure severely damaged, *after making sure that most of its weapons had been destroyed*, in an act of cowardice that must surely be unrivalled in history, the "Coalition of the Willing" (better known as the Coalition of the Bullied and Bought) - sent in an invading army!

Operation Iraqi Freedom? I don't think so. It was more like Operation Let's Run a Race, but First Let Me Break Your Knees.

As soon as the war began, the governments of France, Germany, and Russia, which refused to allow a final resolution legitimizing the war to be passed in the UN Security Council, fell over each other to say how much they wanted the United States to win. President Jacques Chirac offered French airspace to the Anglo-American air force. U.S. military bases in Germany were open for business. German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer publicly hoped for the "rapid collapse" of the Saddam Hussein regime. Vladimir Putin publicly hoped for the same. These are governments that colluded in the enforced disarming of Iraq before their dastardly rush to take the side of those who attacked it. Apart from hoping to share the spoils, they hoped Empire would honor their pre-war oil contracts with Iraq. Only the very naïve could expect old Imperialists to behave otherwise.

Leaving aside the cheap thrills and the lofty moral speeches made in the UN during the run up to the war, eventually, at the moment of crisis, the unity of Western governments - despite the opposition from the majority of their people - was overwhelming.

When the Turkish government temporarily bowed to the views of 90 percent of its population, and turned down the U.S. government's offer of billions of dollars of blood money for the use of Turkish soil, it was accused of lacking "democratic principles." According to a Gallup International poll, in no European country was support for a war carried out "unilaterally by America and its allies" higher than 11 percent. But the governments of England, Italy, Spain, Hungary, and other countries of Eastern Europe were praised for disregarding the views of the majority of their people and supporting the illegal invasion. That, presumably, was fully in keeping with democratic principles. What's it called? New Democracy? (Like Britain's New Labour?)

In stark contrast to the venality displayed by their governments, on the 15th of February, weeks before the invasion, in the most spectacular display of public morality the world has ever seen, more than 10 million people marched against the war on 5 continents. Many of you, I'm sure, were among them. They - we - were disregarded with utter disdain.

When asked to react to the anti-war demonstrations, President Bush said, "It's like deciding, well, I'm going to decide policy based upon a focus group. The role of a leader is to decide policy based upon the security, in this case the security of the people."

Democracy, the modern world's holy cow, is in crisis. And the crisis is a profound one. Every kind of outrage is being committed in the name of democracy. It has become little more than a hollow word, a pretty shell, emptied of all content or meaning. It can be whatever you want it to be. Democracy is the Free World's whore, willing to dress up, dress down, willing to satisfy a whole range of taste, available to be used and abused at will.

Until quite recently, right up to the 1980's, democracy did seem as though it might actually succeed in delivering a degree of real social justice.

But modern democracies have been around for long enough for neo-liberal capitalists to learn how to subvert them. They have mastered the technique of infiltrating the instruments of democracy - the "independent" judiciary, the "free" press, the parliament - and molding them to their purpose. The project of corporate globalization has cracked the code. Free elections, a free press, and an independent judiciary mean little when the free market has reduced them to commodities on sale to the highest bidder.

To fully comprehend the extent to which Democracy is under siege, it might be an idea to look at what goes on in some of our contemporary democracies. The World's Largest: India, (which I have written about at some length and therefore will not speak about tonight). The World's Most Interesting: South Africa. The world's most powerful: the U.S.A. And, most instructive of all, the plans that are being made to usher in the world's newest: Iraq.

In South Africa, after 300 years of brutal domination of the black majority by a white minority through colonialism and apartheid, a non-racial, multi-party democracy came to power in 1994. It was a phenomenal achievement. Within two years of coming to power, the African National Congress had genuflected with no caveats to the Market God. Its massive program of structural adjustment, privatization, and liberalization has only increased the hideous disparities between the rich and the poor. More than a million people have lost their jobs. The corporatization of basic services - electricity, water, and housing-has meant that 10 million South Africans, almost a quarter of the population, have been disconnected from water and electricity. 2 million have been evicted from their homes.

Meanwhile, a small white minority that has been historically privileged by centuries of brutal exploitation is more secure than ever before. They continue to control the land, the farms, the factories, and the abundant natural resources of that country. For them the transition from apartheid to neo-liberalism barely disturbed the grass. It's apartheid with a clean conscience. And it goes by the name of Democracy.

Democracy has become Empire's euphemism for neo-liberal capitalism.

In countries of the first world, too, the machinery of democracy has been effectively subverted. Politicians, media barons, judges, powerful corporate lobbies, and government officials are imbricated in an elaborate underhand configuration that completely undermines the lateral arrangement of checks and balances between the constitution, courts of law, parliament, the administration and, perhaps most important of all, the independent media that form the structural basis of a parliamentary democracy. Increasingly, the imbrication is neither subtle nor elaborate.

Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, for instance, has a controlling interest in major Italian newspapers, magazines, television channels, and publishing houses. The *Financial Times* reported that he controls about 90 percent of Italy's TV viewership. Recently, during a trial on bribery charges, while insisting he was the only person who could save Italy from the left, he said, "How much longer do I have to keep living this life of sacrifices?" That bodes ill for the remaining 10 percent of Italy's TV viewership. What price Free Speech? Free Speech for *whom*?

In the United States, the arrangement is more complex. Clear Channel Worldwide Incorporated is the largest radio station owner in the country. It runs more than 1,200 channels, which together account for 9 percent of the market. Its CEO contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to Bush's election campaign. When hundreds of thousands of American citizens took to the streets to protest against the war on Iraq, Clear Channel organized pro-war patriotic "Rallies for America" across the country. It used its radio stations to advertise the events and then sent correspondents to cover them as though they were breaking news. The era of manufacturing consent has given way to the era of manufacturing news. Soon media newsrooms will drop the pretense, and start hiring theatre directors instead of journalists.

As America's show business gets more and more violent and war-like, and America's wars get more and more like show business, some interesting cross-overs are taking place. The designer who built the 250,000 dollar set in Qatar from which General Tommy Franks stage-managed news coverage of Operation Shock and Awe also built sets for Disney, MGM, and "Good Morning America."

It is a cruel irony that the U.S., which has the most ardent, vociferous defenders of the idea of Free Speech, and (until recently) the most elaborate legislation to protect it, has so circumscribed the space in which that freedom can be expressed. In a strange, convoluted way, the sound and fury that accompanies the legal and *conceptual* defense of Free Speech in America serves to mask the process of the rapid erosion of the possibilities of actually *exercising* that freedom.

The news and entertainment industry in the U.S. is for the most part controlled by a few major corporations - AOL-Time Warner, Disney, Viacom, News Corporation. Each of these corporations owns and controls TV stations, film studios, record companies, and publishing ventures. Effectively, the exits are sealed.

America's media empire is controlled by a tiny coterie of people. Chairman of the Federal Communications

Commission Michael Powell, the son of Secretary of State Colin Powell, has proposed even further deregulation of the communication industry, which will lead to even greater consolidation.

So here it is - the World's Greatest Democracy, led by a man who was not legally elected. America's Supreme Court gifted him his job. What price have American people paid for this spurious presidency?

In the three years of George Bush the Lesser's term, the American economy has lost more than two million jobs. Outlandish military expenses, corporate welfare, and tax giveaways to the rich have created a financial crisis for the U.S. educational system. According to a survey by the National Council of State Legislatures, U.S. states cut 49 billion dollars in public services, health, welfare benefits, and education in 2002. They plan to cut another 25.7 billion dollars this year. That makes a total of 75 billion dollars. Bush's initial budget request to Congress to finance the war in Iraq was 80 billion dollars.

So who's paying for the war? America's poor. Its students, its unemployed, its single mothers, its hospital and home-care patients, its teachers, and health workers.

And who's actually fighting the war?

Once again, America's poor. The soldiers who are baking in Iraq's desert sun are not the children of the rich. Only one of all the representatives in the House of Representatives and the Senate has a child fighting in Iraq. America's "volunteer" army in fact depends on a poverty draft of poor whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians looking for a way to earn a living and get an education. Federal statistics show that African Americans make up 21 percent of the total armed forces and 29 percent of the U.S. army. They count for only 12 percent of the general population. It's ironic, isn't it - the disproportionately high representation of African Americans in the army and prison? Perhaps we should take a positive view, and look at this as affirmative action at its most effective. Nearly 4 million Americans (2 percent of the population) have lost the right to vote because of felony convictions. Of that number, 1.4 million are African Americans, which means that 13 percent of all voting-age Black people have been disenfranchised.

For African Americans there's also affirmative action in death. A study by the economist Amartya Sen shows that African Americans as a group have a lower life expectancy than people born in China, in the Indian State of Kerala (where I come from), Sri Lanka, or Costa Rica. Bangladeshi men have a better chance of making it to the age of forty than African American men from here in Harlem.

This year, on what would have been Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s 74th birthday, President Bush denounced the University of Michigan's affirmative action program favouring Blacks and Latinos. He called it "divisive," "unfair," and "unconstitutional." The successful effort to keep Blacks off the voting rolls in the State of Florida in order that George Bush be elected was of course neither unfair nor unconstitutional. I don't suppose affirmative action for White Boys From Yale ever is.

So we know who's paying for the war. We know who's

fighting it. But who will benefit from it? Who is homing in on the reconstruction contracts estimated to be worth up to one hundred billion dollars? Could it be America's poor and unemployed and sick? Could it be America's single mothers? Or America's Black and Latino minorities?

Operation Iraqi Freedom, George Bush assures us, is about returning Iraqi oil to the Iraqi people. That is, returning Iraqi oil to the Iraqi people via Corporate Multinationals. Like Bechtel, like Chevron, like Halliburton.

Once again, it is a small, tight circle that connects corporate, military, and government leadership to one another. The promiscuousness, the cross-pollination is outrageous.

Consider this: the Defense Policy Board is a government-appointed group that advises the Pentagon. Its members are appointed by the under secretary of defense and approved by Donald Rumsfeld. Its meetings are classified. No information is available for public scrutiny.

The Washington-based Center for Public Integrity found that 9 out of the 30 members of the Defense Policy Board are connected to companies that were awarded defense contracts worth 76 billion dollars between the years 2001 and 2002. One of them, Jack Sheehan, a retired Marine Corps general, is a senior vice president at Bechtel, the giant international engineering outfit. Riley Bechtel, the company chairman, is on the President's Export Council. Former Secretary of State George Shultz, who is also on the Board of Directors of the Bechtel Group, is the chairman of the advisory board of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq. When asked by the *New York Times* whether he was concerned about the appearance of a conflict of interest, he said, "I don't know that Bechtel would particularly benefit from it. But if there's work to be done, Bechtel is the type of company that could do it."

Bechtel has been awarded a 680 million dollar reconstruction contract in Iraq. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Bechtel contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to Republican campaign efforts.

Arcing across this subterfuge, dwarfing it by the sheer magnitude of its malevolence, is America's anti-terrorism legislation. The U.S.A. Patriot Act, passed in October 2001, has become the blueprint for similar anti-terrorism bills in countries across the world. It was passed in the House of Representatives by a majority vote of 337 to 79. According to the *New York Times*, "Many lawmakers said it had been impossible to truly debate or even read the legislation."

The Patriot Act ushers in an era of systemic automated surveillance. It gives the government the authority to monitor phones and computers and spy on people in ways that would have seemed completely unacceptable a few years ago. It gives the FBI the power to seize all of the circulation, purchasing, and other records of library users and bookstore customers on the suspicion that they are part of a terrorist network. It blurs the boundaries between speech and criminal activity creating the space to construe acts of civil disobedience as violating the law.

Already hundreds of people are being held indefinitely as "unlawful combatants." (In India, the number is in the thousands. In Israel, 5,000 Palestinians are now being

detained.) Non-citizens, of course, have no rights at all. They can simply be “disappeared” like the people of Chile under Washington’s old ally, General Pinochet. More than 1,000 people, many of them Muslim or of Middle Eastern origin, have been detained, some without access to legal representatives.

Apart from paying the actual economic costs of war, American people are paying for these wars of “liberation” with their own freedoms. For the ordinary American, the price of “New Democracy” in other countries is the death of real democracy at home.

Meanwhile, Iraq is being groomed for “liberation.” (Or did they mean “liberalization” all along?) The *Wall Street Journal* reports that “the Bush administration has drafted sweeping plans to remake Iraq’s economy in the U.S. image.”

Iraq’s constitution is being redrafted. Its trade laws, tax laws, and intellectual property laws rewritten in order to turn it into an American-style capitalist economy.

The United States Agency for International Development has invited U.S. companies to bid for contracts that range between road building, water systems, text book distribution, and cell phone networks.

Soon after Bush the Second announced that he wanted American farmers to feed the world, Dan Amstutz, a former senior executive of Cargill, the biggest grain exporter in the world, was put in charge of agricultural reconstruction in Iraq. Kevin Watkins, Oxfam’s policy director, said, “Putting Dan Amstutz in charge of agricultural reconstruction in Iraq is like putting Saddam Hussein in the chair of a human rights commission.”

The two men who have been short-listed to run operations for managing Iraqi oil have worked with Shell, BP, and Fluor. Fluor is embroiled in a lawsuit by black South African workers who have accused the company of exploiting and brutalizing them during the apartheid era. Shell, of course, is well known for its devastation of the Ogoni tribal lands in Nigeria.

Tom Brokaw (one of America’s best-known TV anchors) was inadvertently succinct about the process. “One of the things we don’t want to do,” he said, “is to destroy the infrastructure of Iraq because in a few days we’re going to own that country.”

Now that the ownership deeds are being settled, Iraq is ready for New Democracy.

So, as Lenin used to ask: What Is To Be Done?

Well...

We might as well accept the fact that there is no conventional military force that can successfully challenge the American war machine. Terrorist strikes only give the U.S. Government an opportunity that it is eagerly awaiting to further tighten its stranglehold. Within days of an attack you can bet that Patriot II would be passed. To argue against U.S. military aggression by saying that it will increase the possibilities of terrorist strikes is futile. It’s like threatening Brer Rabbit that you’ll throw him into the bramble bush. Any one who has read the documents written by The Project for the New American Century can attest to that. The government’s

suppression of the Congressional committee report on September 11th, which found that there was intelligence warning of the strikes that was ignored, also attests to the fact that, for all their posturing, the terrorists and the Bush regime might as well be working as a team. They both hold people responsible for the actions of their governments. They both believe in the doctrine of collective guilt and collective punishment. Their actions benefit each other greatly.

The U.S. government has already displayed in no uncertain terms the range and extent of its capability for paranoid aggression. In human psychology, paranoid aggression is usually an indicator of nervous insecurity. It could be argued that it’s no different in the case of the psychology of nations. Empire is paranoid because it has a soft underbelly.

Its “homeland” may be defended by border patrols and nuclear weapons, but its economy is strung out across the globe. Its economic outposts are exposed and vulnerable. Already the Internet is buzzing with elaborate lists of American and British government products and companies that should be boycotted. Apart from the usual targets - Coke, Pepsi, McDonalds - government agencies like USAID, the British DFID, British and American banks, Arthur Andersen, Merrill Lynch, and American Express could find themselves under siege. These lists are being honed and refined by activists across the world. They could become a practical guide that directs the amorphous but growing fury in the world. Suddenly, the “inevitability” of the project of Corporate Globalization is beginning to seem more than a little evitable.

It would be naïve to imagine that we can directly confront Empire. Our strategy must be to isolate Empire’s working parts and disable them one by one. No target is too small. No victory too insignificant. We could reverse the idea of the economic sanctions imposed on poor countries by Empire and its Allies. We could impose a regime of Peoples’ Sanctions on every corporate house that has been awarded with a contract in postwar Iraq, just as activists in this country and around the world targeted institutions of apartheid. Each one of them should be named, exposed, and boycotted. Forced out of business. That could be our response to the Shock and Awe campaign. It would be a great beginning.

Another urgent challenge is to expose the corporate media for the boardroom bulletin that it really is. We need to create a universe of alternative information. We need to support independent media like Democracy Now!, Alternative Radio, and South End Press.

The battle to reclaim democracy is going to be a difficult one. Our freedoms were not granted to us by any governments. They were wrested from them by us. And once we surrender them, the battle to retrieve them is called a revolution. It is a battle that must range across continents and countries. It must not acknowledge national boundaries but, if it is to succeed, it has to begin here. In America. The only institution more powerful than the U.S. government is American civil society. The rest of us are subjects of slave nations. We are by no means powerless, but you have the power of proximity. You have access to the Imperial Palace

and the Emperor's chambers. Empire's conquests are being carried out in your name, and you have the right to refuse. You could refuse to fight. Refuse to move those missiles from the warehouse to the dock. Refuse to wave that flag. Refuse the victory parade.

You have a rich tradition of resistance. You need only read Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United States* to remind yourself of this.

Hundreds of thousands of you have survived the relentless propaganda you have been subjected to, and are actively fighting your own government. In the ultra-patriotic climate that prevails in the United States, that's as brave as any Iraqi or Afghan or Palestinian fighting for his or her homeland.

If you join the battle, not in your hundreds of thousands, but in your millions, you will be greeted joyously by the rest of the world. And you will see how beautiful it is to be gentle instead of brutal, safe instead of scared. Befriended instead of isolated. Loved instead of hated.

I hate to disagree with your president. Yours is by no means a great nation. But you could be a great people.

History is giving you the chance.

Seize the time.

Presented in New York City at The Riverside Church
May 13, 2003

Sponsored by the Center for Economic and Social Rights

con't from page 20 >

relationships and gain insights into the culture, history and aspirations of our two societies. Additionally, they learn the basic principles of military doctrine, ethics, and policies that direct our forces, and they gain greater insight into the strengths and challenges that confront our militaries. What is often discovered is that we are more alike than we are different, and that the Malaysian Armed Forces and the United States military share many of the same basic principles that define a modern military.

By understanding each other's doctrine and policies we are better able to work together in areas of mutual interest like humanitarian assistance, disaster relief, anti-piracy, anti-terrorism, or any other challenges.

We are actively engaged with Malaysia in a host of seminars and conferences that span a wide range of subject areas, from humanitarian relief to cooperative planning, and from medical conferences to civilian educational endeavors. I note that the Army Pacific Military Medicine Conference will convene in just a few weeks. And there are numerous other seminars, such as those regarding military doctrine, military law, multi-national operational planning, logistics, submarine, and tactical airlift operations, to name a few.

Our two militaries also maintain a robust bilateral exercise program that encompasses all branches of service, as well as the National Police. Many of you have probably joined in as our Armies participate in Exercises Balance Mint and Keris Strike, our Navies in CARAT, SEACAT and PASKAL, and our Air Forces in Exercises Cope Taufan and Cooperative Cope Thunder. In addition to these programs, the U.S. military is actively engaged with the Royal Malaysian Police through Exercise Vector Balance Mint, and the drug enforcement agencies through Exercise Baker Mint. We value these exercises and strongly desire to maintain these ties.

You will often hear people speak about interoperability between our forces. Certainly fundamental to our ability

to work effectively together is obtaining a common understanding of doctrine, policies, and command and control systems. Equally important, though, is having communications systems that will allow us to coordinate operations; logistic systems that will facilitate cross-servicing support agreements; and compatible weapons systems that allow for synchronization and economy of force in an area of operations. Malaysia has long capitalized on its access to U.S. defense hardware and incorporated advanced weapons systems to enhance the capabilities of the Malaysian Armed Forces. Most notable was the acquisition of the F/A-18/D aircraft stationed at RMAF Base Butterworth and the Royal Malaysian Navy's LST. Malaysia has received solid performance from its previous procurement of F-5 fighters and S-61 (Nuri) Helicopters. This commonality of equipment significantly enhances our ability to work effectively together to support continued peace and prosperity in the Asia Pacific region.

Conclusion

I have tried today to give a brief overview of how my country sees the world in the spring of 2003 and what we are trying to accomplish in our foreign policy. It has been an honor to have this opportunity and I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Thank you very much.

Speech delivered at the Malaysian Armed Forces Defense College, April 14, 2003.

“US Foreign and Defence Policies, Political and Economic Trends”

U.S. Ambassador Marie T. Huhtala

I'm delighted to have the opportunity to speak to the Malaysian Armed Forces Defense College today. I'd like to express my thanks to First Admiral Dato' Mat Rabi bin Abu Samah, Commandant of the Defense College, for extending this gracious invitation. It's good to be back.

It is indeed an honor to address any element of the Malaysian Armed Forces, for yours is a military with a long and distinguished history of service in good causes around the world.

I noticed with great interest last year when the United Nations awarded medals to the families of Malaysian soldiers and police who had perished over the years in UN peacekeeping operations around the world, including the UN operation in Somalia. My country will never forget how Malaysian peacekeepers came to the rescue to imperiled U.S. soldiers there.

The topic on which I have been asked to speak, “US Foreign and Defense Policies, Political and Economic Trends” is a broad one I will do my best to cover it. I will first make some comments on how the U.S. sees the world in the spring of 2003 and then I would be pleased to respond to whatever questions you may have.

Iraq

First let me turn to Iraq. I know we are all following events there very closely. Perhaps the primary lesson from the events of September 11 is that threats to international stability and world peace cannot be allowed to fester and spread. Instead, they must be dealt with early so that the world community does not suffer the consequences of inaction. This is what guides U.S. policy on Iraq.

This is not a new problem. There has been no rush to judgment. I can assure you that the U.S. and its coalition partners did not take the decision to use military force in Iraq lightly.

In the last twelve years, there have been sixteen previous UN resolutions calling on Iraq to give up its weapons of mass destruction. Last fall's UN Security Council Resolution 1441, painstakingly negotiated for almost two months by Security Council members and then unanimously adopted, was the seventeenth resolution in this regard. As Secretary Powell pointed out in his comments to the UN Security Council on February 14, Resolution 1441 was not only about letting in inspectors. Resolution 1441 put the burden on Iraqi to carry out disarmament - full, voluntary disarmament of its horrific arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. And this, Iraq refused to do.

Hans Blix reported improvements in Iraqi cooperation on several issues of process but there was no improvement on issues of substance. The burden was not on the inspectors to find WMD but on the Iraq regime to come clean on what

it had done with the massive amounts of anthrax, botulism, VX and other horrific agents it already had admitted to having.

For the United Nations to have any credibility, it could not continue to allow Iraq to blithely ignore UN resolutions. In particular, the UN could not allow Iraq to escape the “serious consequences” which 1441 clearly stated would be the result of Iraqi non-compliance. In February and March, the United States worked hard to obtain the so-called “second resolution,” which would have expressed the judgment of the Council that Iraq was not complying with Resolution 1441. There our efforts were unsuccessful. But that had no practical effect on Resolution 1441, which is still in effect, and which clearly authorizes military action in Iraq.

As you all know, the military aspect of our campaign in Iraq began March 20 and now appears to be winding down, with the capture of Baghdad and other key cities. Like all wars, this one has brought the inevitable civilian casualties and hardships, though the coalition forces have done all they could to minimize civilian deaths. I believe a final analysis will show both military and civilian casualties have been lighter than feared, and fortunately the worst part of the fighting seems to have been contained to just three weeks. But the situation is still evolving, and much remains to be done. There are many challenges which face us in the next few months in Iraq.

In the joint statement issued after their meeting in Belfast last week, President Bush and Prime Minister Blair were quite explicit on the future of Iraq and the role of the UN. They emphasized that the goal of the Coalition is to help the people of Iraq build a nation that is whole, free and at peace with itself and its neighbors. We support the aspirations of all of Iraq's people for a united, representative government that upholds human rights and the rule of law as cornerstones of democracy. We will protect Iraq's natural resources, which should be used only for the benefit of the Iraqi people themselves.

As the Coalition proceeds with the reconstruction of Iraq, we will work with our allies, other bilateral donors, and with the United Nations and other international institutions. The United Nations has a vital role to play in the reconstruction of Iraq. We welcome the efforts of U.N. agencies and non-governmental organizations in providing immediate assistance to the people of Iraq. We plan to seek the adoption of new UN Security Council resolutions that will affirm Iraq's territorial integrity, ensure rapid delivery of humanitarian relief, and endorse an appropriate post-conflict administration for Iraq. We also welcome the appointment by the United Nations Secretary General of a Special Adviser for Iraq.

We firmly believe that the day when Iraqis govern themselves must come quickly. As early as possible, we support the formation of an Iraqi Interim Authority, a transitional administration, run by Iraqis, to take charge until a permanent government is established by the people of Iraq. The Interim Authority will be broad-based and fully representative, with members from all of Iraq's ethnic groups, regions and Iraqis returning from overseas. The Interim Authority will be established first and foremost by the Iraqi people, with the help of the members of the Coalition, and working with the Secretary General of the United Nations. As coalition forces advance, civilian Iraqi leaders will emerge who can be part of such an Interim Authority. The Interim Authority will progressively assume the functions of government. It will provide a means for Iraqis to participate in the economic and political reconstruction of their country from the outset.

Humanitarian assistance is already coming into Iraq. The international community is providing over 1 million metric tons of food to feed the Iraqi people. The U.S. government is making available an estimated 670,000 metric tons of food worth \$549 million. Last week my government announced an additional \$200 million contribution to the UN World Food Program to procure food in the region.

We have also allocated over \$246 million on essential relief supplies and priority reconstruction activities. Over \$20 million of this will go through NGOs. Additionally, nearly \$125 million has gone to the United Nations and other international organizations for pre-positioning and early response. Additional assistance is in the pipeline in the form of multi-million dollar U.S. contributions to, among others, the World Food Program, the UNHCR, the International Red Cross, UNICEF and the World Health Organization. This represents a massive commitment on the part of the U.S. government to the future of Iraq and the people of Iraq.

Terrorism

All our efforts in Iraq grow out of our overriding concern about the global menace of terrorism, which continues to be the basic underpinning of U.S. foreign policy.

Is terrorism a threat to world peace? Obviously, if we look at how the world has changed since September 11, 2001, the answer is a resounding "yes." But, there is still a debate in some quarters over exactly what constitutes terrorism. Let me offer a definition of terrorism, drawn from a new U.S. counter-terrorism strategy recently announced in Washington, that makes a great deal of sense: "Terrorism is premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents."

It would be difficult to overstate how the events of September 11, 2001 have changed the United States. What happened that day has caused us to take a hard look at our foreign policy and national security objectives around the world. Moreover, with the creation of the

new Department of Homeland Security, the United States has undertaken its largest government reorganization since World War II.

Americans understand that we are not alone in the struggle against terror. Terrorists have left their mark in some way upon every country in the world. Too many nations around the world have had the fundamental fabric of their societies torn by endemic terrorism. It is important to remember that citizens from some 90 countries died in the attacks of September 11. Moreover, last fall's bombings in Bali brought home to all of us that terrorism is lurking in Southeast Asia as well. As Secretary of State Colin Powell recently stated: "In the global campaign against terrorism, no country has the luxury of remaining on the sidelines. There are no sidelines. Terrorists respect no limits, geographic or moral. The frontlines are everywhere and the stakes are high."

Although terrorism is a centuries-old scourge, it has adapted itself to our new, globalized world. Al-Qaida exemplifies how terrorist networks have twisted the benefits and conveniences of our increasingly open, integrated, and modernized world to serve their destructive agenda. The al-Qaida network is a multinational enterprise with operations in more than 60 countries. Its camps in Afghanistan provided sanctuary and its bank accounts served as a trust fund for terrorism. Its global activities are now coordinated through the use of personal couriers and communication technologies emblematic of our era — cellular and satellite phones, encrypted e-mail, Internet chat rooms, videotape, and CD-ROMs. Like a skilled publicist, Usama bin Laden and al-Qaida have exploited the international media to project his image and message worldwide.

How do we respond to such an opponent? First, by defining who and what we are fighting. The enemy is not one person. It is not a single political regime. Certainly, it is not a religion. Rather, we fight those who, regardless of their specific secular or religious objectives, strive to subvert the rule of law and effect change through violence and fear. We fight those who share the misguided belief that killing, kidnapping, extorting, robbing, and wreaking havoc to terrorize people are legitimate forms of political action.

Second, we respond with a variety of methods. Of course, there is military action — which, for example, was necessary in Afghanistan to eliminate the al-Qaida infrastructure and the repressive government which had shielded the terrorists. The United States believes, however, that most terrorist threats will be countered through patient, painstaking diplomatic, law enforcement and intelligence efforts and through the coordination of all these efforts with friendly and allied nations around the world.

Malaysia is a shining example of this. We have always had close law enforcement and intelligence ties with Malaysia but these have increased since September 11, to our mutual benefit. The fruits have been tangible. To cite but one example, you will recall that last fall your government allowed U.S. agents to interview a Malaysian being held under the Internal Security Act in connection

with the U.S. prosecution of al-Qaida member Zacarias Moussouai. We greatly appreciated that opportunity.

The United States and Malaysia have also worked together very effectively on the diplomatic front in the fight against terrorism. Our two countries signed a memorandum of understanding on counter-terrorism when Prime Minister Mahathir was in Washington almost a year ago. Subsequently, drawing from that text, the U.S. and ASEAN signed a declaration on counter-terrorism at the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in August. The United States was honored to co-host with Malaysia last month in Sabah the ARF Intersessional Meeting on Counter-Terrorism and Transnational Crime. Finally, the United States plans to play a constructive role in the regional Counter-Terrorism Center, which Malaysia has agreed to host. These examples illustrate that, while the U.S. and Malaysia do not always agree on all issues, we have found extensive common ground on counter-terrorism and will continue to seek ways to expand on this shared interest.

The United States currently lists seven state sponsors of terrorism: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, and Sudan. We are firmly committed to removing countries from the list once they have taken the necessary steps under our law and policy. A checkered past does not foreclose future membership in the coalition against terrorism or in the world community, as some countries have demonstrated.

Victory in the war on terrorism will occur when our children can live free from fear and when the threat of terrorist attacks no longer hangs over our daily lives.

As we all unite against terrorism, let us remember that although political violence may be endemic to the human condition, we cannot tolerate terrorists who seek to combine the powers of modern technology and WMD to threaten the very notion of civilized society. The war against terrorism, is not some sort of "clash of civilizations." Rather, it is a clash between civilization and those who would destroy it.

There is much talk these days of the "root causes" of terrorism. While the United States recognizes that there are many countries and people living with poverty, deprivation, social disenfranchisement, and unresolved political and regional disputes, those conditions do not justify the use of terror. We all must work to address these underlying conditions that provide fertile ground for terrorists to plant their seeds. Thus ongoing U.S. efforts to resolve regional disputes, foster economic, social, and political development, market-based economies, good governance, and the rule of law, contribute to the campaign against terrorism.

My country has been accused of waging a war against Islam. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Indeed, the United States has fought to defend many imperiled Muslims in the past — in Afghanistan, Kuwait, Bosnia, and Kosovo, to name a few. And the long-suffering people of Iraq - whose former leader Saddam Hussein was responsible for the deaths of millions of Muslims, inside and outside his country - will soon live in peace and prosperity thanks to the efforts of our Coalition.

Finding a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is an urgent objective. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is critical

because of the toll of human suffering, because of America's close relationship with the state of Israel and key Arab states, and because of that region's importance to Muslims around the globe. There can be no peace for either side without freedom for both sides. America stands committed to an independent and democratic Palestine, living beside Israel in peace and security. Like all other people, Palestinians deserve a government that serves their interests and listens to their voices. The United States will continue to encourage all parties to step up to their responsibilities as we seek a just and comprehensive settlement to the conflict. The U.S. can play a crucial role but, ultimately, lasting peace can only come when Israelis and Palestinians resolve the issues and end the conflict between them. The Palestinian state must be a reformed and peaceful and democratic state that abandons forever the use of terror. The Government of Israel must take concrete steps to support the emergence of a viable and credible Palestinian state, and to work as quickly as possible toward a final status agreement. As progress is made toward peace, settlement activity in the occupied territories must end. And the Arab states must oppose terrorism, support the emergence of a peaceful and democratic Palestine, and state clearly that they will live in peace with Israel. This moment offers a new opportunity to meet these objectives. After its recent elections, the nation of Israel has a new government. And the Palestinian Authority has created the new position of Prime Minister. Israeli and Palestinian leaders and other governments in the region now have a chance to move forward with determination and with good faith. As President Bush has stated, we look forward to implementing the road map toward peace so that Arabs and Israelis can live as they deserve to live, in dignity under free and honest governments.

The World Economy

Let me turn now to the world economic situation, which we are all watching closely in light of the war in Iraq and the recent outbreak of SARS. We know how important a strong global economy is for our Asian partners, and the U.S. economy is an important part of that.

The U.S. and Malaysian economies are closely intertwined:

— The United States is Malaysia's largest export market. We absorb one-quarter to one-third of all Malaysian exports.

— Malaysia is our 11th largest trading partner in the world. In 2002, the U.S. imported \$24 billion from Malaysia, while Malaysia imported \$10.3 billion from the United States.

— The United States is Malaysia's largest foreign investor. According to AmCham, at least 100,000 Malaysians are employed by U.S.-affiliated companies. American electronics companies alone provide at least 55,000 jobs, the bulk of them based in Penang, Johor, and the Klang Valley.

I'm sure you'll agree, therefore, that it is good news that the U.S. economy continues to show economic growth. The Conference Board predicts 2.5-3 percent growth in 2003;

other economists predict 1-2 percent growth. Though it appears that we are now in an economic lull, low interest rates combined with President Bush's \$75 billion supplemental spending package should provide additional stimulus to the economy.

Most economists have cited "uncertainty," including high oil prices and the conflict in Iraq, as the main factor delaying investment and consumption decisions and stalling the broad economic recovery we had been expecting. SARS will also undoubtedly have a negative effect on the world economy. Nevertheless, the U.S. Federal Reserve, under its Chairman Alan Greenspan, decided to leave interest rates unchanged at its March meeting. The Fed believes that low interest rates and continuing productivity growth should provide sufficient support to bring about an improving economy. We do expect a return to stronger economic growth later this year.

Malaysia and the United States both stand to gain from reductions in barriers to world trade. The ongoing World Trade Organization talks are an extremely important vehicle to reach that goal. The United States remains committed to working with our trading partners around the world to open markets and continue trade liberalization. We are working with a number of developing countries to open agricultural markets and to reduce agricultural subsidies around the world. Success in that effort will provide an important stimulus to both Malaysian and American exports.

We are also working to improve protection of intellectual property rights and to open financial markets. Success will have an important impact here since knowledge industries and financial services are target growth industries in Malaysia and in other rapidly developing economies.

International economic cooperation is especially evident in the oil industry where Malaysia developed its petroleum resources with the help of Exxon Mobil and other international oil companies. Malaysia is now an important source of petroleum products, and Petronas is a top-flight international company. More recently, Petronas, in cooperation with the U.S. firm Union Carbide, built downstream facilities in Kerteh, Terengganu. Malaysia is now an important producer of higher value-added petrochemicals. International cooperation has paid valuable dividends for Malaysia and its foreign partners.

Global trade and investment has also been instrumental in making Malaysia an international center for electronics manufacturing. U.S. firms like Texas Instruments, Intel, and Dell invested in Malaysia, built successful businesses here, and now sell Malaysian-made goods throughout the world. Open markets and continuing trade liberalization have made the Malaysian economic transformation possible.

Looking to the future, greater openness in trade in services and increased foreign investment in areas such as telecommunications, banking, insurance should lead to new economic growth and stronger industries in Malaysia.

On the regional front, the United States Trade Representative is working with his counterparts in ASEAN countries to conclude a U.S.-ASEAN regional Trade and

Investment Framework Agreement, or TIFA. The ASEAN-wide TIFA will serve as forum for discussing ways to expand trade and how to resolve problems of trade barriers. The United States has also offered to conclude a bilateral Trade and Investment Framework Agreement with Malaysia.

To protect and extend Malaysian trade with the United States, much of which is transported by ship, U.S. and Malaysian Customs are cooperating in the Container Security Initiative to help make container trade safer. We're pleased that Malaysia has signed on as a partner in the CSI program. This is an area in which our trade and security interests intersect.

Asia

Now I would like to address the situation in Asia, the neighborhood of most interest to us all. The U.S. relationship with China continues to balance our differences over Taiwan and human rights with strong counter-terrorism cooperation and expanding commercial opportunities. Our security and economic ties with Japan remain strong, and we are grateful for Japanese support in our current undertaking in Iraq. As you know, we continue to enjoy a wide range of mutually beneficial ties with ASEAN as an organization and with individual ASEAN member states, although we continue to be concerned about the situation in Burma.

But without any doubt the Asian issue with the direst potential for all of us is the nuclear situation in North Korea. As you know, this issue is of such great concern that it was referred to the UN Security Council in February by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

We are working very hard to promote a multilateral approach to confronting North Korea over its violation of international nuclear safeguards. North Korea would prefer to discuss this issue with us bilaterally, but that will not work because many other countries are also affected by its actions.

In fact, the U.S. tried the bilateral approach with Pyongyang 10 years ago, when we negotiated the U.S.-D.P.R.K. Agreed Framework. We agreed to organize an international consortium to provide the light water reactor project and to finance heavy fuel oil shipments, in exchange for the North's agreeing to freeze and eventually dismantle its graphite-moderated nuclear program.

Late last year we found the North could not be trusted. Despite our agreement, Pyongyang had gone ahead with its nuclear program. This time, a new and more comprehensive approach is required. The stakes are extremely high. No one wants a nuclearized Korean peninsula. North Korea's programs for nuclear weapons, and the means to deliver them at increasingly longer range, pose a serious regional and a global threat.

A nuclear North Korea could change the face of Northeast Asia — undermining the security and stability that have underwritten the region's economic vitality and prosperity, and possibly triggering a nuclear arms race that would end prospects for a lasting peace and settlement on the Korean Peninsula.

Achieving a multilateral approach to eliminating North Korea's nuclear weapons program will take time. The key states in Northeast Asia — South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia — all share the common goal of seeking a denuclearized Korean Peninsula. They all have a stake in the outcome of the diplomatic process and want to be consulted and engaged in achieving a resolution. For that reason, all of them support the principle of multilateral dialogue.

North Korea will have to make a choice. Over the past 10 years, Pyongyang has been in pursuit of two mutually exclusive goals. The first is nuclear weapons. The second is redefining its place in the world community — and its access to international assistance — by broadening its diplomatic and foreign economic relations. The D.P.R.K. needs to accept that it cannot do both. The international community is doing its best to impress on the North that it is in its own best interest to end its nuclear arms program.

President Bush has repeatedly said we seek a peaceful, diplomatic solution with North Korea, even though he has taken no option off the table. The President has also stressed that we will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of North Korea.

U.S. - Malaysia Relations

Finally, and I've saved the best for last, let me turn to the bilateral U.S.-Malaysia relationship. Obviously, the ties between our two nations run deep across a broad range of areas. While I do not subscribe to the notion that relations between Kuala Lumpur and Washington were ever "bad," it is important to note that even in periods when political ties were cool, this did not prevent vibrant cooperation in areas like trade, education, investment and military cooperation. You will all recall the warm, friendly visit of Secretary of State Colin Powell to Malaysia last summer. To state the obvious, however, we are in a very challenging period in the bilateral relationship now. We understand and respect the fact that your country fundamentally disagrees with U.S. actions in Iraq. As I stressed in a recent Bernama interview, both of our sides have made clear that despite these fundamental differences on Iraq, our mutual interest in beneficial bilateral relations continues. I firmly believe that no one issue, be it Iraq or anything else, should be allowed to derail the vibrant, comprehensive bilateral relationship we share.

No doubt the aspect of our bilateral relationship that most interests you is the military cooperation. Both my Defense Attache Office and our Office for Defense Cooperation maintain exceptionally vibrant relationships with their counterparts within the Malaysian Armed Forces. And for that I must thank the MAF leadership, to include you here within the Defense and Staff College.

It is this international cooperative spirit that allows us to pursue our diplomatic and military goals on a daily

basis. The entire purpose of this endeavor is to strengthen our bilateral ties and professional cooperation, and to increase the bonds of friendship between our two great countries, all within the context of pursuing our policy objectives. This effort has many facets, including VIP visits between Malaysia and the U.S., military academic and training exchanges, equipment sales, multi-national conferences, subject matter expert exchanges, and combined exercises.

We have enjoyed a very amiable relationship over the years. Much of that is attributable to the high number of senior officers who have exchanged visits between our countries. In the past year alone, that has included such noteworthy personages as Admirals Blair and Fargo, Commanders of our Pacific Command; a visit by the Pacific Command J2; the Commander of the Seventh Fleet; the Bilateral Training and Consultative Group (BITACG), which is the longest standing bilateral exchange that Headquarters, Pacific Command has; the Commander of Navy Logistics in the Western Pacific; as well as the Eighth United States Army Commander.

An impressive number of Malaysian military figures have visited the U.S. this past year, including Defense Minister Dato' Seri Najib Tun Razak; Chiefs of the Air Force General Suleiman and General Abdullah; and the Deputy Director General of Defense Intelligence. All these visits demonstrate that there is no substitute for personal relationships between our leaders, for it is these bonds that allow us to understand and trust one another, and to work with each other to pursue mutual objectives.

The United States and Malaysia have maintained a very strong military training relationship over the past three decades, which I believe has benefited both of our militaries. Most familiar to you may be the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, which serves as the cornerstone of our training programs. In addition, we also maintain a Student Exchange program between the MAF Staff College and the US Army Staff College at Fort Leavenworth Kansas, and regularly send our officers and noncommissioned officers to receive expert training in jungle survival at the Malaysian Army's Jungle Warfare Training Center in Pulada. The Malaysian Army sends a team of jungle trainers to Hawaii each year to run a jungle tracking and survival course for US military based there. Malaysia also receives technical training, such as pilot training and the Defense Resources Management Institute MTT here at the Defense College, under the Foreign Military Sales program.

The benefit of these training programs extends far beyond the tactical or technical skills that are acquired at in the courses. They provide an opportunity at all grade levels for our soldiers, sailors and airmen to forge

con't on page 15 >

sketched was simply the message that this is a war of total aggression to destroy the bastion of Islamic civilisation and that next in line would be other Muslim nations.

The modern media now completely in the hand of political pundits, has been extremely successful to paint this picture of a divided and fragmented world. There seems to be a conscious attempt to divide friends and foes into camps. It is no longer the North-South Divide or the West-East Divide or even the Digital Divide that is threatening and frightening but it is what I call the Demonised Divide. The divide is We are ALL right and You are ALL wrong. We have the Truth, You are Falsehood, We are a Democracy, You are a Dictatorship and finally the matter is put to rest that Your are D'Evil and God is With Us. Of course, the catch phrase is, You are With US – (United States) or You are Against US. You are with Bush or You are with Osama, You are with Blair or with Saddam. You can succeed, if you can demonise the other. Make others believe that God is on your side, and logically the Evil one is the Axis of Terror.

The Demonised Divide is a psychological divide, intended to place a wedge in the very heart of humanity. We are made to condemn and judge people based on their religious beliefs and their way of life. It is a divide founded on prejudice and ironically it is the age-old battle in the name of God but with a new sophistication. Most people do not want to ask the question, Who is Right and Who is Wrong? It is a cultural conditioning that is born, either out of ignorance, on the one hand or anger on the other. The only criteria are economic gains no matter what the consequences. There is no place for transcendental values but only political expediency. There is no place for the dignity of the human person and the protection of the rights of communities and nations.

Part of this divide is also the myth that the only way to peace is through war. For economic growth and modernisation to take place, we need peace and security. With capital and trade liberalisation, the global economy seems to be moving ahead but it is obvious that we cannot run away from recognising the fact that one of the most vital commodities today is oil. It is in this context that it is interesting to note that the members of OPEC are also Muslim countries and most of the European countries, as well as the United States, Canada, Great Britain and Australia are associated with Christianity. Unfortunately, at the core of these rising tensions are the inter-religious conflicts that are closely related to the dehumanising effects of economic and political globalisation. A close study of the rising religious conflicts, especially in South-east Asia and even Bangladesh and Pakistan show that they are a direct spin-off of the growing marginalisation of Muslim communities.

Where then lies the ray of Hope for the future? A close examination of the Message of our Holy Father, Pope John Paul II for the World Day of Peace for 2003 gives us some glimpses as to how Peace on Earth has to become a permanent commitment for all People of Goodwill.

Almost 40 years ago, Pope John XXIII spoke in the context of a new state of disorder with the putting up of the Berlin Wall and the Cuban Missile Crisis. Now at the dawn of a New Millennium, we are being challenged by war and violence and the seeming erosion of the very foundations of our modern civilisation by all sorts of economic and social problems today. Our fears and anxieties are mounting as evidenced not just by threats of terrorists lurking in many of our countries but to realise what an impact the scare of SARS that was induced in so many thousands of people, especially in East and South East Asia.

We are reminded that there is this profound link between what is happening today and the urgency to restore the four fundamental pillar of society today, namely truth, justice, love and freedom. It is these pillars that will seek to restore human dignity and respect human rights without which there can be no universal common good. Ultimately, peace is about a new international moral order that is not possible with a serious consideration for a new constitutional organisation of the human family. But unfortunately, this is not possible if there is no new commitment to moral law and the upholding of truth. Thus our Holy Father makes this vital link between the work for peace and the respect for truth that will lead people of all faiths to spreading a culture of human solidarity and a spirituality and a culture of peace.

It is in this context that we urge you to use the Message of our Holy Father for the World Day of Peace as the focus of our on going reflections as Church. The Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences is in the process of working out the details of a two-day Symposium on the theme *Pacem in Terris* – "Restoring Human Dignity, Respecting Human Rights" and we hope to keep all our readers informed about the proceedings. We would also encourage you to organise a special event, as suggested by our Holy Father himself, to enable all of us in the Church to share the rich insights with all our fellow Christians and also people of other faiths.

Br. Anthony Rogers, FSC

Ushering Democracy into Iraq - Nonviolently

By Metta Spencer

In the United States, apart from a few significant street demonstrations, George W. Bush enjoys enormous support for his war plans. Journalists and pollsters say that this reflects, not some strangely innate blood lust on the part of the population, but two prominent concerns - first, the belief that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction (as if the US itself did not) and, second, the fact that Saddam Hussein is, in fact, a tyrant who represses his own people. The organizers of protests do not, on the whole, propose any alternative, nonviolent way of bringing democracy to Iraq. What is there to demonstrate *for*?

Point well taken. The UN weapons inspectors will reduce the first concern - about Iraq's arsenal - but the second issue remains unresolved. However much one objects to the American plan, it is also unconscionable to acquiesce to a dictator who destroys the lives of his own people. However, three groups of peace activists do object to the war and the existing sanctions while disclaiming responsibility for liberating Iraq from tyranny.

The first group includes those who do not consider democracy important to peace (many of them had also acquiesced to the human rights abuses perpetrated in the name of socialism). The second group consists of people who believe that democracy cannot take root in Iraq now, and that whoever replaces Saddam Hussein will be just as bad, if not worse. They cannot, in conscience, support any worthy but hopeless cause. The third group consists of people who believe that the Iraqi people can rid themselves of their dictator nonviolently, but that such a resistance movement would only be compromised by accepting political or financial support from foreign sources - especially the United States.

This article is addressed primarily to members of the third category. While I understand their qualms about accepting money from such sources as the United States government (which in fact has not offered any), I believe that it is urgently necessary to support the nonviolent activities of an Iraqi opposition movement. (*See the article by Raid Fahmi on page 7 for the perspective of millions of Middle Easterners on this issue.*)

Here I want, first, to appraise the possibility of nonviolently ousting Saddam Hussein; second, to identify the main opposition groups; and third, to consider the prospects for democracy in a post-dictatorship era.

The great majority of Iraqis are not enthusiastic supporters of their leader, despite his claims to that effect. In a referendum held October 15, supposedly 100 percent of the voters supported the extension of Saddam Hussein's presidency for another seven years. Of course, there was no alternative candidate on the ballot. Separate boxes were provided for "Yes" and "No" votes, and anyone present could see where the ballots were placed. It would be

extremely dangerous to vote against the president. On previous occasions, "No" voters have been known to be arrested and dragged away, never to be seen again. The most that might have been achieved by way of opposition would have been increased voter absenteeism, which would have been less dangerous than to vote "No." Iraqi citizens don't have easy ways of showing their displeasure.

On the other hand, according to the Norwegian peace activist Jan Oberg, who recently visited Iraq, the average Iraqi citizen is better informed about current affairs in the West than Europeans and Americans are about Iraq. Any Iraqi caught with a satellite dish is fined the equivalent of \$500, while a person informing against him gets \$250. Nevertheless, some satellite reception does take place, and ordinary TV sets show pirated Hollywood movies, documentaries about Israel, summaries of Western newspapers, belly dance shows, live football matches, and speeches by the president. The Internet and e-mail are spreading, though sanctions have limited their proliferation to the number of computers that can be smuggled into Iraq. Baghdad newspapers offer stories about international affairs and about Western artists and writers that are straight translations of BBC material.

CAN THE REGIME BE OUSTED NONVIOLENTLY?

The well-being of Iraq's citizenry will require that two difficult challenges be met. First, the people must rid themselves of Saddam Hussein's totalitarian regime, and second, a new democratic government must be instituted in a country that is rife with religious, ethnic, clan, and ideological factionalism, and where freedom has never been a way of life. Preparations should be undertaken immediately to implement both of these changes, since if reasonable plans are not undertaken promptly, the opportunities will soon be lost. Indeed, it already is terribly late to start such campaigns.

I will not even discuss whether the Iraqi people deserve to control the circumstances of their own lives, but will assume that every reader can grasp that significant truth. The question is not whether it is desirable to get rid of a dictator, but whether it is feasible, and whether the successor government will constitute any improvement. That is why the challenge of nonviolently toppling Saddam should not be considered in isolation from the realistic opportunities for the subsequent establishment of democracy. A reasonable argument can be made for favorable outcomes on both issues, though it would be truly wrong to underestimate the extent of the difficulty.

There will be serious costs, but all other alternatives may cost even more.

There is a growing independent movement for democracy both inside Iraq and in the émigré community. For example, on October 22, two astonishing demonstrations occurred at the Baghdad Ministry of Information, where several protestors demanded information about their imprisoned relatives. After they were broken up by police, the Information Minister said he would try to account for the whereabouts of their lost relatives. "Something like this has never happened before," said Wamid Nadhmi, a political science professor at Baghdad University. "It's a very, very important and unusual event."

One émigré leader is an exiled journalist, Ismail Zayer, who lives in the Netherlands. He coordinates a nonviolent democratic opposition group, "No to Saddam," which advocates a "third choice" - neither war nor keeping Saddam in power. Zayer supports human rights everywhere and claims that "nonviolence is a new trend in Arabic politics. We are aware of Palestinian nonviolence and are trying to team up with them." Zayer believes that the power of Iraq's leadership is crumbling. He is working with supportive organizations in the United States - especially the International Center for Nonviolent Conflict in Washington, D.C. - a small, private nongovernmental organization headed by Jack DuVall.

In Virginia last January DuVall's organization held a session on strategic nonviolent conflict. Iraqi Kurds met with organizers of nonviolent struggles from South America, the US Civil Rights Movement, Chile, Poland, Mongolia, and Serbia.

DuVall and his colleague Peter Ackerman - both scholar - activists who have studied numerous historical cases of nonviolent resistance - are training Iraqi exiles who are willing to work for a nonviolent overthrow of Saddam Hussein. Ackerman is chair of the board of overseers of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. With the recent example of the successful overthrow of Slobodan Milosevic in mind, they maintain that a similar kind of civilian insurrection is a realistic way for Iraqi people to topple Saddam.

They represent a minority view. Most of the recognized Iraqi opposition groups expect that the United States will lead a coalition to unseat the dictator, and believe that nothing short of armed force from abroad will accomplish such a change. The power of nonviolent resistance has never been comprehended widely and even when it has proved successful, people often tend to discount it as a fluke or attribute it to other factors. Ackerman and DuVall, strongly influenced by the eminent peace researcher Gene Sharp, maintain that the success or failure of nonviolence depends on choices made among a vast number of techniques. The goal is not to make a symbolic point, but to triumph by strategically using

methods that work precisely against the circumstances that are holding tyranny in place. Nonviolent strategies require the same kind of intelligence as the planning of military engagements. Fortunately, their victims ordinarily are far fewer.

Ackerman and DuVall acknowledge that Saddam's rule may be as brutal as that of any dictator since Stalin. On the other hand, he does not enjoy the support that Stalin had - an entrenched party system, backed by ideological zealots. Instead, his hold on power depends more on personal loyalties, material rewards, and mortal penalties. If a campaign against him began with civilian-based incidents of disruption that were dispersed around the country, offering no convenient targets, then any crack-down would depend on the outermost, least reliable members of Saddam's repressive apparatus. If the resisters made it clear to police and soldiers that they were not viewed as the enemy, then the realization that Saddam was being opposed openly would lessen the danger of carrying out further acts of resistance. As opposition became more visible, there would be new places for defectors to meet.

"Saddam recognizes that he can't fight a battle to repress a population on all fronts," says Ackerman. "He has to terrorize to get compliance. The more people he employs to terrorize the population, statistically speaking, the more unreliable his security force. There are elements of the Iraqi Republican Guard he is afraid to have in Baghdad."

Ackerman and DuVall point out that when a nonviolent movement begins, most people think success is impossible, because they can just see the costs of resisting, rather than the costs that the resisters can impose on those in power. Dictatorial regimes are only as tolerant as required to maintain the façade of internal or external legitimacy. Not only gentle, polite regimes have been overthrown, but also some that brutalized their opponents.

"Strategic nonviolent action is not about being nice to your oppressor, much less having to rely on his niceness," say Ackerman and DuVall. "It's about dissolving the foundations of his power and forcing him out. It is possible in Iraq."

But what then? There would be no point in getting rid of Saddam Hussein, only to see him succeeded by another dictator who would rule the same way. Therefore, whenever preparations are made to launch a nonviolent resistance movement, plans must be laid for establishing a democratic regime that will hold together over the long term.

DEMOCRACY IN A POST-TOTALITARIAN IRAQ

The prospects of attaining cooperation among the disparate Iraqi political groups seem bleak. Opposition political groups cannot openly function within any part of

Iraq that is controlled by Saddam Hussein's government. Indeed, the secret police includes a significant fraction of the population (as in Romania under Ceaucescu and East Germany during the Communist regime), making private discussions of political matters dangerous. Even remote Iraqi villages that lack electricity are well supplied with political informants.

Not only does the regime repress political criticism, but the opposition groups themselves are so divided that pluralistic politics would be difficult, even if circumstances permitted openness.

KURDS

The Kurds, who constitute 19 percent of the Iraqi population, live in the Kurdistan Autonomous Region (KAR) of northern Iraq. That region was established in the 1970s but relations were always tense and, during the Iran-Iraq War of 1980-88, Kurdish guerrillas attacked the Iraqi regime, with help from Iran. In retaliation, Saddam Hussein waged war against the strongholds of the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP), even using chemical weapons in thousands of villages. After the 1991 Gulf War, President George H. W. Bush incited rebellion among the Kurds, without providing assistance for their troops against Saddam's forces. The Kurdish insurrection was crushed and some 1.5 million Kurds fled into Iran and Turkey. Baghdad forces regained control of the autonomous region, but then Western troops forced them out of the security zone. Today, most Kurds mistrust the United States, expecting that Washington might grant Turkey even greater influence in northern Iraq in exchange for the right to use Turkish land as bases for military action against Iraq. For its part, the Turkish government is anxious not to encourage Kurds, since many issues with their own separatist Kurds remain unresolved.

The two main Kurdish parties in KAR - the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP) and Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) - have sometimes fought against each other. For example, in 1996 the KDP sought aid from the Iraqi troops to gain control of PUK land. However, the two parties now are sharing power in a relatively civil way. Together they have a total of about 40,000 troops, which the Americans view as potentially comparable to the oppositional function of the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan. However, the Kurds may be unwilling to undertake any such risks, especially now that they enjoy significant levels of freedom and are prospering from access to the cheap fuel and profits of oil smuggling operations that the Iraq regime encourages.

Besides, despite their strength in numbers, the Kurdish parties have apparently been losing influence within the opposition groups and are not thought capable of leading a movement to overthrow the regime. To do so, they would have to compromise with other ethnic groups - notably

the Arabs, Turkmens, and Assyrians, all of which have expatriate communities and political groups.

SHIA

The Shias make up about 60 percent of Iraq's 22 million people. (The ruling group in Baghdad has long been dominated by Sunni Muslims - a group that constitutes only 16 percent of Iraq's population.) Mostly based in the south, the Shia are unlikely to cooperate with a US-led invasion, since they reportedly doubt that it is the way to overthrow Saddam Hussein. In 1991 they did participate in an uprising against the Iraqi president, along with other groups, but this effort was crushed, with the loss of tens of thousands of lives, mainly because the US did not offer military help, despite having incited the insurrection.

The Shiite opposition is supported by Iran and continues to maintain a military organization of between 7,000 and 15,000 men. Their organization is the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCIRI), which is based in Tehran. There are also other Shia groups functioning within Iraq. Not surprisingly, at a meeting of opposition groups in London this fall, the Shiite delegates stated that they did not want a federation in Iraq, and that nothing would succeed in replacing Baghdad as the capital of the country.

DISUNITY UNDER AN UMBRELLA?

The entire exiled Iraqi opposition movement comprises mostly Kurds and Shiites, but it also includes ethnic and secular communities, such as Turkmens, Assyrians, and Communists. The largest effort to coordinate these various communities has taken place within an umbrella organization, the Iraqi National Congress (INC), which was formed in 1992 and is now the best-known organization. It is based in London.

Washington has attempted in the past to consult with opposition groups, to support and to increase unity among them. In 1998 the US Congress authorized expending nearly \$100 million for anti-Saddam activities, but not for combat training. A large portion of the money was to be distributed to the INC, which produces satellite TV programs for Iraq. However, the organization's accounting procedures came under attack and most of the money was never administered.

Indeed, some observers are apprehensive about the quality of leadership available within the entire spectrum of exiled Iraqis. The *Sunday Herald* in Glasgow even ran an article by Cambridge lecturer Glen Rangala, titled, "Unveiled: The Thugs Bush Wants in Place of Saddam," that named the most probable successors of the Iraqi president. One is a former general, Nizar Al-Khazraji, who led the Iraqi army during the invasion of Kuwait and who is the most senior figure ever to have defected from Saddam's regime. He has been blamed for the use of

chemical weapons against the Kurds in the 1980s - a charge that he calls a calculated smear. Another influential Iraqi is Ahmad Al-Chalabi, a former banker and Shia who fled to London in 1989 under charges of embezzlement. He took over the INC for a while and is still often referred to as the "future president of Iraq," despite the fact that about half the money the US gave to the INC during his leadership was not properly accounted for. He remains popular among some factions of American strategists.

By this past summer, as the Bush administration was gearing up for war, many doubts were emerging about the merit of "changing the regime" unless it was clear what kind of democratic regime would replace the dictatorship. In May, a three-day conference was held in Erbil, Iraqi Kurdistan, under the auspices of a British organization, the Westminster Foundation for Democracy. There were 130 participants - academics, clergy, journalists, chieftains, and students from three universities and different ethnic, ideological, and religious backgrounds - who called for sanctions to be lifted, for the development of civil society, for democratic reforms, and for an integration of the whole region, modeled after the European Union.

In July, the US State Department began holding "working group" meetings to bring the Iraqi factions together. These meetings included the INC (which continues to enjoy strong backing from Washington), plus the Kurdish parties; the London-based Iraqi National Accord (which comprises former members of the ruling Ba'ath Party); the Constitutional Monarchy Movement, and the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq, which is the main Shiite Muslim organization.

Not many of these groups see eye to eye. The question is, can a viable democratic regime be created from such material? The prospects are not promising. At our press time in mid-December they had just convened a long-delayed conference in London. Some 300 delegates attended, representing the whole political spectrum of parties, plus ethnic and religious groups. They promised to keep working toward a common program. The attitude in the United States remains mixed. Some strategists, skeptical about the capacity of expatriate political groups to work together, prefer the idea of fostering a coup by Iraqi military leaders. Yet others prefer turning post-Saddam Iraq over to the United Nations as a protectorate (perhaps along the same lines as Kosovo) to evade the (to them) distasteful task of "nation-building." The prospect of unseating the regime by nonviolent means and instituting a truly democratic regime is rarely considered.

ONE IRAQI'S PLAN FOR DEMOCRACY

Laith Kubba is an Iraqi who works in Washington D. C. with the National Endowment for Democracy, a private, nonprofit organization created in 1983 to strengthen democratic institutions around the world through

nongovernmental efforts. The Endowment is governed by an independent, nonpartisan board of directors. Although some émigré Iraqis worry about Kubba's closeness to the US State Department (they demand that any opposition group remain financially and politically remote from American influences) others worry about the opposite problem - that, apart from the Kurds, no Iraqi democratic opposition groups receive financial help from the US government.

Kubba believes democracy is possible in all Muslim countries, including Iraq. He maintains that there is nothing in Islamic texts and traditions to interfere with democratization, for the cultural obstacle is not religious, but only a deficit of modernity. Eventually there will be a regime change in Iraq, but none of the options suggested to date is workable, in his opinion, so he offers the following proposals of his own.

The fragmented communities of Shi'ites, Kurds, and Sunnis must manage a transition that is difficult, Kubba says, but not impossible. The important thing is to create an inclusive interim power-sharing administration that will maintain order while allowing all the interest groups to express their ideas. The most urgent step will be to hold a constitutional assembly and plan for a free, fair referendum on ratification, while maintaining law and order.

The last thing Iraq needs is another strongman, says Kubba. Instead, the interim administration should have three temporary councils. One would function as a lower house for deputies appointed or elected by political groups. Opposition organizations, whether in exile or in northern Iraq, could fill up to three-quarters of its 200 seats.

The second council would be a sort of senate, with 100 seats mainly for tribal, religious, and ethnic dignitaries. It would give traditional leaders a role and ensure the inclusion of minorities such as Turkmens, Chaldeans, and Assyrian Christians. These two councils would nominate members of the constitutional assembly, but should stay out of administrative matters.

A third council would handle national security and control weapons and armed men, preventing the outbreak of private warfare. It would include officers from the current Iraqi military and security establishment, plus representatives of the political opposition organizations named above. Kubba proposes allowing most of Saddam's ordinary civilian bureaucrats, as opposed to secret police, to keep their jobs.

Overseeing the transition would be a three-member presidency with authority over the three temporary councils. There would be one senior figure from the north, the centre, and the south - all with untarnished records of integrity. The presidency would appoint cabinet ministers, consulting with the KDP and PUK regarding nominations concerning the north and with the SCIRI regarding the south.

Kubba acknowledges that this plan will not please everyone, but says it would allow for a legitimate and legal

transfer of power. It makes existing armed groups part of the solution rather than part of the problem.

CONCLUSION

George W. Bush can prevent a war against Iraq merely by deciding not to launch it. He can also improve the quality of life for ordinary Iraqi citizens by agreeing to end the harsh sanctions that have killed so many people - especially innocent children. But neither of these decisions alone would bring democracy and human security to the Iraqi citizens. Basically, the people must claim those rights by their own efforts, ousting the dictator and establishing a better government in which old ethnic, ideological, and religious enmities are constrained within pluralistic tolerance.

This can be done. It cannot be done overnight, and it cannot be done at all without moral and financial support. DuVall's Center for Nonviolence hopes eventually to have a \$100 million private endowment to challenge dictators, but the money does not exist for that purpose yet. Nongovernmental organizations and, especially, governments themselves have little faith in the potential of nonviolent resistance. Too often, they are afraid of appearing naïve by supporting a cause that has little chance of success. No one can be sanguine that Iraq's dictatorship will collapse easily or without imposing pain on the domestic opposition. However, the cost of supporting an autonomous nonviolent movement calling for democracy is a pittance in comparison to the probable alternative - war - whereas the payoff is enormous in terms of lives

potentially saved, and as a way of recovering the respect and trust of Muslims throughout the world.

It's a promising investment. So far, however, no government has offered recognition or support comparable to that devoted to ousting Milosevic. Private sources of assistance are even less available, but unless democratic peace activists support their true allies among Iraqis, public opinion will waver and fail to block Bush's war plans.

In mid-December, however, US Secretary of State Colin Powell announced a major American policy shift that, if fulfilled, will certainly bear upon these issues. According to Powell, the US will henceforth not play favorites, aligning with some Middle Eastern autocrats while demanding that others introduce reforms. He declared that the rulers of oil-rich Persian Gulf countries have failed to bring either democracy or prosperity to the Arab world. "I no longer think that is affordable and sustainable. America wants to align itself with the people of the Middle East." It will promote democratic change and social reforms throughout the region.

If this really is the US policy it may have been designed to mollify Arab indignation over the US double standard (attacking Iraq while retaining other Islamic dictators as allies). Nevertheless, a universalistic policy of reform will be welcomed by the despairing Arab populations. It will also create new opportunities and challenges for peace activists. We should promote nonviolent ways of attaining these goals ourselves.

Source: **Peace Magazine**, January - March 2003.

Peace

Peace is not something that happens to you, nor is it the absence of anything happening to you. Peace comes from who and what you are, and how you choose to be. The world around you can be full of turmoil and strife, and yet you can be at peace in your own heart.

Peace is one of the surest signs of strength. Those who lack confidence feel the need to lash out. Those who are strong have what it takes to stay calm. When your identity and fulfillment are tied to fleeting, superficial things it is impossible to remain at peace. When you invest your being in true and lasting values, and when you remain ever vigilant to those values, you develop the confidence and strength to be peaceful.

Peace cannot be forced on anyone, and true peace cannot be forcibly taken from anyone. Peace comes to those who are strong enough and wise enough to choose it, and with that peace comes an abundance of living which is otherwise impossible to know. Choose peace, and by the strength of your choice, help it to grow.

— **Ralph Marston**

Orientation Concept of International Young Christian Students (IYCS) Asia for 2003-2006

In support and appreciation for the contribution of the youth for the Church in Asia, we are reproducing here the Orientation Concept of the IYCS Asia. We hope to journey with them in their efforts to find peace, love and justice, not only in Asia, but throughout the world. The Editor

Introduction:

In the spirit of the YCS, we 61 delegates* from 14 Asian countries representing members, animators and chaplains of the YCS movement, invitees and observers took part in the 9th Asian Session & Council, held at We-Train International House, Bangkok, Thailand, from 23 May – 2 June 2003. We actively participated in the process of discovering the realities of Asia and of our Movement based on our See-Judge-Act (Review of Life) methodology. From the new challenges that arose from our discussions on the ASC 2003 theme: “With Faith & Heart, We Call All Students to Build a Culture of Peace & Love,” we are able to find meaningful Orientations for the coming three years.

See:

We, the participants, recall our past and become aware of what is happening presently in real life. And we realize that our understanding of life depends to a great extent on reflecting on our own experiences and on our exposure to new experiences. With the sharing of group reports of our exposure, our country realities and YCS activities, we get a clearer picture of life and of the basic life skills (behind See-Judge-Act methodology) needed by students to use our imaginations for creativity to “have life and have it to the full” (Jn 10:10).

Globalization: Through the exposure observation, group discussion, sharing and deeper analysis, we recognize that we cannot escape from the impact of globalization in Asia where there is incredible speed of rapid change, tremendous exposure to new experiences, greater opportunities for self-development, much more mobility and erosion of authority. However, a great deal of uncertainty awaits us; hence the challenge to young people is to be responsible in making self-controlled choices.

Education: We realize in the study session through social analysis and the sharing of our reflection that students are dissatisfied with the present educational system due to lack of creativity in school life (focuses on memorizing and examinations), there is competition so strong that the students have to spend more time on

academic studies than learning other basic life skills (listening, speaking, asking questions etc.). Also, the high cost of education favors only those who can afford it, while many cannot even enjoy the basic education which is the right for all. So, we became aware that it is time to think analytically about an alternative education which can inculcate the values like peace and love.

We begin to see that material life, nature and distribution of resources are not according to God’s plan of creation. Thus, it is significant to look deeper and discover personal and interpersonal world in particular situations. At this stage, we move to consider the meaning of life and the values and the spiritual life of the people.

Judge:

We come to know through deep reflection from our chaplains, animators and also from our own reflection and sharing on how Jesus accompanies us in our lives. From the sharing of our experiences of God, we understand and learn to value our spirituality which must be nourished by being alone, silent and praying in our daily lives.

We are enlightened by the spiritual values and teachings of all religions and convinced about the importance of reading the Scriptures and meditation. As Christians, we are encouraged to value the Holy Eucharist and the Sacraments as a way of getting close to God, knowing and understanding the mind, heart and spirit of Jesus.

While we respect what other people believe and learn from their cultures and our YCS Spirituality reflected on our Asian Creed, we believe that:

- the Father’s creation is for all and we respect all people as being equal in dignity.
- Jesus is our model of a ‘life’ especially for the poor and the marginalized.
- the Holy Spirit inspires, strengthens and encourages us to denounce bad news and announce good news.

con’t on page 28 >

Br. Anthony Rogers, FSC

Editor

Editorial Consultants:

Manolita Gonzales

Ma. Celeste S.C. Gimena

Teresita M. Aparente

Aurelio Joaquin

Info is the newsletter of the Office for Human Development of the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences.

News and articles may be freely reproduced with acknowledgement except those reproduced "with permission."

**Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences
OFFICE FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

1451 P. Guevarra St., Sta. Cruz, Manila 1014, Philippines
P.O. Box 180, Manila 1099, Philippines

PRINTED MATTER AIR MAIL

con't from page 27 >

Act:

With the clearer understanding of our YCS spirituality, we move towards evaluation of our experiences in the past three years. As young Christian students, we are determined to build a culture of peace and love hence, we prioritize the following challenges to make plans of actions at the Asian level:

- 1) Greater awareness of YCS realities
- 2) Formation of animators, chaplains and student leaders
- 3) Integration of ASC 2003 Orientation in the formation programs

- 4) Strengthening the national and international coordination towards unity

- 5) Mobilize sufficient human and financial resources

And so, with full understanding of faith in our hearts, we call all youth and students to make a difference and together build a culture of peace and love in Asia and in the world.

* (YCS Bangladesh, YCS/YSM India, YCS Sri Lanka, YCS Nepal, YCS Pakistan, YCS Thailand, YCS Singapore, YCS Vietnam, SCA Indonesia, YCS Indonesia, YCS Taiwan, YCS Hong Kong, CYA Korea, YCS Taiwan, Laos Youth Group, IYCS Asian Team, IYCS International Coordinator, Pan-African Coordinator, EASY Net Coordinator)