

TERRORISM: A FALSE THREAT

John Scales Avery

December 15, 2019

Introduction

Terrorism, a pseudothreat

This book consists mainly of chapters and articles that I have previously published, although a considerable amount of new material has been added. The book deals with the terrible consequences of the so-called “War on Terror” which followed the 9/11 attacks.

Is the threat of terrorism real? Or is it like the barking of a dog driving a herd? The threat of catastrophic climate change is very real indeed. The threat to future global food security is real too. Already 11 million children die every year from malnutrition and poverty-related causes. The threat to human civilization and the biosphere posed by a possible Third World War is real. The threat of exhaustion of non-renewable resources and economic collapse is real. The dangers associated with our unstable fractional reserve banking system are also real. Beside these all too real threats to our future, the threat of terrorism is vanishingly small.

Millions starve. Millions die yearly from preventable diseases. Millions die as a consequence of wars. Compared with these numbers, the total count of terrorist victims is vanishingly small. It is even invisible compared with the number of people killed yearly in automobile accidents.

The official story of 9/11 is untrue

There is strong evidence, available to everyone who is willing to look at it on the Internet, which shows that the official version of 9/11 is untrue, and that the US government made the disaster worse than it otherwise would have been in order to justify not only an unending “War on Terror”, but also the abridgement of civil liberties within the United States. But very few people wish to challenge the official version of the attack on the World Trade Center. Those who accept the official version are, by definition, respectable citizens, while those who challenge it are “leftists” and “probably terrorist sympathizers”. As George W. Bush said, “You are either for us, or you are against us”.

Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan

Bush's response to the 9/11 attacks seems to have been to inquire from his advisors whether he was now free to invade Iraq. According to former counterterrorism chief, Richard Clarke, Bush was "obsessed" with Iraq as his principal target after 9/11.

The British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, was a guest at a private White House dinner nine days after the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington. Sir Christopher Meyer, former UK Ambassador to Washington, was also present at the dinner. According to Meyer, Blair said to Bush that they must not get distracted from their main goal - dealing with the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, and Bush replied: "I agree with you Tony. We must deal with this first. But when we have dealt with Afghanistan, we must come back to Iraq." Faced with the prospect of wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan, Blair did not protest, according to Meyer.

During the summer of 2002, Bush and Blair discussed Iraq by telephone. A senior official from Vice-President Dick Cheney's office who read the transcript of the call is quoted by the magazine *Vanity Fair* as saying: "The way it read was that come what may, Saddam was going to go; they said that they were going forward, they were going to take out the regime, and they were doing the right thing. Blair did not need any convincing. There was no 'Come on, Tony, we've got to get you on board'. I remember reading it and then thinking, 'OK, now I know what we're going to be doing for the next year.'"

On June 1, 2002, Bush announced a new US policy which not only totally violated all precedents in American foreign policy but also undermined the United Nations Charter and international law. Speaking at the graduation ceremony of the US Military Academy at West Point he asserted that the United States had the right to initiate a preemptive war against any country that might in the future become a danger to the United States. "If we wait for threats to fully materialize", he said, "we will have waited too long." He indicated that 60 countries might fall into this category, roughly a third of the nations of the world.

The assertion that the United States, or any other country, has the right to initiate preemptive wars specifically violates Chapter 1, Articles 2.3 and 2.4, of the United Nations Charter. These require that "All members shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security and justice are not endangered", and that "All members shall

refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.” The UN Charter allows a nation that is actually under attack to defend itself, but only until the Security Council has had time to act.

Murder and torture in the name of fighting terrorism

With the end of the Cold War, a new justification for the colossal US military budget had to be found. The answer was the “War on Terror”. No matter that terrorism is a crime committed by individuals rather than by nations, and that police action rather than war is the appropriate answer. Whole nations were accused of “sponsoring terror”, and invaded. Furthermore, individual terrorist suspects were extrajudicially murdered, for example through drone strikes. Large-scale torture programs were also initiated and justified by the excuse that any method can be used when “fighting terror”.

Of course, the effect of innocent people killed in drone strikes, and the effect of torture programs, was not to reduce the number of terrorists, but to produce more of them and to strengthen their fanaticism. But that was fine with the government, since the real aim of the “War on Terror” was not to end terrorism, but to justify obscenely bloated military budgets.

Progressives can save America

This book is unsparing in its criticism of America’s “War on Terror”. But America is full of good people. Although an enormous river of money from the military-industrial complex (and other corporate oligarchies) controls many corrupt politicians, progressives are fighting back. We must unite behind progressives and combat militarism, not only in the United States but also throughout the world.

Contents

1	ARE WE BEING DRIVEN LIKE CATTLE?	9
1.1	Terrorism is actually a trivial threat	9
1.2	9/11 truth: Is it a question of truth, or of identity?	10
1.3	<i>Beyond Misinformation</i>	17
1.4	<i>9/11 Unmasked</i>	18
1.5	The arrogance of power	20
1.6	Terrorism: a pseudothreat	21
2	WHY WAR?	25
2.1	Ethology	25
2.2	Population genetics	30
2.3	Hope for the future	32
2.4	Religion and ethnic identity	32
2.5	Tribal markings; ethnicity; pseudospeciation	33
2.6	The arms race prior to World War 1	42
2.7	Krupp, Thyssen and Germany's steel industry	44
2.8	Colonialism and the outbreak of the First World War	44
2.9	Prescott Bush and Hitler	45
2.10	Fritz Thyssen supports Hitler's rise to power	47
2.11	Eisenhower's farewell address	53
2.12	The nuclear arms race	55
2.13	Global famine produced by nuclear war	61
2.14	Dangers of nuclear power generation	63
2.15	Military-industrial complexes today	68
2.16	A culture of violence	76
3	THE MEDIA SABOTAGE PROGRESSIVE POLITICS	95
3.1	Restoring Democracy in the United States	95
3.2	Europe needs to be independent	96
3.3	Secrecy and democracy are incompatible	99
3.4	Democracy and freedom of information	102
3.5	Racism, colonialism and exceptionalism	103
3.6	Attacks on Iran, past and present	104

3.7	Some contributions of Islamic culture	107
3.8	Politeness in multi-ethnic societies	110
3.9	The 2016 US presidential election	111
3.10	Sabotaging Jeremy Corbyn	122
3.11	The media are part of our educational system	125
3.12	Humanity betrayed by the mass media	130
3.13	The propaganda model of the mass media	131
3.14	Institutional and cultural inertia	132
4	US WARS, INTERVENTIONS, AND COUPS	141
4.1	Harold Pinter's Nobel Lecture	141
4.2	List of US wars, interventions and coups	152
4.3	An empire of bases	187
4.4	Operation Condor	189
5	THE DEEP STATE	199
5.1	Edward Snowden's revelations	199
5.2	Secrecy and dark acts	200
5.3	<i>The United States of Secrets</i>	207
5.4	Censorship of the news	208
5.5	Coups, torture and illegal killing	208
5.6	Secret trade deals	209
5.7	Secrecy, democracy and nuclear weapons	210
5.8	Freedom from fear	211
5.9	<i>Inside Job</i>	212
5.10	<i>Confessions of an economic hit-man</i>	215
6	TORTURE AND MURDER	217
6.1	Torture in the name of fighting terrorism	217
6.2	Murder in the name of fighting terrorism	228
7	THE FAR RIGHT	235
7.1	Alt-right	235
7.2	Proud Boys	241
7.3	Evangelicals	243
7.4	The El Paso mass murders	249
7.5	Right-wing parties in Europe and elsewhere.	249
7.6	Trump copies Hitler's rhetoric	251
8	PROGRESSIVES CAN SAVE AMERICA	261
8.1	Progressives from the 1960's can inspire us today	261
8.2	Woodstock	261
8.3	Joan Baez	265

8.4	Bob Dylan	269
8.5	Pete Seeger	273
8.6	Protests against the Vietnam War	280
8.7	Progressive Democrats versus the DNC and Nancy Pelosi	290
8.8	Elizabeth Warren	291
8.9	Bernie Sanders	294

Chapter 1

ARE WE BEING DRIVEN LIKE CATTLE?

1.1 Terrorism is actually a trivial threat

As we stand in line for security checks at airports, we may have the distinct feeling that we are being herded like cattle. Air travel has changed, and has become much less pleasant, since the fear of terrorism replaced the fear of communism as the excuse that governments give for diverting colossal sums of money from desperately needed social goals to the bottomless pit of war. Innocent grandmothers, and their grandchildren, are required to remove their shoes and belts. Everyone is treated like a criminal. It is a humiliating experience. We may well feel like dumb driven cattle; and the purpose of the charade is not so much to prevent airliners from being sabotaged as it is to keep the idea of terrorism fresh in our minds.

Is the threat of terrorism real? Or is it like the barking of a dog driving a herd? The threat of climate change is very real indeed. The threat to future global food security is real too. Already 11 million children die every year from malnutrition and poverty-related causes. The threat to human civilization and the biosphere posed by a possible Third World War is real. The threat of exhaustion of non-renewable resources and economic collapse is real. The dangers associated with our unstable fractional reserve banking system are also real. Beside these all too real threats to our future, the threat of terrorism is vanishingly small.

Millions starve. Millions die yearly from preventable diseases. Millions die as a consequence of wars. Compared with these numbers, the total count of terrorist victims is vanishingly small. It is even invisible compared with the number of people killed yearly in automobile accidents.

Terrorism is an invented threat. Our military industrial complexes invented it to take the place of the threat of communism after the end of the Cold War. They invented it so that they would be able to continue spending 1,700,000,000,000 dollars each year on armaments, an amount almost too large to be imagined.

So the people, the driven cattle, have been made to fear terrorism. How was this done? It was easy after 9/11. Could it be that the purpose of the 9/11 disaster was to make people fear terrorism, so that they could be more easily manipulated, more easily deprived of their civil rights, more easily driven into a war against Iraq? There is strong evidence that many highly placed governmental figures knew well in advanced that the World Trade Center would be attacked, and that they made the disaster much worse than it otherwise would have been. This evidence is available on the Internet.

Are we being driven like cattle into another war, by another fake threat? Is Iran really a threat? It is a country which has not attacked any of its neighbors for a century, although it has frequently itself been attacked. Israel has 300 nuclear weapons, and the US has many thousand, yet they claim that Iran's civilian nuclear program is a threat. Is it a real threat, or are we being driven, like cattle, by a false threat.

The precipice towards which we are being driven is very dangerous indeed. There is a real danger that a military attack on Iran could escalate uncontrollably into World War III. We have just passed the 100th anniversary of the start of World War I, and we should remember that this catastrophic conflagration was started as a limited operation by Austria to punish the Serbian nationalists, but it escalated uncontrollably

The Middle East is already a deeply troubled region, and it is a region in which the US and Israel cannot be said to be universally popular. Might not an attack on Iran initiate a revolution in Pakistan, thus throwing Pakistan's nuclear weapons into the conflict on the side of Iran? Furthermore, both China and Russia are staunch allies of Iran. Perhaps they would be drawn into the war.

Let us stop being driven like cattle by invented threats. Let us instead look at the very real dangers that threaten human civilization, and do our utmost to avoid them.

1.2 9/11 truth: Is it a question of truth, or of identity?

"What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account?" Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth

"The human brain was not designed by evolution for finding truth. It was designed for finding advantage." Albert Szent-Györgyi

"History is a set of agreed-upon lies", Napoleon, quoting Fontanelle

When two people tell each other that they believe the same nonsense, a bond is formed between them; and the worse the nonsense, the stronger the bond. This is an aspect of tribalism. The bonding through shared beliefs is, like ritual scarification in African tribes, a mark of identity. This aspect of human nature makes it difficult to find out the truth. For example, any American who casts doubt on the official government-endorsed narrative

of the the events of September 11, 2001 becomes a “conspiracy theorist”, or a “terrorist sympathizer” - in any case certainly not a loyal, upstanding, patriotic citizen. As George W. Bush said shortly after the events, “You are either with us or against us.” It is not a question of truth. It is a question of identity.

But what is the truth? According to testimony given by CIA insider Susan Lindauer, the CIA knew about the planned attack on the World Trade Center as early as April, 2001. According to Lindauer, it was realized that airplanes striking the buildings would not cause their collapse, and so the disaster was deliberately made worse than it otherwise would have been by US government agents, who planted charges of explosives.

Other evidence supports Lindauer’s testimony. Numerous people in New York saved samples of the dust produced by the collapse of the WTC buildings, and chemical analysis of the dust shows the presence of nanothermite, a powerful heat-producing compound which seems to have been used to melt the steel framework of the strongly-constructed sky scrapers. Videos the collapse of the buildings, especially Building 7, show them falling freely in the manner of structures brought down in a controlled demolition. The videos also show molten steel pouring out of the buildings. Furthermore, pools of recently-melted steel were found in the ruins before these were sealed off from the public. An ordinary fire does not produce temperatures high enough to melt steel. New York Fire Department workers report hearing numerous explosions in the WTC buildings before they collapsed.

Thus there is strong evidence, available to everyone who is willing to look at it on the Internet, which shows that the official version of 9/11 is untrue, and that the US government made the disaster worse than it otherwise would have been in order to justify not only an unending “War on Terror”, but also the abridgement of civil liberties within the United States. But very few people wish to challenge the official version of the attack on the World Trade Center. Those who accept the official version are, by definition, respectable citizens, while those who challenge it are “leftists” and “probably terrorist sympathizers”. As George W. Bush said, “You are either for us, or you are against us”.



Figure 1.1: Molten steel pouring from the burning World Trade Center. An ordinary fire is not hot enough to melt steel.



Figure 1.2: Molten steel in the ruins of the World Trade Center.



Figure 1.3: Photo of the World Trade Center shortly before its collapse. Thermite, used for cutting steel in the demolition of buildings, produces white smoke when it burns




Figure 1.4: The type of thermite that seems to have been used for the destruction of WTC 1 and WTC 2 was military-grade nano-thermite, which cannot be purchased by private persons.



Figure 1.5: Building 7 was not hit by any aircraft, and yet it collapsed many hours later, during the afternoon, in a manner that looked exactly like a controlled demolition.



Figure 1.6: Reports of observers who heard explosions are corroborated by MSNBC video footage of reporter Ashleigh Banfield several blocks north of WTC 7. In the video, she hears a loud sound, turns her attention to WTC 7, and says, “Oh my god.... This is it.” About seven seconds after she hears the loud sound, WTC 7 collapses. As David Chandler observes in the video Sound Evidence for Explosions: There were two blasts, followed by seven more regularly spaced all in two and a half seconds. Craig Bartmer’s testimony may come to mind: “The whole time you’re hearing ‘thume, thume, thume, thume, thume.’ ”....



Figure 1.7: This picture shows materials of WTC 1, including multi-ton beams, being explosively ejected several hundred feet in all directions. Physics teacher David Chandler states that “[U]nder the canopy of falling debris, do you see the rapid sequence of explosive ejections of material? Some of the jets have been clocked at over 100 mph.... They’re continuous and widespread. They move progressively down the faces of the building, keeping pace with the falling debris.... The building is being progressively destroyed from the top down by waves of explosions creating a huge debris field.”

1.3 *Beyond Misinformation*

In 2015, Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth Inc. published a 52-page report entitled **Beyond Misinformation**. It can be downloaded from their website at <https://www.ae911truth.org/>. Here are a few quotations from the report.

The history of steel-framed high-rise buildings spans about 100 years. Setting aside the events of September 11, 2001, every total collapse of a steel- framed high-rise building during that period of time has been caused by controlled demolition. In comparison, fires have never caused the total collapse of high-rise buildings, though high-rise building fires occur frequently...

If the destruction of WTC 1, WTC 2, and WTC 7 were caused by fire, this would make them the first steel- framed high-rise buildings in history to suffer total fire-induced collapse (combined with structural damage from the airplane impacts in the case of WTC 1 and WTC 2). They would also be the first fire-induced collapses to exhibit nearly all of the features of controlled demolition and none of the features of fire-induced collapse. Edward Munyak, a fire protection engineer, puts it this way: “Even one progressive global collapse would have been extraordinary. But to have three occur in one day was just beyond comprehension.”...

According to NIST¹, once collapse initiated, WTC 1 and WTC 2 fell in approximately 11 seconds and 9 seconds, respectively, each coming down “essentially in free fall.” To many observers, the speed of collapse was the most striking feature of their destruction. Yet, NIST’s explanation for why WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed “essentially in free fall” was limited to a half-page section of its 10,000-page report titled “Events Following Collapse Initiation.” In this section, NIST attempted to explain the speed and completeness of the collapses simply by saying: “It was not stopped by the floors below. So there was no calculation that we did to determine what is clear from the videos.”...

Not only was molten metal seen pouring out of WTC 2, dozens of eyewitnesses observed it in the debris of all three buildings. A small selection is presented below:

- *Leslie Robertson, a lead engineer in the design of WTC 1 and WTC 2, told an audience: “We were down at the B-1 level and one of the firefighters said, ‘I think you’d be interested in this.’ And they pulled up a big block of concrete, and there was like a little river of steel flowing.”*
- *FDNY Captain Philip Ruvolo recalled with other firefighters seated next to him: “You’d get down below and you’d see molten steel, molten steel, running down the channel rails, like you’re in a foundry, like lava”. Other firefighters chimed in, “Like lava”, “Like lava from a volcano”.*
- *Ken Holden, the Commissioner of the NYC Department of Design and Construction, testified before the 9/11 Commission: “Underground it was still so hot that molten metal dripped down the sides of the wall from building 6”.*

¹NIST, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, produced a report on 9/11 which many regard as a cover-up.

Three scientific studies have documented evidence in the WTC dust that indicates extremely high temperatures during the destruction of WTC 1 and WTC 2 - and possibly WTC 7.

Released in May 2004, the RJ Lee report titled WTC Dust Signature identified “[s]pherical iron and spherical or vesicular silicate particles that result from exposure to high temperature” in the dust.

An earlier 2003 version of RJ Lee’s report observed: “Various metals (most notably iron and lead) were melted during the WTC event, producing spherical metallic particles. Exposure of phases to high heat results in the formation of spherical particles due to surface tension.... Particles of materials that had been modified by exposure to high temperature, such as spherical particles of iron and silicates, are common in the WTC dust...but are not common in normal office dust.” The 2003 version also reported that while iron particles make up only 0.04 percent of normal building dust, they constituted 5.87 percent of the WTC dust.

Iron does not melt until 1,538 °C (2,800 °F), which, as discussed above, cannot be reached by diffuse hydrocarbon fires. Still, even higher temperatures than 1,538 °C were indicated by another discovery documented in RJ Lee’s report...

In April 2009 a group of scientists led by Dr. Niels Harrit, an expert in nano-chemistry who taught chemistry at the University of Copenhagen for over 40 years, published a paper in the Open Chemical Physics Journal titled “Active Thermite Materials Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe”. This paper, which reported the results of experiments conducted on small red-gray, bi-layered chips found in multiple independent WTC dust samples, concluded that the chips were unreacted nano-thermite, a form of thermite with explosive properties engineered at the nano-level.

1.4 9/11 Unmasked

“9/11 Unmasked” is a very recent book by David Ray Griffin and Elizabeth Woodworth. A review of the book in “The Guardian” by Piers Robinson can be found on the following link: <https://off-guardian.org/2018/09/10/9-11-unmasked-by-david-ray-griffin-and-elizabeth-woodworth-a-review/> Here are a few quotations from the review:

Although not a topic for polite conversation, nor a widely recognized ‘acceptable’ issue for mainstream academics and journalists, the issue of 9/11 and the multiple questions that persist with respect to this transformative event continue to bubble under the surface. 9/11 ushered in the global ‘war on terror’, shaping the geo-political agenda of Western governments for almost two decades now and having a deleterious impact on civil liberties across Western liberal democratic states. Torture has been used as part of official policy and there is bulk data collection and surveillance of entire populations.

In recent years, further information has come into the public domain, via the UK Chilcot report regarding the formative stages of the post 9/11 ‘war on terror’: Within days of 9/11 having occurred a British embassy cable reported that ‘the “regime-change hawks” in

Washington are arguing that a coalition put together for one purpose (against international terrorism) could be used to clear up other problems in the region'; Chilcot also published a Bush-Blair communication from the aftermath of 9/11 which discussed phase two of the 'war on terror' and indicated debate over when to 'hit' countries unconnected with Al Qaeda, such as Iraq, Syria and Iran.

Broadly speaking, Chilcot corroborated former Supreme Allied Commander Wesley Clark's claim that he was informed, immediately after 9/11, that seven countries, including Syria, were to be 'taken out' in five years.

It is against this backdrop that "9/11 Unmasked" by David Ray Griffin and Elizabeth Woodworth now emerges. The book is the culmination of seven years work by the 9/11 Consensus Panel which includes 23 experts from fields including physics, chemistry, structural engineering, aeronautical engineering, piloting, airplane crash investigation, medicine, journalism, psychology, and religion.

Another review of the book, by Edward Curtin, has recently been published by TMS Media Service Weekly Digest. It can be reached on the following link: <https://www.transcend.org/tms/2018-fakest-fake-news-the-u-s-governments-9-11-conspiracy-theory/> . Here are some excerpts from the review:

For seventeen years we have been subjected to an onslaught of U.S. government and corporate media propaganda about 9/11 that has been used to support the "war on terror" that has resulted in millions of deaths around the world. It has been used as a pretext to attack nations throughout the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa. It has led to a great increase in Islamophobia since Muslims were accused of being responsible for the attacks. It has led to a crackdown on civil liberties in the United States, the exponential growth of a vast and costly national security apparatus, the spreading of fear and anxiety on a great scale, and a state of permanent war that is pushing the world toward a nuclear confrontation. And much, much more.

The authors of this essential book, David Ray Griffin and Elizabeth Woodworth, and all their colleagues who have contributed to this volume, have long been at the front lines trying to wake people up to the real news about 9/11. They have battled against three U.S. presidents, a vast propaganda machine "strangely" allied with well-known leftists, and a corporate mass media intent on serving deep-state interests, all of whom have used illogic, lies, and pseudo-science to conceal the terrible truth. Yet despite the establishment's disinformation and deceptions, very many people have come to suspect that the official story of the September 11, 2001 attacks is not true.

With the publication of "9/11Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation", they now have a brilliant source book to use to turn their suspicions into certitudes. And for those who have never doubted the official account (or accounts would be more accurate), reading this book should shock them into reality, because it is not based on speculation, but on carefully documented and corroborated facts, exacting logic, and the scientific method...

This research process went on for many years, with the findings reported in this book. The Consensus 9/11 Panel provides evidence against the official claims in nine categories:

1. *The Destruction of the Twin Towers*
2. *The Destruction of WTC 7*
3. *The Attack on the Pentagon*
4. *The 9/11 Flights*
5. *US Military Exercises on and before 9/11*
6. *Claims about Military and Political Leaders*
7. *Osama bin Laden and the Hijackers*
8. *Phone Calls from the 9/11 Flights*
9. *Insider Trading*

Each category is introduced and then broken down into sub-sections called points, which are examined in turn. For example, the destruction of the Twin Towers has points that include, "The Claim That No One Reported Explosions in the Twin Towers," "The Claim That the Twin Towers Were Destroyed by Airplane Impacts, Jet Fuel, and Fire," "The Claim That There Were Widespread Infernos in the South Tower," etc. Each point is introduced with background, the official account is presented, then the best evidence, followed by a conclusion. Within the nine categories there are 51 points examined, each meticulously documented through quotations, references, etc., all connected to 875 endnotes that the reader can follow. It is scrupulously laid out and logical, and the reader can follow it sequentially or pick out an aspect that particularly interests them...

As a grandson of a Deputy Chief of the New York Fire Department (343 firefighters died on 9/11), I find it particularly despicable that the government agency, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), that was charged with investigating the collapse of the Towers and Building 7, would claim that no one gave evidence of explosions in the Twin Towers, when it is documented by the fastidious researcher Graeme MacQueen, a member of The 9/11 Consensus Panel, that over 100 firefighters who were at the scene reported hearing explosions in the towers. One may follow endnote 22 to MacQueen's research and his sources that are indisputable. There are recordings.

1.5 The arrogance of power

9/11 is an example of the arrogance of power. There is strong evidence of a governmental lie, but very few dare to point to it. Like Lady Macbeth, the US government is saying, "What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account?" However, we should remember that things ended badly for Macbeth and his wife.

The fear-enforced conformity of Nazi Germany is also an example of the arrogance of power. There are strong parallels between 9/11 and the way in which the Nazi's used the Reichstag Fire as an excuse both for attacking civil liberties within Germany, and for invading Poland. All of us remember seeing in films the quasi-religious expressions of ecstasy on the faces of enormous crowds of Germans as they listened to Hitler's speeches. Fanatical nationalism appeals to primitive emotions of tribalism which all of us have inherited from our remote ancestors; but in the faces of the crowds listening to Hitler's hypnotic speeches

we can see something more: conformity enforced by fear. But what about ourselves? Are we really fearless? If so, why don't we speak truth to power? Why don't we challenge governmental lies?

Attempts to rule the world through military power were tyrannical and undemocratic under the Roman Empire, tyrannical under the British Empire, and tyrannical under Napoleon. The ambition of military world dominance was evil when it was the aim of Hitler; and it is evil today when practiced by any country, much more so now than in earlier times because of the invention of nuclear weapons.

1.6 Terrorism: a pseudothreat

Globally, the number of people killed by terrorism is vanishingly small compared to the number of children who die from starvation every year. It is even vanishingly small compared with the number of people who are killed in automobile accidents. It is certainly small compared with the number of people killed in wars aimed at gaining western hegemony over oil-rich regions of the world.

In order to make the American people really fear terrorism, and in order to make them willing to give up their civil liberties, a big event was needed, something like the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center.

There is strong evidence, available on the Internet for anyone who wishes to look at it, that the US government knew well in advance that the 9/11 attacks would take place, and that government agents made the disaster worse than it otherwise would have been by planting explosives in the buildings of the World Trade Center. For example, CIA insider Susan Lindauer has testified that the US government knew about the planned attacks as early as April, 2001. Other experts have testified that explosives must have been used to bring the buildings down.

Numerous samples of the dust from the disaster were collected by people in New York City, and chemical analysis of the dust has shown the presence of nanothermite, a compound that produces intense heat. Pools of recently-melted steel were found in the ruins of the buildings before these were sealed off from the public. An ordinary fire does not produce temperatures high enough to melt steel.

Thus it seems probable that the US government participated in the 9/11 attacks, and used them in much the same way that the Nazis used the Reichstag fire, to abridge civil liberties and to justify a foreign invasion. Soon afterward, the Patriot Act was passed. It's Orwellian name is easily understood by anyone who has read "1984".

But in Shelley's words, "We are many; they are few!" The people who want democracy greatly outnumber those who profit from maintaining a government based on secrecy and fear. Let us "rise like lions after slumbers, in unvanquishable numbers". Let us abolish governmental secrecy and reclaim our democracy.

Some Suggestions for further reading

1. Bazant, Zdenek and Le, Jia-Liang, *Why the Observed Motion History of the World Trade Center Towers is Smooth*, Journal of Engineering Mechanics (January 2011)
2. Chandler, David, *NIST Finally Admits Free Fall*, video (February 2010)
3. Chandler, David, *North Tower Exploding* video (February 2010)
4. Chandler, David, *Sound Evidence for Explosions*, video (July 2010)
5. Chandler, David. *The Destruction of the World Trade Center North Tower and Fundamental Physics*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (February 2010)
6. Chandler, David, *Free Fall and Building 7 on 9/11* (Reprinted by AE911Truth in April 2014)
7. Cole, Jonathan, *9/11 Experiments: The Mysterious Eutectic Steel*, video (July 2010)
8. FEMA, *World Trade Center Building Performance Study: Data Collection, Preliminary Observations, and Recommendations* (May 2002)
9. Fire Department of New York (FDNY), *World Trade Center Task Force Interviews*, The New York Times (October 2001 - January 2002)
10. Griffin, David Ray, *The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7*, (2009)
11. Harrit, Niels (et al.), *Active Thermite Materials Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe*, Open Chemical Physics Journal (April 2009)
12. Jones, Steven (et al.), *Extremely High Temperatures during the World Trade Center Destruction*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (February 2008)
13. Jones, Steven, *Revisiting 9/11/2001 - Applying the Scientific Method*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (May 2007)
14. Jones, Steven, *Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Collapse Completely?*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (September 2006)
15. Legge, Frank and Szamboti, Anthony, *9/11 and the Twin Towers: Sudden Collapse Initiation was Impossible*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (December 2007)
16. Lee, Richard J., RJ Lee Group, Inc., *WTC Dust Signature* (May 2004)
17. MacQueen, Graeme, *Eyewitness Evidence of Explosions in the Twin Towers*, Chapter Eight, The 9/11 Toronto Report, Editor: James Gourley (November 2012)
18. MacQueen, Graeme, *118 Witnesses: The Firefighters' Testimony to Explosions in the Twin Towers*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (2006)
19. National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), *NFPA 921 Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations* (Current edition: 2014)
20. NFPA Report, *High-Rise Building Fires* by John R. Hall, Jr. (September 2013)
21. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), *National Institute of Standards and Technology Final Plan: National Building Fire Safety Investment of the World Trade Center* by Sivaraj Shyam-Sunder (August 2002)
22. NIST, *June 2004 Progress Report on the Federal Building and Fire Safety Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster (WTC 1 & WTC 2)*
23. NIST, *Draft Reports from the NIST World Trade Center Disaster Investigation (WTC 1 & WTC 2 in April 2005; WTC 7 in August 2008)*
24. NIST, *Final Reports from the NIST Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster (WTC 1 & WTC 2 in September 2005; WTC 7 in November 2008)*

25. NIST: To NIST, *Request for Correction* from Bob McIlvaine, Bill Doyle, Steven Jones, Kevin Ryan, Richard Gage, Frank Legge (April 2007)
26. NIST: From NIST, *Response to the Request for Correction* (September 2007)
27. NIST: To NIST, *Appeal from James R. Gourley, Bob McIlvaine, Steven Jones to NIST's Response to the Request for Correction* (October 2007)
28. NIST, *Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC Towers Investigation (NIST FAQs for WTC 1 & WTC 2* updated September 19, 2011)
29. NIST, *Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation (NIST FAQs for WTC 7*, updated June 27, 2012)
30. NIST, *WTC 7 Technical Briefing* (August 26, 2008)
31. NIST, *Analysis of Needs and Existing Capabilities for Full-Scale Fire Resistance Testing* (October 2008)
32. Ryan, Kevin, *High Velocity Bursts of Debris from Point-Like Sources in the WTC Towers*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (June 2007)
33. Szamboti, Anthony and Johns, Richard, *ASCE Journals Refuse to Correct Fraudulent Paper Published on WTC Collapses*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (September 2014)
34. Szamboti, Anthony and MacQueen, Graeme, *The Missing Jolt: A Simple Refutation of the NIST-Bazant Collapse Hypothesis*, Journal of 9/11 Studies (April 2009)
35. Szuladziński, Gregory and Szamboti, Anthony and Johns, Richard, *Some Misunderstandings Related to WTC Collapse Analysis*, International Journal of Protective Structures (June 2013)
36. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), *Particle Atlas of World Trade Center Dust* by Heather A. Lowers and Gregory P. Meeker (2005)

Chapter 2

WHY WAR?

2.1 Ethology

In the long run, because of the terrible weapons that have already been produced through the misuse of science, and because of the even more terrible weapons that are likely to be invented in the future, the only way in which we can ensure the survival of civilization is to abolish the institution of war. But is this possible? Or are the emotions that make war possible so much a part of human nature that we cannot stop humans from fighting any more than we can stop cats and dogs from fighting? Can biological science throw any light on the problem of why our supposedly rational species seems intent on choosing war, pain and death instead of peace, happiness and life? To answer this question, we need to turn to the science of ethology - the study of inherited emotional tendencies and behavior patterns in animals and humans.

In *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin devoted a chapter to the evolution of instincts, and he later published a separate book on *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. Because of these pioneering studies, Darwin is considered to be the founder of ethology.

The study of inherited behavior patterns in animals (and humans) was continued in the 20th century by such researchers as Karl von Frisch (1886-1982), Nikolaas Tinbergen (1907-1988), and Konrad Lorenz (1903-1989), three scientists who shared a Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology in 1973.

The third of the 1973 prizewinners, Konrad Lorenz, is controversial, but at the same time very interesting in the context of studies of the causes of war and discussions of how war may be avoided. As a young boy, he was very fond of animals, and his tolerant parents allowed him to build up a large menagerie in their house in Altenberg, Austria. Even as a child, he became an expert on waterfowl behavior, and he discovered the phenomenon of imprinting. He was given a one day old duckling, and found, to his intense joy, that it transferred its following response to his person. As Lorenz discovered, young waterfowl have a short period immediately after being hatched, when they identify as their “mother” whomever they see first. In later life, Lorenz continued his studies of imprinting, and there




Figure 2.1: Because of Charles Darwin's book "The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals", he is considered to be the founder of the field of Ethology, the study of inherited behavior patterns.



Figure 2.2: Nikolaas Tinbergen (1907-1988) on the left, with Konrad Lorenz (1903-1989). Together with Karl von Frisch (1886-1982) they shared the 1973 Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine for their pioneering work in Ethology.



Figure 2.3: Konrad Lorenz with geese who consider him to be their mother.

exists a touching photograph of him, with his white beard, standing waist-deep in a pond, surrounded by an adoring group of goslings who believe him to be their mother. Lorenz also studied bonding behavior in waterfowl.

It is, however, for his controversial book *On Aggression* that Konrad Lorenz is best known. In this book, Lorenz makes a distinction between intergroup aggression and intragroup aggression. Among animals, he points out, rank-determining fights are seldom fatal. Thus, for example, the fights that determine leadership within a wolf pack end when the loser makes a gesture of submission. By contrast, fights between groups of animals are often fights to the death, examples being wars between ant colonies, or of bees against intruders, or the defense of a rat pack against strange rats.

Many animals, humans included, seem willing to kill or be killed in defense of the communities to which they belong. Lorenz calls this behavioral tendency a “communal defense response”. He points out that the “holy shiver” - the tingling of the spine that humans experience when performing a heroic act in defense of their communities - is related to the prehuman reflex for raising the hair on the back of an animal as it confronts an enemy - a reflex that makes the animal seem larger than it really is.

In his book *On Aggression*, Konrad Lorenz gives the following description of the emotions of a hero preparing to risk his life for the sake of the group:

“In reality, militant enthusiasm is a specialized form of communal aggression, clearly distinct from and yet functionally related to the more primitive forms of individual aggression. Every man of normally strong emotions knows, from his own experience, the subjective phenomena that go hand in hand with the response of militant enthusiasm. A shiver runs down the back and, as more exact observation shows, along the outside of both arms. One soars elated, above all the ties of everyday life, one is ready to abandon all for the call of what, in the moment of this specific emotion, seems to be a sacred duty. All obstacles in its path become unimportant; the instinctive inhibitions against hurting or killing one’s fellows lose, unfortunately, much of their power. Rational considerations, criticisms, and all reasonable arguments against the behavior dictated by militant enthusiasm are silenced by an amazing reversal of all values, making them appear not only untenable, but base and dishonorable.

Men may enjoy the feeling of absolute righteousness even while they commit atrocities. Conceptual thought and moral responsibility are at their lowest ebb. As the Ukrainian proverb says: ‘When the banner is unfurled, all reason is in the trumpet’.”

“The subjective experiences just described are correlated with the following objectively demonstrable phenomena. The tone of the striated musculature is raised, the carriage is stiffened, the arms are raised from the sides and slightly rotated inward, so that the elbows point outward. The head is proudly raised, the chin stuck out, and the facial muscles mime the ‘hero face’ familiar from the films. On the back and along the outer surface of the arms, the hair stands on end. This is the objectively observed aspect of the shiver!”

“Anybody who has ever seen the corresponding behavior of the male chimpanzee defending his band or family with self-sacrificing courage will doubt the purely spiritual character of human enthusiasm. The chimp, too, sticks out his chin, stiffens his body, and raises his elbows; his hair stands on end, producing a terrifying magnification of his body

contours as seen from the front. The inward rotation of the arms obviously has the purpose of turning the longest-haired side outward to enhance the effect. The whole combination of body attitude and hair-raising constitutes a bluff. This is also seen when a cat humps its back, and is calculated to make the animal appear bigger and more dangerous than it really is. Our shiver, which in German poetry is called a 'heiliger Schauer', a 'holy' shiver, turns out to be the vestige of a prehuman vegetative response for making a fur bristle which we no longer have. To the humble seeker for biological truth, there cannot be the slightest doubt that human militant enthusiasm evolved out of a communal defense response of our prehuman ancestor."

Lorenz goes on to say, "An impartial visitor from another planet, looking at man as he is today - in his hand the atom bomb, the product of his intelligence - in his heart the aggression drive, inherited from his anthropoid ancestors, which the same intelligence cannot control - such a visitor would not give mankind much chance of survival."

In an essay entitled *The Urge to Self-Destruction*¹, Arthur Koestler says:

"Even a cursory glance at history should convince one that individual crimes, committed for selfish motives, play a quite insignificant role in the human tragedy compared with the numbers massacred in unselfish love of one's tribe, nation, dynasty, church or ideology... Wars are not fought for personal gain, but out of loyalty and devotion to king, country or cause..."

"We have seen on the screen the radiant love of the Führer on the faces of the Hitler Youth... They are transfixed with love, like monks in ecstasy on religious paintings. The sound of the nation's anthem, the sight of its proud flag, makes you feel part of a wonderfully loving community. The fanatic is prepared to lay down his life for the object of his worship, as the lover is prepared to die for his idol. He is, alas, also prepared to kill anybody who represents a supposed threat to the idol." The emotion described here by Koestler is the same as the communal defense mechanism ("militant enthusiasm") described in biological terms by Lorenz.

Generations of schoolboys have learned the Latin motto: "Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori" - it is both sweet and noble to die for one's country. Even in today's world, death in battle in defense of country and religion is still praised by nationalists. However, because of the development of weapons of mass destruction, both nationalism and narrow patriotism have become dangerous anachronisms.

In thinking of violence and war, we must be extremely careful not to confuse the behavioral patterns that lead to wife-beating or bar-room brawls with those that lead to episodes like the trench warfare of the First World War, or to the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The first type of aggression is similar to the rank-determining fights of animals, while the second is more akin to the team-spirit exhibited by a football side. Heroic behavior in defense of one's community has been praised throughout the ages, but the tendency to such behavior has now become a threat to the survival of civilization, since tribalism makes war possible, and war with thermonuclear weapons threatens civilization

¹in *The Place of Value in a World of Facts*, A. Tiselius and S. Nielsson editors, Wiley, New York, (1970)

with catastrophe.

Warfare involves not only a high degree of aggression, but also an extremely high degree of altruism. Soldiers kill, but they also sacrifice their own lives. Thus patriotism and duty are as essential to war as the willingness to kill. As Arthur Koestler points out, "Wars are not fought for personal gain, but out of loyalty and devotion to king, country or cause..."

Tribalism involves passionate attachment to one's own group, self-sacrifice for the sake of the group, willingness both to die and to kill if necessary to defend the group from its enemies, and belief that in case of a conflict, one's own group is always in the right.

2.2 Population genetics

If we examine altruism and aggression in humans, we notice that members of our species exhibit great altruism towards their own children. Kindness towards close relatives is also characteristic of human behavior, and the closer the biological relationship is between two humans, the greater is the altruism they tend to show towards each other. This profile of altruism is easy to explain on the basis of Darwinian natural selection since two closely related individuals share many genes and, if they cooperate, the genes will be more effectively propagated.

To explain from an evolutionary point of view the communal defense mechanism discussed by Lorenz - the willingness of humans to kill and be killed in defense of their communities - we have only to imagine that our ancestors lived in small tribes and that marriage was likely to take place within a tribe rather than across tribal boundaries. Under these circumstances, each tribe would tend to consist of genetically similar individuals. The tribe itself, rather than the individual, would be the unit on which the evolutionary forces of natural selection would act. The idea of group selection in evolution was proposed in the 1930's by J.B.S. Haldane and R.A. Fisher, and more recently it has been discussed by W.D. Hamilton and E.O. Wilson.

According to the group selection model, a tribe whose members showed altruism towards each other would be more likely to survive than a tribe whose members cooperated less effectively. Since several tribes might be in competition for the same territory, intertribal aggression might, under some circumstances, increase the chances for survival of one's own tribe. Thus, on the basis of the group selection model, one would expect humans to be kind and cooperative towards members of their own group, but at the same time to sometimes exhibit aggression towards members of other groups, especially in conflicts over territory. One would also expect intergroup conflicts to be most severe in cases where the boundaries between groups are sharpest - where marriage is forbidden across the boundaries.



Figure 2.4: **Sir Ronald Aylmer Fischer (1890-1962).** Together with J.B.S Haldane he pioneered the theory of population genetics. Recent contributions to this theory have been made by W.D. Hamilton and E.O. Wilson.

2.3 Hope for the future

Although humans originally lived in small, genetically homogeneous tribes, the social and political groups of the modern world are much larger, and are often multiracial and multiethnic.

There are a number of large countries that are remarkable for their diversity, for example Brazil, Argentina and the United States. Nevertheless it has been possible to establish social cohesion and group identity within each of these enormous nations. India and China too, are mosaics of diverse peoples, but nevertheless, they function as coherent societies. Thus we see that group identity is a social construction, in which artificial “tribal markings” define the boundaries of the group. These tribal markings will be discussed in more detail below.

One gains hope for the future by observing how it has been possible to produce both internal peace and social cohesion over very large areas of the globe - areas that contain extremely diverse populations. The difference between making large, ethnically diverse countries function as coherent sociopolitical units and making the entire world function as a unit is not very great.

Since group identity is a social construction, it is not an impossible goal to think of enlarging the already-large groups of the modern world to include all of humanity.

On our small but beautiful earth, made small by technology, made beautiful by nature, there is room for one group only: the all-inclusive family of humankind.

2.4 Religion and ethnic identity

An acceleration of human cultural development seems to have begun approximately 70,000 years ago. The first art objects date from that period, as do migrations that ultimately took modern man across the Bering Strait to the western hemisphere. A land bridge extending from Siberia to Alaska is thought to have been formed approximately 70,000 years ago, disappearing again roughly 10,000 years before the present. Cultural and genetic studies indicate that migrations from Asia to North America took place during this period. Shamanism,² which is found both in Asia and the new world, as well as among the Sami (Lapps) of northern Scandinavia, is an example of the cultural links between the hunting societies of these regions.

Before the acceleration of human cultural development just mentioned, genetic change and cultural change went hand in hand, but during the last 70,000 years, the constantly accelerating rate of information-accumulation and cultural evolution has increasingly out-distanced the rate of genetic change in humans. Genetically we are almost identical with our hunter-gatherer ancestors of 70,000 years ago, but cultural evolution has changed our way of life beyond recognition.

²A shaman is a special member of a hunting society who, while in a trance, is thought to be able pass between the upper world, the present world, and the lower world, to cure illnesses, and to insure the success of a hunt.

Humans are capable of cultural evolution because it is so easy to overwrite and modify our instinctive behavior patterns with learned behavior. Within the animal kingdom, humans are undoubtedly the champions in this respect. No other species is so good at learning as we are. During the early stages of cultural evolution, the tendency of humans to be religious may have facilitated the overwriting of instinctive behavior with the culture of the tribe. Since religions, like languages, are closely associated with particular cultures, they serve as marks of ethnic identity.

2.5 Tribal markings; ethnicity; pseudospeciation

In biology, a species is defined to be a group of mutually fertile organisms. Thus all humans form a single species, since mixed marriages between all known races will produce children, and subsequent generations in mixed marriages are also fertile. However, although there is never a biological barrier to marriages across ethnic and racial boundaries, there are often very severe cultural barriers.

Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, a student of Konrad Lorenz, introduced the word *pseudospeciation* to denote cases where cultural barriers between two groups of humans are so strongly marked that marriages across the boundary are difficult and infrequent. In such cases, he pointed out, the two groups function as though they were separate species, although from a biological standpoint this is nonsense. When two such groups are competing for the same land, the same water, the same resources, and the same jobs, the conflicts between them can become very bitter indeed. Each group regards the other as being “not truly human”.

In his book *The Biology of War and Peace*, Eibl-Eibesfeldt discusses the “tribal markings” used by groups of humans to underline their own identity and to clearly mark the boundary between themselves and other groups. One of the illustrations in the book shows the marks left by ritual scarification on the faces of the members of certain African tribes. These scars would be hard to counterfeit, and they help to establish and strengthen tribal identity. Seeing a photograph of the marks left by ritual scarification on the faces of African tribesmen, it is impossible not to be reminded of the dueling scars that Prussian army officers once used to distinguish their caste from outsiders.

Surveying the human scene, one can find endless examples of signs that mark the bearer as a member of a particular group - signs that can be thought of as “tribal markings”: tattoos; piercing; bones through the nose or ears; elongated necks or ears; filed teeth; Chinese binding of feet; circumcision, both male and female; unique hair styles; decorations of the tongue, nose, or naval; peculiarities of dress, fashions, veils, chadors, and headdresses; caste markings in India; use or nonuse of perfumes; codes of honor and value systems; traditions of hospitality and manners; peculiarities of diet (certain foods forbidden, others preferred); giving traditional names to children; knowledge of dances and songs; knowledge of recipes; knowledge of common stories, literature, myths, poetry or common history; festivals, ceremonies, and rituals; burial customs, treatment of the dead and ancestor worship; methods of building and decorating homes; games and sports peculiar to a culture;



Figure 2.5: A tattooed face can help to establish tribal identity



Figure 2.6: An example of the dueling scars that Prussian army officers once used to distinguish their caste from outsiders.

relationship to animals, knowledge of horses and ability to ride; nonrational systems of belief. Even a baseball hat worn backwards or the professed ability to enjoy atonal music can mark a person as a member of a special “tribe”. Undoubtedly there many people in New York who would never think of marrying someone who could not appreciate the the paintings of Jasper Johns, and many in London who would consider anyone had not read all the books of Virginia Wolfe to be entirely outside the bounds of civilization.

By far the most important mark of ethnic identity is language, and within a particular language, dialect and accent. If the only purpose of language were communication, it would be logical for the people of a small country like Denmark to stop speaking Danish and go over to a more universally-understood international language such as English. However, language has another function in addition to communication: It is also a mark of identity. It establishes the boundary of the group.

Within a particular language, dialects and accents mark the boundaries of subgroups. For example, in England, great social significance is attached to accents and diction, a tendency that George Bernard Shaw satirized in his play, *Pygmalion*, which later gained greater fame as the musical comedy, *My Fair Lady*. This being the case, we can ask why all citizens of England do not follow the example of Eliza Doolittle in Shaw’s play, and improve their social positions by acquiring Oxford accents. However, to do so would be to run the risk of being laughed at by one’s peers and regarded as a traitor to one’s own local community and friends. School children everywhere can be very cruel to any child who does not fit into the local pattern. At Eton, an Oxford accent is compulsory; but in a Yorkshire school, a child with an Oxford accent would suffer for it.

Next after language, the most important “tribal marking” is religion. As mentioned above, it seems probable that in the early history of our hunter-gatherer ancestors, religion evolved as a mechanism for perpetuating tribal traditions and culture. Like language, and like the innate facial expressions studied by Darwin, religion is a universal characteristic of all human societies. All known races and cultures practice some sort of religion. Thus a tendency to be religious seems to be built into human nature, or at any rate, the needs that religion satisfies seem to be a part of our inherited makeup. Otherwise, religion would not be so universal as it is.

Religion is often strongly associated with ethnicity and nationalism, that is to say, it is associated with the demarcation of a particular group of people by its culture or race. For example, the Jewish religion is associated with Zionism and with Jewish nationalism. Similarly Islam is strongly associated with Arab nationalism. Christianity too has played an important role in in many aggressive wars, for example in the Crusades, in the European conquest of the New World, in European colonial conquests in Africa and Asia, and in the wars between Catholics and Protestants within Europe. We shall see in a later chapter how the originators of the German nationalist movement (the precursors of the Nazis), used quasi-religious psychological methods.

Human history seems to be saturated with blood. It would be impossible to enumerate the conflicts with which the story of humankind is stained. Many of the atrocities of history have involved what Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt called “pseudospeciation”, that is to say, they were committed in conflicts involving groups between which sharply marked

cultural barriers have made intermarriage difficult and infrequent. Examples include the present conflict between Israelis and Palestinians; “racial cleansing” in Kosovo; the devastating wars between Catholics and Protestants in Europe; the Lebanese civil war; genocide committed against Jews and Gypsies during World War II; recent genocide in Rwanda; current intertribal massacres in the Ituri Province of Congo; use of poison gas against Kurdish civilians by Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq; the massacre of Armenians by Turks; massacres of Hindus by Muslims and of Muslims by Hindus in post-independence India; massacres of Native Americans by white conquerors and settlers in all parts of the New World; and massacres committed during the Crusades. The list seems almost endless.

Religion often contributes to conflicts by sharpening the boundaries between ethnic groups and by making marriage across those boundaries difficult and infrequent. However, this negative role is balanced by a positive one, whenever religion is the source of ethical principles, especially the principle of universal human brotherhood.

The religious leaders of today’s world have the opportunity to contribute importantly to the solution of the problem of war. They have the opportunity to powerfully support the concept of universal human brotherhood, to build bridges between religious groups, to make intermarriage across ethnic boundaries easier, and to soften the distinctions between communities. Our political leaders have the duty to move away from nationalism and militarism. If they fail to do this, they will have failed humankind at a time of great danger and crisis.



Figure 2.7: An illustration from Darwin's book, "The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals". Here a cat raises its back and fur when confronting an enemy to make itself seem larger and more dangerous. This reflex was later discussed by the ethologist Konrad Lorenz.




Figure 2.8: **Professor E.O. Wilson of Harvard is famous for his books on Sociobiology.**



Figure 2.9: **Professor Richard Dawkins** of Oxford, controversial author of “**The Selfish Gene**” and many other books. He has contributed much to the debate on relationships between science, religion, aggression and altruism.



Figure 2.10: William Donald Hamilton was a Royal Society Research Professor at Oxford University until his death in 2000. He contributed importantly to our understanding of altruism from the standpoint of genetics.

2.6 The arms race prior to World War 1

The inherited tendency towards tribalism in human nature makes war possible. Humans are willing to kill and to be killed to defend their own group against perceived enemies. However, there is another element that drives and perpetuates the institution of war - the enormous amounts of money earned by arms manufacturers - the military-industrial complex against which Dwight D. Eisenhower warned in his famous farewell address.

In an article entitled *Arms Race Prior to 1914, Armament Policy*³, Eric Brose writes: “New weapons produced during the Industrial Revolution in the late 1800s heightened existing tensions among European nations as countries strove to outpace their enemies technologically. This armaments race accelerated in the decade before 1914 as the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy squared off against the Triple Entente of France, Russia, and Britain. Germany’s fears of increases in Russian armaments, and British fears of the German naval buildup, contributed heavily to the outbreak and spread of the First World War in 1914.”

The Wikipedia article on *Arms race* states that “From 1897 to 1914, a naval arms race between the United Kingdom and Germany took place. British concern about rapid increase in German naval power resulted in a costly building competition of Dreadnought-class ships. This tense arms race lasted until 1914, when the war broke out. After the war, a new arms race developed among the victorious Allies, which was temporarily ended by the Washington Naval Treaty.

“In addition to the British and Germans, contemporaneous but smaller naval arms races also broke out between Russia and the Ottoman Empire; the Ottomans and Greece; France and Italy; the United States and Japan; and Brazil, Argentina, and Chile.

“The United Kingdom had the largest navy in the world. In accord with Wilhelm II’s enthusiasm for an expanded German navy and the strong desires of Grand Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, Secretary of State of the German Imperial Naval Office, four Fleet Acts from 1898 and 1912 greatly expanded the German High Seas Fleet. The German aim was to build a fleet that would be two thirds the size of the British navy. The plan was sparked by the threat of the British Foreign Office in March 1897, after the British invasion of Transvaal that started the Boer War, of blockading the German coast and thereby crippling the German economy if Germany intervened in the conflict in Transvaal. From 1905 onward, the British navy developed plans for such a blockade, which was a central part of British strategy.

“In reaction to the challenge to its naval supremacy, from 1902 to 1910, the British Royal Navy embarked on a massive expansion to keep ahead of the Germans. The competition came to focus on the revolutionary new ships based on HMS Dreadnought, which was launched in 1906.”

³International Encyclopedia of the First World War




Figure 2.11: Left to right, US, Britain, Germany, France and Japan, engage in a “no limits” game for naval supremacy.

2.7 Krupp, Thyssen and Germany's steel industry

The Krupp family business, known as Friedrich Krupp AG, was the largest company in Europe at the beginning of the 20th century. It was important to weapons development and production in both world wars. One of the most powerful dynasties in European history, for 400 years Krupp flourished as the premier weapons manufacturer for Germany. From the Thirty Years' War until the end of the Second World War, they produced everything from battleships, U-boats, tanks, howitzers, guns, utilities, and hundreds of other commodities.

The Thyssen family similarly profited from the arms races prior to World War I and World War II. August Thyssen (1842-1925) founded a large iron and steel company in the Ruhr district of Germany, and was succeeded by his son Fritz Thyssen, who greatly aided Hitler's rise to power.

2.8 Colonialism and the outbreak of the First World War

The First World War broke out approximately 100 years ago, and much thought has been given to the causes of this tragic event, whose consequences continue to cast a dark shadow over the human future. When the war ended four years later, ten million young men had been killed and twenty million wounded, of whom six million were crippled for life. The war had cost 350,000,000,000 1919 dollars. This was a calculable cost; but the cost in human suffering and brutalization of values was incalculable.

It hardly mattered whose fault the catastrophe had been. Perhaps the Austrian government had been more to blame than any other. But blame for the war certainly did not rest with the Austrian people nor with the young Austrians who had been forced to fight. However, the tragedy of the First World War was that it created long-lasting hatred between the nations involved; and in this way it led, only twenty years later, to an even more catastrophic global war, during the course of which nuclear weapons were developed.

Most scholars believe that competing colonial ambitions played an important role in setting the stage for the First World War. A second factor was an armaments race between European countries, and the huge profits gained by arms manufacturers. Even at that time, the Military-industrial complex was firmly established; and today it continues to be the greatest source of war, together with neocolonialism.⁴

⁴<http://alphahistory.com/worldwar1/imperialism/>
<http://www.flowofhistory.com/units/etc/19/26>
<http://alphahistory.com/worldwar1/militarism/>



Figure 2.12: Map of European colonies in Africa in 1914, just before the First World War. Source: www.createdebate.com

2.9 Prescott Bush and Hitler

Prescott Sheldon Bush (1895-1972), the father of George H.W. Bush and grandfather of George W. Bush, actively supported the revival of Germany's armament's industry in the 1930's, as well as supplying large amounts of money to Adolf Hitler's Nazi Party.⁵

An article in *The Guardian*⁶, Ben Aris and Dubcab Campbell write that "George Bush's grandfather, the late US senator Prescott Bush, was a director and shareholder of companies that profited from their involvement with the financial backers of Nazi Germany.

"The Guardian has obtained confirmation from newly discovered files in the US National Archives that a firm of which Prescott Bush was a director was involved with the financial architects of Nazism.

"His business dealings, which continued until his company's assets were seized in 1942 under the Trading with the Enemy Act, has led more than 60 years later to a civil action for damages being brought in Germany against the Bush family by two former slave laborers at Auschwitz and to a hum of pre-election controversy.

"The debate over Prescott Bush's behavior has been bubbling under the surface for some time. There has been a steady Internet chatter about the "Bush/Nazi" connection,

⁵<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TnHnjmCYjy4>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7BZCfbrXKs4>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7BZCfbrXKs4>
<http://www.georgewalkerbush.net/bushfamilyfundedhitler.htm>
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/sep/25/usa.secondworldwar>

⁶September 25, 2004



Figure 2.13: Prescott Bush, the father of George H.W. Bush and grandfather of George W. Bush, supported Hitler's rise to power with large financial contributions to the Nazi Party. The photo shows them together. Source: topinfo-post.com

much of it inaccurate and unfair. But the new documents, many of which were only declassified last year, show that even after America had entered the war and when there was already significant information about the Nazis' plans and policies, he worked for and profited from companies closely involved with the very German businesses that financed Hitler's rise to power. It has also been suggested that the money he made from these dealings helped to establish the Bush family fortune and set up its political dynasty.

"Bush was also on the board of at least one of the companies that formed part of a multinational network of front companies to allow [Fritz] Thyssen to move assets around the world.

"Thyssen owned the largest steel and coal company in Germany and grew rich from Hitler's efforts to re-arm between the two world wars. One of the pillars in Thyssen's international corporate web, UBC, worked exclusively for, and was owned by, a Thyssen-controlled bank in the Netherlands. More tantalizing are Bush's links to the Consolidated Silesian Steel Company (CSSC), based in mineral rich Silesia on the German-Polish border. During the war, the company made use of Nazi slave labor from the concentration camps, including Auschwitz. The ownership of CSSC changed hands several times in the 1930s, but documents from the US National Archive declassified last year link Bush to CSSC, although it is not clear if he and UBC were still involved in the company when Thyssen's American assets were seized in 1942."

2.10 Fritz Thyssen supports Hitler's rise to power

"In 1923, Thyssen met former General Erich Ludendorff, who advised him to attend a speech given by Adolf Hitler, leader of the Nazi Party. Thyssen was impressed by Hitler and his bitter opposition to the Treaty of Versailles, and began to make large donations to the party, including 100,000 gold marks in 1923 to Ludendorff. In this he was unusual among German business leaders, as most were traditional conservatives who regarded the Nazis with suspicion. Thyssen's principal motive in supporting the National Socialists was his great fear of communism; he had little confidence that the various German anticommunist factions would prevent a Soviet-style revolution in Germany unless the popular appeal of communism among the lower classes was co-opted by an anticommunist alternative. Postwar investigators found that he had donated 650,000 Reichsmarks to right-wing parties, mostly to the Nazis, although Thyssen himself claimed to have donated 1 million marks to the Nazi Party. Thyssen remained a member of the German National People's Party until 1932, and did not join the Nazi Party (National Socialist German Workers' Party) until 1933.

"In November, 1932, Thyssen and Hjalmar Schacht were the main organizers of a letter to President Paul von Hindenburg urging him to appoint Hitler as Chancellor. Thyssen also persuaded the Association of German Industrialists to donate 3 million Reichsmarks to the Nazi Party (National Socialist German Workers' Party) for the March, 1933 Reichstag election. As a reward, he was elected a Nazi member of the Reichstag and appointed to the Council of State of Prussia, the largest German state (both purely honorary positions).

"Thyssen welcomed the suppression of the Communist Party, the Social Democrats and the trade unions. In 1934 he was one of the business leaders who persuaded Hitler to suppress the SA, leading to the "Night of the Long Knives". Thyssen accepted the exclusion of Jews from German business and professional life by the Nazis, and dismissed his own Jewish employees. But as a Catholic, he objected to the increasing repression of the Roman Catholic Church, which gathered pace after 1935: in 1937 he sent a letter to Hitler, protesting the persecution of Christians in Germany.[4] The breaking point for Thyssen was the violent pogrom against the Jews in November 1938, known as Kristallnacht, which caused him to resign from the Council of State. By 1939 he was also bitterly criticizing the regime's economic policies, which were subordinating everything to rearmament in preparation for war."



Figure 2.14: An arms race between the major European powers contributed to the start of World War I.



Figure 2.15: World War I was called “The War to End All Wars”. Today it seems more like The War that Began All Wars.



Figure 2.16: The naval arms race, which contributed to the start of World War I, enriched steel manufacturers and military shipbuilders.



Figure 2.17: Who is the leader, and who the follower?




Figure 2.18: A vicious circle.



Figure 2.19: Ready, set, go!




Figure 2.20: If our economies depend on armaments industries, it is an unhealthy dependence, analogous to drug addiction.



Figure 2.21: The nuclear arms race casts a dark shadow over the future of human civilization and the biosphere.



Figure 2.22: During the Cuban Missile Crisis, the world came close to a catastrophic thermonuclear war.




Figure 2.23: Dr. Helen Caldecott has worked to document the dangers of both nuclear weapons and nuclear power generation.



Figure 2.24: We must listen to the wise words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

2.11 Eisenhower's farewell address

In his famous farewell address, US President Dwight Eisenhower eloquently described the terrible effects of an overgrown Military-industrial complex. Here are his words:

"We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.... This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence, economic, political, even spiritual, is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government...[and] we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the Military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

In another speech, he said: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children."

Today the world spends more than 1.7 trillion dollars (\$ 1,700,000,000,000) every year on armaments. This vast river of money, almost too large to be imagined, is the "devil's dynamo" driving the institution of war. Politicians notoriously can be bought with a tiny fraction of this enormous amount; hence the decay of democracy. It is also plain that if the almost unbelievable sums now wasted on armaments were used constructively, most of the pressing problems now facing humanity could be solved.

Because the world spends almost two thousand billion dollars each year on armaments, it follows that very many people make their living from war. This is the reason why it is correct to speak of war as an institution, and why it persists, although we know that it is the cause of much of the suffering that inflicts humanity.




Figure 2.25: “In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the Military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.”

2.12 The nuclear arms race

Flaws in the concept of nuclear deterrence

Before discussing other defects in the concept of deterrence, it must be said very clearly that the idea of “massive nuclear retaliation” is completely unacceptable from an ethical point of view. The doctrine of retaliation, performed on a massive scale, violates not only the principles of common human decency and common sense, but also the ethical principles of every major religion. Retaliation is especially contrary to the central commandment of Christianity which tells us to love our neighbor, even if he or she is far away from us, belonging to a different ethnic or political group, and even if our distant neighbor has seriously injured us. This principle has a fundamental place not only in Christianity but also in all other major religions. “Massive retaliation” completely violates these very central ethical principles, which are not only clearly stated and fundamental but also very practical, since they prevent escalatory cycles of revenge and counter-revenge.

Contrast Christian ethics with estimates of the number of deaths that would follow a US nuclear strike against Russia: Several hundred million deaths. These horrifying estimates shock us not only because of the enormous magnitude of the expected mortality, but also because the victims would include people of every kind: women, men, old people, children and infants, completely irrespective of any degree of guilt that they might have. As a result of such an attack, many millions of people in neutral countries would also die. This type of killing has to be classified as genocide.

When a suspected criminal is tried for a wrongdoing, great efforts are devoted to clarifying the question of guilt or innocence. Punishment only follows if guilt can be proved beyond any reasonable doubt. Contrast this with the totally indiscriminate mass slaughter that results from a nuclear attack!

It might be objected that disregard for the guilt or innocence of victims is a universal characteristic of modern war, since statistics show that, with time, a larger and larger percentage of the victims have been civilians, and especially children. For example, the air attacks on Coventry during World War II, or the fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo, produced massive casualties which involved all segments of the population with complete disregard for the question of guilt or innocence. The answer, I think, is that modern war has become generally unacceptable from an ethical point of view, and this unacceptability is epitomized in nuclear weapons.

The enormous and indiscriminate destruction produced by nuclear weapons formed the background for an historic 1996 decision by the International Court of Justice in the Hague. In response to questions put to it by WHO and the UN General Assembly, the Court ruled that “the threat and use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and particularly the principles and rules of Humanitarian law.”

The only *possible* exception to this general rule might be “an extreme circumstance of self-defense, in which the very survival of a state would be at stake”. But the Court refused to say that even in this extreme circumstance the threat or use of nuclear weapons



would be legal. It left the exceptional case undecided. In addition, the World Court added unanimously that “there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith *and bring to a conclusion* negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict international control.”

This landmark decision has been criticized by the nuclear weapon states as being decided “by a narrow margin”, but the structuring of the vote made the margin seem more narrow than it actually was. Seven judges voted against Paragraph 2E of the decision (the paragraph which states that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be generally illegal, but which mentions as a possible exception the case where a nation might be defending itself from an attack that threatened its very existence.) Seven judges voted for the paragraph, with the President of the Court, Muhammad Bedjaoui of Algeria casting the deciding vote. Thus the Court adopted it, seemingly by a narrow margin. But three of the judges who voted against 2E did so because they believed that no possible exception should be mentioned! Thus, if the vote had been slightly differently structured, the result would have been ten to four.

Of the remaining four judges who cast dissenting votes, three represented nuclear weapons states, while the fourth thought that the Court ought not to have accepted the questions from WHO and the UN. However Judge Schwebel from the United States, who voted against Paragraph 2E, nevertheless added, in a separate opinion, “It cannot be accepted that the use of nuclear weapons on a scale which would - or could - result in the deaths of many millions in indiscriminate inferno and by far-reaching fallout, have pernicious effects in space and time, and render uninhabitable much of the earth, could be lawful.” Judge Higgins from the UK, the first woman judge in the history of the Court, had problems with the word “generally” in Paragraph 2E and therefore voted against it, but she thought that a more profound analysis might have led the Court to conclude in favor of illegality in all circumstances. Judge Fleischhauer of Germany said in his separate

opinion, “The nuclear weapon is, in many ways, the negation of the humanitarian considerations underlying the law applicable in armed conflict and the principle of neutrality. The nuclear weapon cannot distinguish between civilian and military targets. It causes immeasurable suffering. The radiation released by it is unable to respect the territorial integrity of neutral States.”

President Bedjaoui, summarizing the majority opinion, called nuclear weapons “the ultimate evil”, and said “By its nature, the nuclear weapon, this blind weapon, destabilizes Humanitarian law, the law of discrimination in the use of weapons... The ultimate aim of every action in the field of nuclear arms will always be nuclear disarmament, an aim which is no longer utopian and which all have a duty to pursue more actively than ever.”

Thus the concept of nuclear deterrence is not only unacceptable from the standpoint of ethics; it is also contrary to international law. The World Court’s 1996 advisory Opinion unquestionably also represents the opinion of the majority of the world’s peoples. Although no formal plebiscite has been taken, the votes in numerous resolutions of the UN General Assembly speak very clearly on this question. For example the New Agenda Resolution (53/77Y) was adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December 1998 by a massively affirmative vote, in which only 18 out of the 170 member states voted against the resolution.⁷ The New Agenda Resolution proposes numerous practical steps towards complete nuclear disarmament, and it calls on the Nuclear-Weapon States “to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their nuclear weapons and without delay to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to the elimination of these weapons, thereby fulfilling their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)”. Thus, in addition to being ethically unacceptable and contrary to international law, nuclear weapons also contrary to the principles of democracy.

Having said these important things, we can now turn to some of the other defects in the concept of nuclear deterrence. One important defect is that nuclear war may occur through accident or miscalculation - through technical defects or human failings. This possibility is made greater by the fact that despite the end of the Cold War, thousands of missiles carrying nuclear warheads are still kept on a “hair-trigger” state of alert with a quasi-automatic reaction time measured in minutes. There is a constant danger that a nuclear war will be triggered by error in evaluating the signal on a radar screen. For example, the BBC reported recently that a group of scientists and military leaders are worried that a small asteroid entering the earths atmosphere and exploding could trigger a nuclear war if mistaken for a missile strike.

A number of prominent political and military figures (many of whom have ample knowledge of the system of deterrence, having been part of it) have expressed concern about the danger of accidental nuclear war. Colin S. Grey⁸ expressed this concern as follows: “The problem, indeed the enduring problem, is that we are resting our future upon a nuclear

⁷Of the 18 countries that voted against the New Agenda resolution, 10 were Eastern European countries hoping for acceptance into NATO, whose votes seem to have been traded for increased probability of acceptance.

⁸Chairman, National Institute for Public Policy

deterrence system concerning which we cannot tolerate even a single malfunction.” General Curtis E. LeMay⁹ has written, “In my opinion a general war will grow through a series of political miscalculations and accidents rather than through any deliberate attack by either side.” Bruce G. Blair¹⁰ has remarked that “It is obvious that the rushed nature of the process, from warning to decision to action, risks causing a catastrophic mistake.”... “This system is an accident waiting to happen.”

“But nobody can predict that the fatal accident or unauthorized act will never happen”, Fred Ikle of the Rand Corporation has written, “Given the huge and far-flung missile forces, ready to be launched from land and sea on on both sides, the scope for disaster by accident is immense... In a matter of seconds - through technical accident or human failure - mutual deterrence might thus collapse.”

Nuclear terrorism is a real threat

Another serious failure of the concept of nuclear deterrence is that it does not take into account the possibility that atomic bombs may be used by terrorists. Indeed, the threat of nuclear terrorism has today become one of the most pressing dangers that the world faces, a danger that is particularly acute in the United States.

Since 1945, more than 3,000 metric tons (3,000,000 kilograms) of highly enriched uranium and plutonium have been produced - enough for several hundred thousand nuclear weapons. Of this, roughly a million kilograms are in Russia, inadequately guarded, in establishments where the technicians are poorly paid and vulnerable to the temptations of bribery. There is a continuing danger that these fissile materials will fall into the hands of terrorists, or organized criminals, or irresponsible governments. Also, an extensive black market for fissile materials, nuclear weapons components etc. has recently been revealed in connection with the confessions of Pakistan’s bomb-maker, Dr. A.Q. Khan. Furthermore, if Pakistan’s less-than-stable government should be overthrown, complete nuclear weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists.

On November 3, 2003, Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, made a speech to the United Nations in which he called for “limiting the processing of weapons-usable material (separated plutonium and high enriched uranium) in civilian nuclear programmes - as well as the production of new material through reprocessing and enrichment - by agreeing to restrict these operations to facilities exclusively under international control.” It is almost incredible, considering the dangers of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, that such restrictions were not imposed long ago. Nuclear reactors used for “peaceful” purposes unfortunately also generate fissionable isotopes of plutonium, neptunium and americium. Thus all nuclear reactors must be regarded as ambiguous in function, and all must be put under strict international control. One might ask, in fact, whether globally widespread use of nuclear energy is worth the danger that it entails.

⁹Founder and former Commander in Chief of the United States Strategic Air Command

¹⁰Brookings Institute




Figure 2.26: Recent studies by atmospheric scientists have shown that the smoke from burning cities produced by even a limited nuclear war would have a devastating effect on global agriculture. The studies show that the smoke would rise to the stratosphere, where it would spread globally and remain for a decade, blocking sunlight and destroying the ozone layer. Because of the devastating effect on global agriculture, darkness from even a small nuclear war (e.g. between India and Pakistan) would result in an estimated billion deaths from famine. Nuclear darkness resulting from a large-scale war involving all of the nuclear weapons that are now on high alert status would destroy all agriculture on earth for a period of ten years, and almost all humans would die of starvation. (See O. Toon, A. Robock, and R. Turco, “The Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War”, *Physics Today*, vol. 61, No. 12, 2008, p. 37-42).

The Italian nuclear physicist Francesco Calogero, who has studied the matter closely, believes that terrorists could easily construct a simple gun-type nuclear bomb if they were in possession of a critical mass of highly enriched uranium. In such a simple atomic bomb, two grapefruit-sized subcritical portions of HEU are placed at opposite ends of the barrel of an artillery piece and are driven together by means of a conventional explosive. Prof. Calogero estimates that the fatalities produced by the explosion of such a device in the center of a large city could exceed 100,000.

We must remember the remark of U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan after the 9/11/2001 attacks on the World Trade Center. He said, “*This time* it was not a nuclear explosion”. The meaning of his remark is clear: If the world does not take strong steps to eliminate fissionable materials and nuclear weapons, it will only be a matter of time before they will be used in terrorist attacks on major cities. Neither terrorists nor organized criminals can be deterred by the threat of nuclear retaliation, since they have no territory against which such retaliation could be directed. They blend invisibly into the general population. Nor can a “missile defense system” prevent terrorists from using nuclear weapons, since the weapons can be brought into a port in any one of the hundreds of thousands of containers that enter on ships each year, a number far too large to be checked exhaustively.

Today we must give special weight to the danger that a catastrophic nuclear war may occur through the mental instability of a political leader or an error of judgement, since we now are living with Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un. In the words of ICAN’s Executive Director Beatrice Finn, the end of human civilization and much of the biosphere is “only a tantrum away”. Donald Trump has repeatedly expressed his desire for more “usable” nuclear weapons. and if nuclear weapons are ever used, there is a strong danger of escalation to a full-scale thermonuclear war.

Another problem with the concept of nuclear deterrence is that even if the danger that a catastrophic nuclear war will occur in any given year is small, over a long period of time the danger builds up into a certainty. If the dangers for any given year are 1%, 2% or 3%, the probabilities of are survival until 2100 are respectively 43%, 18% and 8%. If the period for which we must survive is extended to the year 2200, the chances of survival in the three cases are respectively .16%, .025%, and .0039%.

In this perilous situation, the only logical thing for the world to do is to get rid of both fissile materials and nuclear weapons as rapidly as possible. We must acknowledge that the idea of nuclear deterrence is a dangerous fallacy, and acknowledge that the development of military systems based on nuclear weapons has been a terrible mistake, a false step that needs to be reversed. If the most prestigious of the nuclear weapons states can sincerely acknowledge their mistakes and begin to reverse them, nuclear weapons will seem less glamorous to countries like India, Pakistan, North Korea and Iran, where they now are symbols of national pride and modernism.

Civilians have for too long played the role of passive targets, hostages in the power struggles of politicians. It is time for civil society to make its will felt. If our leaders continue to enthusiastically support the institution of war, if they will not abolish nuclear weapons, then let us have new leaders.

2.13 Global famine produced by nuclear war

The danger of a catastrophic nuclear war casts a dark shadow over the future of our species. It also casts a very black shadow over the future of the global environment. The environmental consequences of a massive exchange of nuclear weapons have been treated in a number of studies by meteorologists and other experts from both East and West. They predict that a large-scale use of nuclear weapons would result in fire storms with very high winds and high temperatures, which would burn a large proportion of the wild land fuels in the affected nations. The resulting smoke and dust would block out sunlight for a period of many months, at first only in the northern hemisphere but later also in the southern hemisphere.

Temperatures in many places would fall far below freezing, and much of the earth's plant life would be killed. Animals and humans would then die of starvation. The nuclear winter effect was first discovered as a result of the Mariner 9 spacecraft exploration of Mars in 1971. The spacecraft arrived in the middle of an enormous dust-storm on Mars, and measured a large temperature drop at the surface of the planet, accompanied by a heating of the upper atmosphere. These measurements allowed scientists to check their theoretical models for predicting the effect of dust and other pollutants distributed in planetary atmospheres.

Using experience gained from the studies of Mars, R.P. Turco, O.B. Toon, T. Ackerman, J.B. Pollack and C. Sagan made a computer study of the climatic effects of the smoke and dust that would result from a large-scale nuclear war. This early research project is sometimes called the TTAPS Study, after the initials of the authors.

In April 1983, a special meeting was held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where the results of the TTAPS Study and other independent studies of the nuclear winter effect were discussed by more than 100 experts. Their conclusions were presented at a forum in Washington, D.C., the following December, under the chairmanship of U.S. Senators Kennedy and Hatfield. The numerous independent studies of the nuclear winter effect all agreed of the following main predictions:

High-yield nuclear weapons exploded near the earth's surface would put large amounts of dust into the upper atmosphere. Nuclear weapons exploded over cities, forests, oilfields and refineries would produce fire storms of the type experienced in Dresden and Hamburg after incendiary bombings during the Second World War. The combination of high-altitude dust and lower altitude soot would prevent sunlight from reaching the earth's surface, and the degree of obscuration would be extremely high for a wide range of scenarios.

A baseline scenario used by the TTAPS study assumes a 5,000-megaton nuclear exchange, but the threshold for triggering the nuclear winter effect is believed to be much lower than that. After such an exchange, the screening effect of pollutants in the atmosphere might be so great that, in the northern and middle latitudes, the sunlight reaching the earth would be only 1% of ordinary sunlight on a clear day, and this effect would persist for many months. As a result, the upper layers in the atmosphere might rise in temperature by as much as 100 °C, while the surface temperatures would fall, perhaps by as much as 50 °C.

The temperature inversion produced in this way would lead to superstability, a condition in which the normal mixing of atmospheric layers is suppressed. The hydrological cycle (which normally takes moist air from the oceans to a higher and cooler level, where the moisture condenses as rain) would be strongly suppressed. Severe droughts would thus take place over continental land masses. The normal cleansing action of rain would be absent in the atmosphere, an effect which would prolong the nuclear winter.

In the northern hemisphere, forests would die because of lack of sunlight, extreme cold, and drought. Although the temperature drop in the southern hemisphere would be less severe, it might still be sufficient to kill a large portion of the tropical forests, which normally help to renew the earth's oxygen.

The oxygen content of the atmosphere would then fall dangerously, while the concentration of carbon dioxide and oxides of nitrogen produced by firestorms would remain high. The oxides of nitrogen would ultimately diffuse to the upper atmosphere, where they would destroy the ozone layer.

Thus, even when the sunlight returned after an absence of many months, it would be sunlight containing a large proportion of the ultraviolet frequencies which are normally absorbed by the ozone in the stratosphere, and therefore a type of light dangerous to life. Finally, after being so severely disturbed, there is no guarantee that the global climate would return to its normal equilibrium.

Even a nuclear war below the threshold of nuclear winter might have climatic effects very damaging to human life. Professor Paul Ehrlich, of Stanford University, has expressed this in the following words:

"...A smaller war, which set off fewer fires and put less dust into the atmosphere, could easily depress temperatures enough to essentially cancel grain production in the northern hemisphere. That in itself would be the greatest catastrophe ever delivered upon Homo Sapiens, just that one thing, not worrying about prompt effects. Thus even below the threshold, one cannot think of survival of a nuclear war as just being able to stand up after the bomb has gone off."¹¹

¹¹<http://www.voanews.com/content/pope-francis-calls-for-nuclear-weapons-ban/2909357.html>
<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-4/flaws-concept-nuclear-deterrence>
<http://www.countercurrents.org/avery300713.htm>
<https://www.wagingpeace.org/author/john-avery/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/08/06/70-years-after-bombing-hiroshima-calls-abolish-nuclear-weapons>
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42488.htm>
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42492.htm>
<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/08/06/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-remembering-power>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/07/22/israel-iran-and-the-nuclear-non-proliferation-treaty/>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/06/25/militarisms-hostages/>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/05/24/the-path-to-zero-dialogues-on-nuclear-dangers-by-richard-falk-and-david-krieger/>
<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/03/30/europe-must-not-be-forced-into-a-nuclear-war-with-russia/>
<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/32073-the-us-should-eliminate-its-nuclear-arsenal-not-modernize-it>
<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-4/flaws-concept-nuclear-deterrence>

A 2012 report published by International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War states that even a small local nuclear war between India and Pakistan would put two billion people at risk of starvation.

2.14 Dangers of nuclear power generation

The Chernobyl disaster

The dangers of nuclear power generation are exemplified by the Chernobyl disaster: On the 26th of April, 1986, during the small hours of the morning, the staff of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor in Ukraine turned off several safety systems in order to perform a test. The result was a core meltdown in Reactor 4, causing a chemical explosion that blew off the reactor's 1,000-ton steel and concrete lid. 190 tons of highly radioactive uranium and graphite were hurled into the atmosphere. The resulting radioactive fallout was 200 times greater than that caused by the nuclear bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The radioactive cloud spread over Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, Finland, Sweden and Eastern Europe, exposing the populations of these regions to levels of radiation 100 times the normal background. Ultimately, the radioactive cloud reached as far as Greenland and parts of Asia.

The exact number of casualties resulting from the Chernobyl meltdown is a matter of controversy, but according to a United Nations report, as many as 9 million people have been adversely affected by the disaster. Since 1986, the rate of thyroid cancer in affected areas has increased ten-fold. An area of 155,000 square kilometers (almost half the size of Italy) in Belarus, Ukraine and Russia is still severely contaminated. Even as far away as Wales, hundreds of farms are still under restrictions because of sheep eating radioactive grass.

Public opinion turned against nuclear power generation as a result of the Chernobyl disaster. Had the disaster taken place in Western Europe or North America, its effect on public opinion would have been still greater. Nevertheless, because of the current energy crisis, and because of worries about global warming, a number of people are arguing that nuclear energy should be given a second chance. The counter-argument is that a large

<http://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/issue-6/arms-trade-treaty-opens-new-possibilities-u>

<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-6/article/remember-your-humanity>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42568.htm>

<https://firstlook.org/theintercept/2014/09/23/nobel-peace-prize-fact-day-syria-7th-country-bombed-obama/>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42577.htm>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42580.htm>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/06/us-unleashing-of-atomic-weapons-against-civilian-populations-was-a-criminal-act-of-the-first-order/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/06/hiroshima-and-nagasaki-remembering-the-power-of-peace/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/04/atomic-bombing-hear-the-story-setsuko-thurlow/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/04/atomic-bombing-hear-the-story-yasuaki-yamashita/>

<http://human-wrongs-watch.net/2015/08/03/why-nuclear-weapons/>

increase in the share of nuclear power in the total spectrum of energy production would have little effect on climate change but it would involve unacceptable dangers, not only dangers of accidents and dangers associated with radioactive waste disposal, but above all, dangers of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Of the two bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, one made use of the rare isotope of uranium, U-235, while the other used plutonium. Both of these materials can be made by a nation with a nuclear power generation program.

Reactors and nuclear weapons

Uranium has atomic number 92, i.e., a neutral uranium atom has a nucleus containing 92 positively-charged protons, around which 92 negatively-charged electrons circle. All of the isotopes of uranium have the same number of protons and electrons, and hence the same chemical properties, but they differ in the number of neutrons in their nuclei. For example, the nucleus of U-235 has 143 neutrons, while that of U-238 has 146. Notice that $92+143=235$, while $92+146=238$. The number written after the name of an element to specify a particular isotope is the number of neutrons plus the number of protons. This is called the "nucleon number", and the weight of an isotope is roughly proportional to it. This means that U-238 is slightly heavier than U-235. If the two isotopes are to be separated, difficult physical methods dependent on mass must be used, since their chemical properties are identical. In natural uranium, the amount of the rare isotope U-235 is only 0.7 percent.

A paper published in 1939 by Niels Bohr and John A. Wheeler indicated that it was the rare isotope of uranium, U-235, that undergoes fission. A bomb could be constructed, they pointed out, if enough highly enriched U-235 could be isolated from the more common isotope, U-238. Calculations later performed in England by Otto Frisch and Rudolf Peierls showed that the "critical mass" of highly enriched uranium needed is quite small: only a few kilograms.

The Bohr-Wheeler theory also predicted that an isotope of plutonium, Pu-239, should be just as fissionable as U-235¹². Instead of trying to separate the rare isotope, U-235, from the common isotope, U-238, physicists could just operate a nuclear reactor until a sufficient amount of Pu-239 accumulated, and then separate it out by ordinary chemical means.

Thus in 1942, when Enrico Fermi and his coworkers at the University of Chicago produced the world's first controlled chain reaction within a pile of cans containing ordinary (nonenriched) uranium powder, separated by blocks of very pure graphite, the chain-reacting pile had a double significance: It represented a new source of energy for mankind,

¹²Both U-235 and Pu-239 have odd nucleon numbers. When U-235 absorbs a neutron, it becomes U-236, while when Pu-239 absorbs a neutron it becomes Pu-240. In other words, absorption of a neutron converts both these species to nuclei with even nucleon numbers. According to the Bohr-Wheeler theory, nuclei with even nucleon numbers are especially tightly-bound. Thus absorption of a neutron converts U-235 to a highly-excited state of U-236, while Pu-239 is similarly converted to a highly excited state of Pu-240. The excitation energy distorts the nuclei to such an extent that fission becomes possible.

but it also had a sinister meaning. It represented an easy path to nuclear weapons, since one of the by-products of the reaction was a fissionable isotope of plutonium, Pu-239. The bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 used U-235, while the Nagasaki bomb used Pu-239.

By reprocessing spent nuclear fuel rods, using ordinary chemical means, a nation with a power reactor can obtain weapons-usable Pu-239. Even when such reprocessing is performed under international control, the uncertainty as to the amount of Pu-239 obtained is large enough so that the operation might superficially seem to conform to regulations while still supplying enough Pu-239 to make many bombs.

The enrichment of uranium¹³ is also linked to reactor use. Many reactors of modern design make use of low enriched uranium (LEU) as a fuel. Nations operating such a reactor may claim that they need a program for uranium enrichment in order to produce LEU for fuel rods. However, by operating their ultracentrifuges a little longer, they can easily produce highly enriched uranium (HEU), i.e., uranium containing a high percentage of the rare isotope U-235, and therefore usable in weapons.

Known reserves of uranium are only sufficient for the generation of 8×10^{20} joules of electrical energy¹⁴, i.e., about 25 TWy. It is sometimes argued that a larger amount of electricity could be obtained from the same amount of uranium through the use of fast breeder reactors, but this would involve totally unacceptable proliferation risks. In fast breeder reactors, the fuel rods consist of highly enriched uranium. Around the core, is an envelope of natural uranium. The flux of fast neutrons from the core is sufficient to convert a part of the U-238 in the envelope into Pu-239, a fissionable isotope of plutonium.

Fast breeder reactors are prohibitively dangerous from the standpoint of nuclear proliferation because both the highly enriched uranium from the fuel rods and the Pu-239 from the envelope are directly weapons-usable. It would be impossible, from the standpoint of equity, to maintain that some nations have the right to use fast breeder reactors, while others do not. If all nations used fast breeder reactors, the number of nuclear weapons states would increase drastically.

It is interesting to review the way in which Israel, South Africa, Pakistan, India and North Korea¹⁵ obtained their nuclear weapons, since in all these cases the weapons were constructed under the guise of “atoms for peace”, a phrase that future generations may someday regard as being tragically self-contradictory.

Israel began producing nuclear weapons in the late 1960's (with the help of a “peaceful” nuclear reactor provided by France, and with the tacit approval of the United States) and the country is now believed to possess 100-150 of them, including neutron bombs. Israel's policy is one of visibly possessing nuclear weapons while denying their existence.

South Africa, with the help of Israel and France, also weaponized its civil nuclear program, and it tested nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean in 1979. In 1991 however, South Africa destroyed its nuclear weapons and signed the NPT.

¹³i.e. production of uranium with a higher percentage of U-235 than is found in natural uranium

¹⁴Craig, J.R., Vagn, D.J. and Skinner, B.J., *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, page 210.

¹⁵Israel, India and Pakistan have refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and North Korea, after signing the NPT, withdrew from it in 2003.

India produced what it described as a “peaceful nuclear explosion” in 1974. By 1989 Indian scientists were making efforts to purify the lithium-6 isotope, a key component of the much more powerful thermonuclear bombs. In 1998, India conducted underground tests of nuclear weapons, and is now believed to have roughly 60 warheads, constructed from Pu-239 produced in “peaceful” reactors.

Pakistan’s efforts to obtain nuclear weapons were spurred by India’s 1974 “peaceful nuclear explosion”. As early as 1970, the laboratory of Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan, (a metallurgist who was to become Pakistan’s leading nuclear bomb maker) had been able to obtain from a Dutch firm the high-speed ultracentrifuges needed for uranium enrichment. With unlimited financial support and freedom from auditing requirements, Dr. Khan purchased restricted items needed for nuclear weapon construction from companies in Europe and the United States. In the process, Dr. Khan became an extremely wealthy man. With additional help from China, Pakistan was ready to test five nuclear weapons in 1998. The Indian and Pakistani nuclear bomb tests, conducted in rapid succession, presented the world with the danger that these devastating weapons would be used in the conflict over Kashmir. Indeed, Pakistan announced that if a war broke out using conventional weapons, Pakistan’s nuclear weapons would be used “at an early stage”.

In Pakistan, Dr. A.Q. Khan became a great national hero. He was presented as the person who had saved Pakistan from attack by India by creating Pakistan’s own nuclear weapons. In a Washington Post article¹⁶ Pervez Hoodbhoy wrote: “Nuclear nationalism was the order of the day as governments vigorously promoted the bomb as the symbol of Pakistan’s high scientific achievement and self-respect...” Similar manifestations of nuclear nationalism could also be seen in India after India’s 1998 bomb tests.

Early in 2004, it was revealed that Dr. Khan had for years been selling nuclear secrets and equipment to Libya, Iran and North Korea, and that he had contacts with Al-Qaeda. However, observers considered that it was unlikely that Khan would be tried, since a trial might implicate Pakistan’s army as well as two of its former prime ministers.

Recent assassination attempts directed at Pakistan’s President, Pervez Musharraf, emphasize the precariousness of Pakistan’s government. There a danger that it may be overthrown, and that the revolutionists would give Pakistan’s nuclear weapons to a subnational organization. This type of danger is a general one associated with nuclear proliferation. As more and more countries obtain nuclear weapons, it becomes increasingly likely that one of them will undergo a revolution, during the course of which nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of criminals or terrorists.

If nuclear reactors become the standard means for electricity generation as the result of a future energy crisis, the number of nations possessing nuclear weapons might ultimately be as high as 40. If this should happen, then over a long period of time the chance that one or another of these nations would undergo a revolution during which the weapons would fall into the hands of a subnational group would gradually grow into a certainty.

There is also a possibility that poorly-guarded fissionable material could fall into the hands of subnational groups, who would then succeed in constructing their own nuclear

¹⁶1 February, 2004

weapons. Given a critical mass of highly-enriched uranium, a terrorist group, or an organized criminal (Mafia) group, could easily construct a crude gun-type nuclear explosive device. Pu-239 is more difficult to use since it is highly radioactive, but the physicist Frank Barnaby believes that a subnational group could nevertheless construct a crude nuclear bomb (of the Nagasaki type) from this material.

We must remember the remark of U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan after the 9/11/2001 attacks on the World Trade Center. He said, "*This time* it was not a nuclear explosion". The meaning of his remark is clear: If the world does not take strong steps to eliminate fissionable materials and nuclear weapons, it will only be a matter of time before they will be used in terrorist attacks on major cities, or by organized criminals for the purpose of extortion. Neither terrorists nor organized criminals can be deterred by the threat of nuclear retaliation, since they have no territory against which such retaliation could be directed. They blend invisibly into the general population. Nor can a "missile defense system" prevent criminals or terrorists from using nuclear weapons, since the weapons can be brought into a port in any one of the hundreds of thousands of containers that enter on ships each year, a number far too large to be checked exhaustively.

Finally we must remember that if the number of nations possessing nuclear weapons becomes very large, there will be a greatly increased chance that these weapons will be used in conflicts between nations, either by accident or through irresponsible political decisions.

On November 3, 2003, Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, made a speech to the United Nations in which he called for "limiting the processing of weapons-usable material (separated plutonium and high enriched uranium) in civilian nuclear programs - as well as the production of new material through reprocessing and enrichment - by agreeing to restrict these operations to facilities exclusively under international control." It is almost incredible, considering the dangers of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, that such restrictions were not imposed long ago.

From the facts that we have been reviewing, we can conclude that if nuclear power generation becomes widespread during a future energy crisis, and if equally widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons is to be avoided, the powers and budget of the IAEA will have to be greatly increased. All enrichment of uranium and Reprocessing fuel rods throughout the world will have to be placed be under direct international control, as has been emphasized by Mohamed ElBaradei. Because this will need to be done with fairness, such regulations will have to hold both in countries that at present have nuclear weapons and in countries that do not. It has been proposed that there should be an international fuel rod bank, to supply new fuel rods and reprocess spent ones. In addition to this excellent proposal, one might also consider a system where all power generation reactors and all research reactors would be staffed by the IAEA.

Nuclear reactors used for "peaceful" purposes unfortunately also generate fissionable isotopes of not only of plutonium, but also of neptunium and americium. Thus all nuclear reactors must be regarded as ambiguous in function, and all must be put under strict international control. One must ask whether globally widespread use of nuclear energy is worth the danger that it entails.

Let us now examine the question of whether nuclear power generation would appreciably help to prevent global warming. The fraction of nuclear power in the present energy generation spectrum is at present approximately 1/16. Nuclear energy is used primarily for electricity generation. Thus increasing the nuclear fraction would not affect the consumption of fossil fuels used directly in industry, transportation, in commerce, and in the residential sector. Coal is still a very inexpensive fuel, and an increase in nuclear power generation would do little to prevent it from being burned. Thus besides being prohibitively dangerous, and besides being unsustainable in the long run (because of finite stocks of uranium and thorium), the large-scale use of nuclear power cannot be considered to be a solution to the problem of anthropogenic climate change.

Optimists point to the possibility of using fusion of light elements, such as hydrogen, to generate power. However, although this can be done on a very small scale (and at great expense) in laboratory experiments, the practical generation of energy by means of thermonuclear reactions remains a mirage rather than a realistic prospect on which planners can rely. The reason for this is the enormous temperature required to produce thermonuclear reactions. This temperature is comparable to that existing in the interior of the sun, and it is sufficient to melt any ordinary container. Elaborate “magnetic bottles” have been constructed to contain thermonuclear reactions, and these have been used in successful very small scale experiments. However, despite 50 years of heavily-financed research, there has been absolutely no success in producing thermonuclear energy on a large scale, or at anything remotely approaching commercially competitive prices.

2.15 Military-industrial complexes today

“We’re going to take out seven countries in five years”

In an interview with Amy Goodman¹⁷, retired 4-star General Wesley Clark said: “About ten days after 9/11, I went through the Pentagon and I saw Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz. I went downstairs just to say hello to some of the people on the Joint Staff who used to work for me, any one of the generals called me in. He said, “Sir, you’ve got to come in and talk to me a second.” I said, “Well, you’re too busy.” He said, “No, no.” He says, “We’ve made the decision we’re going to war with Iraq.” This was on or about the 20th of September. I said, “We’re going to war with Iraq? Why?” He said, “I don’t know.” He said, “I guess they don’t know what else to do.” So I said, “Well, did they find some information connecting Saddam to al-Qaeda?” He said, “No, no.” He says, “There’s nothing new that way. They just made the decision to go to war with Iraq.” He said, “I guess it’s like we don’t know what to do about terrorists, but we’ve got a good military and we can take down governments.” And he said, “I guess if the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem has to look like a nail.

So I came back to see him a few weeks later, and by that time we were bombing in Afghanistan. I said, “Are we still going to war with Iraq?” And he said, “Oh, it’s worse

¹⁷<https://genius.com/General-wesley-clark-seven-countries-in-five-years-annotated>



Figure 2.27: General Wesley Clark

than that.” He reached over on his desk. He picked up a piece of paper. And he said, “I just got this down from upstairs” - meaning the Secretary of Defense’s office - “today.” And he said, “This is a memo that describes how we’re going to take out seven countries in five years, starting with Iraq, and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and, finishing off, Iran.” I said, “Is it classified?” He said, “Yes, sir.” I said, “Well, don’t show it to me.” And I saw him a year or so ago, and I said, “You remember that?” He said, “Sir, I didn’t show you that memo! I didn’t show it to you!”

The global trade in light arms

An important poverty-generating factor in the developing countries is war - often civil war. The five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council are, ironically, the five largest exporters of small arms. Small arms have a long life. The weapons poured into Africa by both sides during the Cold War are still there, and they contribute to political chaos and civil wars that block development and cause enormous human suffering.

The United Nations website on Peace and Security through Disarmament states that “Small arms and light weapons destabilize regions; spark, fuel and prolong conflicts; obstruct relief programmes; undermine peace initiatives; exacerbate human rights abuses; hamper development; and foster a ‘culture of violence’.”

An estimated 639 million small arms and light weapons are in circulation worldwide,

one for every ten people. Approximately 300,000 people are killed every year by these weapons, many of them women and children.

Examples of endemic conflict

In several regions of Africa, long-lasting conflicts have prevented development and caused enormous human misery. These regions include Ethiopia, Eritiria, Somalia (Darfur), Chad, Zimbabwe and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In the Congo, the death toll reached 5.4 million in 2008, with most of the victims dying of disease and starvation, but with war as the root cause. In view of these statistics, the international community can be seen to have a strong responsibility to stop supplying small arms and ammunition to regions of conflict. There is absolutely no excuse for the large-scale manufacture and international sale of small arms that exists today.

The Wolfowitz Doctrine

The Wolfowitz Doctrine is the unofficial name given to the early version of the Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy report for the 1994-99 fiscal years. It was later released by then Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney in 1993. It brazenly advocates that America do everything in its power to retain its global hegemony and superpower status, including ensuring that Russia, China, Iran and other regional powers - but especially Russia - be prevented from attaining enough power to seriously challenge the US. In short, it's another US blueprint for total global supremacy.

There are many quotable passages from the Wolfowitz Doctrine. Here's one which sums up its aims:

“Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia.”

Similar motives guide US policy today. In February, 2018, US Secretary of Defense James Mattis said: “We will continue to prosecute the campaign against terrorists, but great-power competition - not terrorism - is now the primary focus of US national security.”

Militarism in North Korea

The following states are now believed to currently possess nuclear weapons: The United states, Russia, The United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel. The way in which North Korea obtained its nuclear weapons is described by Wikipedia in the following paragraphs:




Figure 2.28: 40,000 children die each day from starvation or from poverty-related diseases. Meanwhile, the world spends more than \$1,700,000,000,000 each year on armaments.




Figure 2.29: **Countries by estimated nuclear warhead stockpiles according to the Federation of American scientists.**

“The nuclear program can be traced back to about 1962, when North Korea committed itself to what it called ‘all-fortressization’, which was the beginning of the hyper-militarized North Korea of today. In 1963, North Korea asked the Soviet Union for help in developing nuclear weapons, but was refused. The Soviet Union agreed to help North Korea develop a peaceful nuclear energy program, including the training of nuclear scientists. Later, China, after its nuclear tests, similarly rejected North Korean requests for help with developing nuclear weapons.

“Soviet engineers took part in the construction of the Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center and began construction of an IRT-2000 research reactor in 1963, which became operational in 1965 and was upgraded to 8 MW in 1974. In 1979 North Korea indigenously began to build in Yongbyon a second research reactor, an ore processing plant and a fuel rod fabrication plant. Soviet engineers took part in the construction of the Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center, and began construction of an IRT-2000 research reactor in 1963, which became operational in 1965 and was upgraded to 8 MW in 1974. In 1979 North Korea indigenously began to build in Yongbyon a second research reactor, an ore processing plant and a fuel rod fabrication plant. ”

Thus like other new nuclear weapons states, North Korea obtained nuclear weapons by misuse of nuclear power generation facilities donated by other countries. In addition, North Korea spend a large fraction of its GDP on conventional armaments. Under the Songun policy, the Korean Peoples Army is the central institution of North Korean society. As of 2016, the Korean Peoples Army had 5,889,000 paramilitary personelle (25% of the population of North Korea) making it the largest paramilitary organization on earth.

Table 2.1: **SIPRI Military Expenditure Database, 2016**

Rank	Country	Annual Spending \$ Bn.	% of GDP
1	United State	611.2	3.3
2	China	215.7	1.9
3	Russia	69.2	5.3
4	Saudi Arabia	63.7	10
5	India	55.9	2.5
6	France	55.7	2.3
7	United Kingdom	48.3	1.9
8	Japan	46.1	1.0
9	Germany	41.1	1.2
10	South Korea	36.8	2.7
11	Italy	27.9	1.5
12	Australia	24.3	2.0

Table 2.2: **SIPRI List of arms manufacturers, 2016**

Rank	Company	Country	Annual Arms Sales \$ Mn.
1	Lockheed Martin	United States	40,830
2	Boeing	United States	29,510
3	Raytheon	United States	22,910
4	BAE Systems	United Kingdom	22,700
5	Northrop Grumman	United States	21,400
6	General Dynamics	United States	19,230
7	Airbus	European Union	12,520
8	L-3 Communications	United States	8,890
9	Leonardo-Finmeccanica	Italy	8,500
10	Thales Group	France	8,170
11	United Technologies Corporation	United States	6,870
12	Huntington Ingals Industries	United States	6,720



Figure 2.30: North Korea's dictator, Kim Jong-un. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence rests on the assumption that political leaders will always act rationally, an assumption that seems very uncertain in the case of the U.S.-North Korean conflict.

The SIPRI Yearbook, 2017

Dan Smith of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) wrote the following Introduction to the organization's yearbook for 2017:

"An overall perspective on 2016 finds a balance between negative developments and the continued functioning of the international system. However, the year ended with clear grounds for concern that the balance sheet seemed to be tipping towards the negative amid growing unease about the durability of key parts of the international security architecture.

"Conflicts in the Middle East continued to generate humanitarian tragedies and large-scale movement of refugees, and violent conflict continued in several other parts of the world, most notably Africa, Asia and to a lesser extent Eastern Europe. Developments in North Korea's nuclear programme contributed to international political instability with potentially serious knock-on effects. On the positive side, the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement entered into force in November 2016, the 2015 Iran nuclear deal began implementation on time in early 2016 and the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution to start negotiations in 2017 on eliminating nuclear weapons. Progress was also made on work to monitor the unfolding implementation of the UN's Agenda 2030 for international social and economic development. A major contribution to the positive side of the balance sheet in 2016 was the peace agreement in Colombia.

"Nonetheless, virtually all the major global indicators for peace and security have moved in a negative direction: more military spending, increased arms trading, more violent conflicts and the continuing forward march of military technology.

"Existing multilateral and bilateral arms control agreements and processes are also under challenge-not least due to the deteriorating relationship between Russia and the United States-raising questions of global concern and potentially epochal scope. Were the great gains in peaceful relations since the end of the cold war now being reversed? Would the return of strategic competition between the major powers have negative implications for managing increased conflict risk? These uncertainties, combined with political developments in Europe and the USA- especially the vote by the United Kingdom to leave the European Union and the election of Donald J. Trump as US President-seemed to reveal

a much decreased commitment to international institutions and a renewed emphasis in several key states on a narrowly defined national interest.

“The scale of the challenges facing humanity has been summed up in the proposal to adopt the label of ‘the Anthropocene’ for the current era, thus designating it as one in which human activity is the dominant influence on climate and the environment. It is disconcerting to note that such cooperation risks becoming more elusive than it has seemed for most of the time since the end of the cold war, at a time when it is more needed than ever. Experience has shown that international cooperation can work. But is the international cooperative urge as persistent as the problems it needs to address?”

2.16 A culture of violence

Links with the entertainment industry

Here are a few films that glorify war:

- Black Hawk Down
- Top Gun
- Behind Enemy Lines
- Red Dawn (1984)
- American Sniper
- Iron Eagle
- Pearl Harbor
- Act of Valor
- We Were Soldiers
- The Green Berets



Figure 2.31: Tom Cruise in “Top Gun”.



Figure 2.32: A culture of violence supports the Devil’s Dynamo.




Figure 2.33: A culture of violence: In the United States the National Rifle Association has proposed guns in schools as the answer to the epidemic of school shootings.




Figure 2.34: A culture of violence. Guns in schools?

Suggestions for further reading

1. P.J. Bowler, *Evolution: The History of an Idea*, University of California Press, (1989).
2. D.J. Futuyma, *Evolutionary Biology*, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland Mass., (1986).
3. B. Glass, O. Temkin, and W.L. Strauss, eds., *Forerunners of Darwin: 1745-1859*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, (1959).
4. R. Milner, *The Encyclopedia of Evolution*, an Owl Book, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1990).
5. T.A. Appel, *The Cuvier-Geoffroy Debate: French Biology in the Decades before Darwin*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
6. P.J. Bowler, *Fossils and Progress: Paleontology and the Idea of Progressive Evolution in the Nineteenth Century*, Science History Publications, New York, (1976).
7. P. Corsi, *The Age of Lamarck: Evolutionary Theories in France, 1790-1834*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (1988).
8. M. McNeil, *Under the Banner of Science: Erasmus Darwin and his Age*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, (1987).
9. L.G. Wilson, *Sir Charles Lyell's Scientific Journals on the Species Question*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (1970).
10. A.B. Adams, *Eternal Quest: The Story of the Great Naturalists*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1969).
11. A.S. Packard, *Lamarck, the Founder of Evolution: His Life and Work*, Longmans, Green, and Co., New York, (1901).
12. C. Darwin, *An historical sketch of the progress of opinion on the Origin of Species, previously to the publication of this work*, Appended to third and later editions of *On the Origin of Species*, (1861).
13. L. Eiseley, *Darwin's Century: Evolution and the Men who Discovered It*, Doubleday, New York, (1958).
14. H.F. Osborne, *From the Greeks to Darwin: The Development of the Evolution Idea Through Twenty-Four Centuries*, Charles Scribner and Sons, New York, (1929).
15. Sir Julian Huxley and H.B.D. Kettlewell, *Charles Darwin and his World*, Thames and Hudson, London (1965).
16. Allan Moorehead, *Darwin and the Beagle*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1971).
17. Francis Darwin (editor), *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin and Selected Letters*, Dover, New York (1958).
18. Charles Darwin, *The Voyage of the Beagle*, J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London (1975).
19. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Collier MacMillan, London (1974).
20. Charles Darwin, *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*, The University of Chicago Press (1965).
21. Ruth Moore, *Evolution*, Time-Life Books (1962).
22. L. Barber, *The Heyday of Natural History: 1820-1870*, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, New York, (1980).
23. A. Desmond, *Huxley*, Addison Wesley, Reading, Mass., (1994).
24. R. Owen, (P.R. Sloan editor), *The Hunterian Lectures in Comparative Anatomy, May-June, 1837*, University of Chicago Press, (1992).

25. C. Nichols, *Darwinism and the social sciences*, Phil. Soc. Scient. **4**, 255-277 (1974).
26. M. Ruse, *The Darwinian Revolution*, University of Chicago Press, (1979).
27. A. Desmond and J. Moore, *Darwin*, Penguin Books, (1992).
28. R. Dawkins, *The Extended Phenotype*, Oxford University Press, (1982).
29. R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, W.W. Norton, (1987).
30. R. Dawkins, *River out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*, Harper Collins, (1995).
31. R. Dawkins, *Climbing Mount Improbable*, W.W. Norton, (1996).
32. S.J. Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*, W.W. Norton, (1977).
33. R.G.B. Reid, *Evolutionary Theory: The Unfinished Synthesis*, Croom Helm, (1985).
34. M. Ho and P.T. Saunders, editors, *Beyond Neo-Darwinism: An Introduction to a New Evolutionary Paradigm*, Academic Press, London, (1984).
35. J. Maynard Smith, *Did Darwin Get it Right? Essays on Games, Sex and Evolution*, Chapman and Hall, (1989).
36. E. Sober, *The Nature of Selection: Evolutionary Theory in Philosophical Focus*, University of Chicago Press, (1984).
37. B.K. Hall, *Evolutionary Developmental Biology*, Chapman and Hall, London, (1992).
38. J. Thompson, *Interaction and Coevolution*, Wiley and Sons, (1982).
39. R.A. Fischer, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Clarendon, Oxford, (1930).
40. J.B.S. Haldane, *Population genetics*, New Biology **18**, 34-51, (1955).
41. N. Tinbergen, *The Study of Instinct*, Oxford University Press, (1951).
42. N. Tinbergen, *The Herring Gull's World*, Collins, London, (1953).
43. N. Tinbergen, *Social Behavior in Animals*, Methuen, London, (1953).
44. N. Tinbergen, *Curious Naturalists*, Country Life, London, (1958).
45. N. Tinbergen, *The Animal in its World: Explorations of an Ethologist*, Allan and Unwin, London, (1973).
46. K. Lorenz, *On the evolution of behavior*, Scientific American, December, (1958).
47. K. Lorenz, *Evolution and Modification of Behavior* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, (1961).
48. K. Lorenz, *Studies in Animal and Human Behavior. I and II.*, Harvard University Press, (1970) and (1971).
49. P.H. Klopfer and J.P. Hailman, *An Introduction to Animal Behavior: Ethology's First Century*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, (1969).
50. J. Jaynes, *The historical origins of "Ethology" and "Comparative Psychology"*, Anim. Behav. **17**, 601-606 (1969).
51. W.H. Thorpe, *The Origin and Rise of Ethology: The Science of the Natural Behavior of Animals*, Heinemann, London, (1979).
52. R.A. Hinde, *Animal Behavior: A Synthesis of Ethological and Comparative Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, (1970).
53. J.H. Crook, editor, *Social Behavior in Birds and Mammals*, Academic Press, London, (1970).
54. P. Ekman, editor, *Darwin and Facial Expression*, Academic Press, New York, (1973).
55. P. Ekman, W.V. Friesen and P. Ekworth, *Emotions in the Human Face*, Pergamon, New York, (1972).

56. N. Blurton Jones, editor, *Ethological Studies of Child Behavior*, Cambridge University Press, (1975).
57. M. von Cranach, editor, *Methods of Inference from Animals to Human Behavior*, Chicago/Mouton, Haag, (1976); Aldine, Paris, (1976).
58. K. Lorenz, *On Aggression*, Bantem Books, (1977).
59. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Ethology, The Biology of Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, (1975).
60. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt and F.K. Salter, editors, *Indoctrinability, Ideology, and Warfare: Evolutionary Perspectives*, Berghahn Books, (1998).
61. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Human Ethology*, Walter De Gruyter Inc., (1989).
62. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Love and Hate*, Walter De Gruyter Inc., (1996).
63. J. Bowlby, *By ethology out of psychoanalysis: An experiment in interbreeding*, *Animal Behavior*, **28**, 649-656 (1980).
64. B.B. Beck, *Animal Tool Behavior*, Garland STPM Press, New York, (1980).
65. R. Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Basic Books, New York, (1984).
66. J.D. Carthy and F.L. Ebling, *The Natural History of Aggression*, Academic Press, New York, (1964)
67. D.L. Cheney and R.M. Seyfarth, *How Monkeys See the World: Inside the Mind of Another Species*, University of Chicago Press, (1990).
68. F. De Waal, *Chimpanzee Politics*, Cape, London, (1982).
69. M. Edmunds, *Defense in Animals*, Longman, London, (1974).
70. R.D. Estes, *The Behavior Guide to African Mammals*, University of California Press, Los Angeles, (1991).
71. R.F. Ewer, *Ethology of Mammals*, Logos Press, London, (1968).
72. E. Morgan, *The Scars of Evolution*, Oxford University Press, (1990).
73. W.D. Hamilton, *The genetical theory of social behavior. I and II*, *J. Theor. Biol.* **7**, 1-52 (1964).
74. R. Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press, (1989).
75. R.W. Sussman, *The Biological Basis of Human Behavior*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, (1997).
76. Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *The Biology of Peace and War*, Thames and Hudson, New York (1979).
77. R.A. Hinde, *Biological Bases of Human Social Behavior*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1977).
78. R.A. Hinde, *Towards Understanding Relationships*, Academic Press, London (1979).
79. Albert Szent-Györgyi, *The Crazy Ape*, Philosophical Library, New York (1970).
80. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press (1975).
81. C. Zhan-Waxler, *Altruism and Aggression: Biological and Social Origins*, Cambridge University Press (1986).
82. D.R. Griffin, *Animal Mind - Human Mind*, Dahlem Konferenzen 1982, Springer, Berlin, (1982).
83. R. Dart, *The predatory transition from ape to man*, *International Anthropological and Linguistic Review*, **1**, (1953).

84. S. Savage-Rumbaugh, R. Lewin, et al., *Kanzi: The Ape at the Brink of the Human Mind*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, (1996).
85. R. Dunbar, *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*, Harvard University Press, (1998).
86. M.E. Bitterman, *The evolution of intelligence*, Scientific American, January, (1965).
87. R. Fox, *In the beginning: Aspects of hominid behavioral evolution*, Man, **NS 2**, 415-433 (1967).
88. M.S. Gazzaniga, *The split brain in man*, Scientific American, **217**, 24-29 (1967).
89. D. Kimura, *The asymmetry of the human brain*, Scientific American, **228**, 70-78 (1973).
90. R.G. Klein, *Anatomy, behavior, and modern human origins*, Journal of World Prehistory, **9 (2)**, 167-198 (1995).
91. N.G. Jablonski and L.C. Aiello, editors, *The Origin and Diversification of Language*, Wattis Symposium Series in Anthropology. Memoirs of the California Academy of Sciences, No. 24, The California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, (1998).
92. S. Pinker, *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language*, Harper-Collins Publishers, New York, (1995).
93. J.H. Barkow, L. Cosmides and J. Tooby, editors, *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture*, Oxford University Press, (1995).
94. D.R. Begun, C.V. Ward and M.D. Rose, *Function, Phylogeny and Fossils: Miocene Hominid Evolution and Adaptations*, Plenum Press, New York, (1997).
95. R.W. Byrne and A.W. Whitten, *Machiavellian Intelligence: Social Expertise and the Evolution of Intellect in Monkeys, Apes and Humans*, Cambridge University Press, (1988).
96. V.P. Clark, P.A. Escholz and A.F. Rosa, editors, *Language: Readings in Language and Culture*, St Martin's Press, New York, (1997).
97. T.W. Deacon, *The Symbolic Species: The Co-evolution of Language and the Brain*, W.W. Norton and Company, New York, (1997).
98. C. Gamble, *Timewalkers: The Prehistory of Global Colonization*, Harvard University Press, (1994).
99. K.R. Gibson and T. Ingold, editors, *Tools, Language and Cognition in Human Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, (1993).
100. P. Mellers, *The Emergence of Modern Humans: An Archaeological Perspective*, Edinburgh University Press, (1990).
101. P. Mellers, *The Neanderthal Legacy: An Archaeological Perspective of Western Europe*, Princeton University Press, (1996).
102. S. Mithen, *The Prehistory of the Mind*, Thames and Hudson, London, (1996).
103. D. Haraway, *Signs of dominance: from a physiology to a cybernetics of primate biology*, C.R. Carpenter, 1939-1970, Studies in History of Biology, **6**, 129-219 (1983).
104. D. Johanson and M. Edey, *Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1981).
105. B. Kurtén, *Our Earliest Ancestors*, Colombia University Press, New York, (1992).
106. R.E. Leakey and R. Lewin, *Origins Reconsidered*, Doubleday, New York, (1992).

107. P. Lieberman, *The Biology and Evolution of Language*, Harvard University Press, (1984).
108. J.D. Wall and M. Przeworski, *When did the human population size start increasing?*, *Genetics*, **155**, 1865-1874 (2000).
109. L. Aiello and C. Dean, *An Introduction to Human Evolutionary Anatomy*, Academic Press, London, (1990).
110. F. Ikawa-Smith, ed., *Early Paleolithic in South and East Asia*, Mouton, The Hague, (1978).
111. R.R. Baker, *Migration: Paths Through Space and Time*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, (1982).
112. P. Bellwood, *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*, Academic Press, Sidney, (1985).
113. P.J. Bowler, *Theories of Human Evolution: A Century of Debate, 1884-1944*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, (1986).
114. G. Isaac and M. McCown, eds., *Human Origins: Louis Leaky and the East African Evidence*, Benjamin, Menlo Park, (1976).
115. F.J. Brown, R. Leaky, and A. Walker, *Early Homo erectus skeleton from west Lake Turkana, Kenya*, *Nature*, **316**, 788-92, (1985).
116. K.W. Butzer, *Archeology as Human Ecology*, Cambridge University Press, (1982).
117. A.T. Chamberlain and B.A. Wood, *Early hominid phylogeny*, *Journal of Human Evolution*, **16**, 119-33, (1987).
118. P. Mellars and C. Stringer, eds., *The Human Revolution: Behavioural and Biological Perspectives in the Origins of Modern Humans*, Edinburgh University Press, (1989).
119. G.C. Conroy, *Primate Evolution*, W.W. Norton, New York, (1990).
120. R.I.M. Dunbar, *Primate Social Systems*, Croom Helm, London, (1988).
121. B. Fagan, *The Great Journey: The Peopling of Ancient America*, Thames and Hudson, London, (1987).
122. R.A. Foley, ed., *Hominid Evolution and Community Ecology*, Academic Press, New York, (1984).
123. S.R. Binford and L.R. Binford, *Stone tools and human behavior*, *Scientific American*, **220**, 70-84, (1969).
124. G. Klein, *The Human Career, Human Biological and Cultural Origins*, University of Chicago Press, (1989).
125. B.F. Skinner and N. Chomsky, *Verbal behavior*, *Language*, **35** 26-58 (1959).
126. D. Bickerton, *The Roots of Language*, Karoma, Ann Arbor, Mich., (1981).
127. E. Lenneberg in *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, J.A. Fodor and J.A. Katz editors, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs N.J., (1964).
128. S. Pinker, *Talk of genetics and visa versa*, *Nature*, **413**, 465-466, (2001).
129. S. Pinker, *Words and rules in the human brain*, *Nature*, **387**, 547-548, (1997).
130. M. Ruhelen, *The Origin of Language*, Wiley, New York, (1994).
131. C.B. Stringer and R. McKie, *African Exodus: The Origins of Modern Humanity*, Johnathan Cape, London (1996).

132. R.W. Sussman, *The Biological Basis of Human Behavior*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, (1997).
133. D.P. Barash *Sociobiology and Behavior*, Elsevier, New York, (1977).
134. J.D. Carthy and F.J. Eblin, eds., *The Natural History of Aggression*, Academic Press, New York, (1964).
135. N.A. Chagnon and W. Irons, eds., *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior, an Anthropological Perspective*, Duxbury Press, N. Scituate, MA, (1979).
136. E. Danielson, *Vold, en Ond Arv?*, Gyldendal, Copenhagen, (1929).
137. M.R. Davie, *The Evolution of War*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, (1929).
138. T. Dobzhanski, *Mankind Evolving*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, (1962).
139. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Der Vorprogrammiert Mensch*, Molden, Vienna, (1973).
140. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Ethology, the Biology of Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, (1975).
141. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Liebe und Hass*, Molden, Vienna, (1973).
142. R.L. Holloway, *Primate Aggression: Territoriality and Xenophobia*, Academic Press, New York, (1974).
143. P. Kitcher, *Vaulting Ambition: Sociobiology and the Quest for Human Nature*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, (1985).
144. S.L.W. Mellen, *The Evolution of Love*, Freeman, Oxford, (1981).
145. A. Roe and G.G. Simpson, *Behavior and Evolution*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, (1958).
146. N.J. Smelser, *The Theory of Collective Behavior*, Free Press, New York, (1963).
147. R. Trivers, *Social Evolution*, Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA, (1985).
148. W. Weiser, *Konrad Lorenz und seine Kritiker*, Piper, Munich, (1976).
149. W. Wickler, *Biologie der 10 Gebote*, Piper, Munich, (1971).
150. E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology*, Harvard University Press (1975).
151. E.O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, Bantam Books, New York, (1979).
152. C. Zahn-Waxler, *Altruism and Aggression: Biological and Social Origins*, Cambridge University Press, (1986).
153. J. Galtung, *A structural theory of aggression*, Journal of Peace Research, **1**, 95-119, (1964).
154. G.E. Kang, *Exogamy and peace relations of social units: A cross-cultural test*, Ethology, **18**, 85-99, (1979).
155. A. Montagu, *Man and Aggression*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1968).
156. W.A. Nesbitt, *Human Nature and War*, State Education Department of New York, Albany, (1973).
157. W. Suttles, *Subhuman and human fighting*, Anthropologica, **3**, 148-163, (1961).
158. V. Vale and Andrea Juno, editors, *Modern Primitives: An Investigation of Contemporary Adornment and Ritual*, San Francisco Re/Search, (1990).
159. R.A. Hinde, editor, *The Institution of War*, Cambridge University Press, (1991).
160. R.A. Hinde, *Individuals, Relationships and Culture: Links Between Ethology and the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, (1987).
161. R.A. Hinde, *Ethology: Its Nature and Relationship With Other Sciences*

162. R.A. Hinde, *Animal Behaviour: A Synthesis of Ethology and Comparative Psychology*
163. R.A. Hinde, *Non-Verbal Communication*, Cambridge University Press, (1972).
164. R.A. Hinde, *Why Gods Persist: A Scientific Approach to Religion*, Routledge, London, (1999).
165. P.P.G. Bateson and R.A. Hinde, editors, *Growing Points in Ethology: Based on a Conference Sponsored by St. John's College and King's College, Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press, (1976).
166. R.A. Hinde, A.-N. Perret-Clermont and J. Stevenson-Hinde, editors, *Social Relationships and Cognitive Development*, Clarendon, Oxford, (1985).
167. R.A. Hinde and J. Stevenson-Hinde, editors, *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influences*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1988).
168. P. Bateson, editor, *The Development and Integration of Behaviour: Essays in Honour of Robert Hinde*, Cambridge University Press, (1991).
169. C. Darwin, *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*, The University of Chicago Press (1965).
170. P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid, A Factor in Evolution*, Walter Heinemann, London, (1902).
171. R.A. Fischer, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Clarendon, Oxford, (1930).
172. J.B.S. Haldane, *Population genetics*, *New Biology* **18**, 34-51, (1955).
173. L. Margulis, *Symbiosis as a Source of Evolutionary Innovation: Speciation and Morphogenesis*, The MIT Press, (1991).
174. L. Margulis, *Symbiosis in Cell Evolution: Microbial Communities in the Archean and Proterozoic Eons*, W.H. Freeman, (1992).
175. N. Tinbergen, *The Study of Instinct*, Oxford University Press, (1951).
176. I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *The Biology of Peace and War*, Thames and Hudson, New York (1979).
177. E.O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, Bantam Books, New York, (1979).
178. R.A. Hinde, *Biological Bases of Human Social Behavior*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1977).
179. R.A. Hinde, *Individuals, Relationships and Culture: Links Between Ethology and the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, (1987).
180. W.M. Senner, editor, *The Origins of Writing*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London, (1989).
181. A. Robock, L. Oman, G. L. Stenchikov, O. B. Toon, C. Bardeen, and R. Turco, *Climatic consequences of regional nuclear conflicts*, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, Vol. 7, p. 2003-2012, (2007).
182. M. Mills, O. Toon, R. Turco, D. Kinnison, R. Garcia, *Massive global ozone loss predicted following regional nuclear conflict*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)*, vol. 105(14), pp. 5307-12, Apr 8, (2008).
183. O. Toon, A. Robock, and R. Turco, *The Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War*, *Physics Today*, vol. 61, No. 12, p. 37-42, (2008).

184. R. Turco, O. Toon, T. Ackermann, J. Pollack, and C. Sagan, *Nuclear Winter: Global consequences of multiple nuclear explosions*, Science, Vol. 222, No. 4630, pp. 1283-1292, December (1983).
185. A. Robock, L. Oman, G. Stenchikov, *Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Still catastrophic consequences*, Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, Vol. 112, No. D13, p. 4 of 14, (2007).
186. I. Helfand, *An Assessment of the Extent of Projected Global Famine Resulting From Limited, Regional Nuclear War*, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Leeds, MA, (2007).
187. George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn, *A World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, The Wall Street Journal, January 4, 2007, page A15 and January 15, (2008), page A15.
188. Mikhail Gorbachev, *The Nuclear Threat*, The Wall Street Journal, January 30, (2007), page A15.
189. Massimo D'Alema, Gianfranco Fini, Giorgio La Malfa, Arturo Parisi and Francesco Calogero, *For a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Corriere Della Sera, July 24, (2008).
190. Hoover Institution, *Reykjavik Revisited; Steps Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, October, (2007).
191. Douglas Hurd, Malcolm Rifkind, David Owen and George Robertson, *Start Worrying and Learn to Ditch the Bomb*, The Times, June 30, (2008).
192. Des Brown, Secretary of State for Defense, UK, *Laying the Foundations for Multilateral Disarmament*, Geneva Conference on Disarmament, February 5, (2008).
193. Government of Norway, International Conference on *Achieving the Vision of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Oslo, Norway, February 26-27, (2008).
194. Jonas Gahr Støre, Foreign Minister, Norway, *Statement at the Conference on Disarmament*, Geneva, March 4, (2008).
195. Anne-Grete Strøm-Erichsen, Defense Minister, Norway, *Emerging Opportunities for Nuclear Disarmament*, Pugwash Conference, Canada, July 11, (2008).
196. Kevin Rudd, Prime Minister, Australia, *International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament*, Media Release, July 9, (2008).
197. Helmut Schmidt, Richard von Weizsäcker, Egon Bahr and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, *Towards a Nuclear-Free World: a German View*, International Herald Tribune, January 9, (2009).
198. Hans M. Kristensen and Elliot Negin, *Support Growing for Removal of U.S. Nuclear Weapons from Europe*, Common Dreams Newscenter, first posted May 6, (2005).
199. David Krieger, *President-elect Obama and a World Free of Nuclear Weapons*, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Website, (2008).
200. J.L. Henderson, *Hiroshima*, Longmans (1974).
201. A. Osada, *Children of the A-Bomb, The Testament of Boys and Girls of Hiroshima*, Putnam, New York (1963).
202. M. Hachiya, M.D., *Hiroshima Diary*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C. (1955).
203. M. Yass, *Hiroshima*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York (1972).

204. R. Jungk, *Children of the Ashes*, Harcourt, Brace and World (1961).
205. B. Hirschfield, *A Cloud Over Hiroshima*, Baily Brothers and Swinfin Ltd. (1974).
206. J. Hersey, *Hiroshima*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1975).
207. R. Rhodes, *Dark Sun: The Making of the Hydrogen Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1995).
208. R. Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1988).
209. D.V. Babst et al., *Accidental Nuclear War: The Growing Peril*, Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Ontario, (1984).
210. S. Britten, *The Invisible Event: An Assessment of the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Detonation of Nuclear Weapons and of War by Miscalculation*, Menard Press, London, (1983).
211. M. Dando and P. Rogers, *The Death of Deterrence*, CND Publications, London, (1984).
212. N.F. Dixon, *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*, Futura, London, (1976).
213. D. Frei and C. Catrina, *Risks of Unintentional Nuclear War*, United Nations, Geneva, (1982).
214. H. L'Etang, *Fit to Lead?*, Heinemann Medical, London, (1980).
215. SPANW, *Nuclear War by Mistake - Inevitable or Preventable?*, Swedish Physicians Against Nuclear War, Lulea, (1985).
216. J. Goldblat, *Nuclear Non-proliferation: The Why and the Wherefore*, (SIPRI Publications), Taylor and Francis, (1985).
217. J. Schear, ed., *Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Nuclear Risk*, Gower, London, (1984).
218. D.P. Barash and J.E. Lipton, *Stop Nuclear War! A Handbook*, Grove Press, New York, (1982).
219. C.F. Barnaby and G.P. Thomas, eds., *The Nuclear Arms Race: Control or Catastrophe*, Francis Pinter, London, (1982).
220. L.R. Beres, *Apocalypse: Nuclear Catastrophe in World Politics*, Chicago University press, Chicago, IL, (1980).
221. F. Blackaby et al., eds., *No-first-use*, Taylor and Francis, London, (1984).
222. NS, ed., *New Statesman Papers on Destruction and Disarmament* (NS Report No. 3), New Statesman, London, (1981).
223. H. Caldicot, *Missile Envy: The Arms Race and Nuclear War*, William Morrow, New York, (1984).
224. R. Ehrlich, *Waging the Peace: The Technology and Politics of Nuclear Weapons*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, (1985).
225. W. Epstein, *The Prevention of Nuclear War: A United Nations Perspective*, Gunn and Hain, Cambridge, MA, (1984).
226. W. Epstein and T. Toyoda, eds., *A New Design for Nuclear Disarmament*, Spokesman, Nottingham, (1975).
227. G.F. Kennan, *The Nuclear Delusion*, Pantheon, New York, (1983).
228. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).

229. J.R. Macy, *Despair and Personal Power in the Nuclear Age*, New Society Publishers, Philadelphia, PA, (1983).
230. A.S. Miller et al., eds., *Nuclear Weapons and Law*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, (1984).
231. MIT Coalition on Disarmament, eds., *The Nuclear Almanac: Confronting the Atom in War and Peace*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, (1984).
232. UN, *Nuclear Weapons: Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations*, United Nations, New York, (1980).
233. IC, *Proceedings of the Conference on Understanding Nuclear War*, Imperial College, London, (1980).
234. B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1959).
235. F. Barnaby, *The Nuclear Age*, Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, (1974).
236. D. Albright, F. Berkhout and W. Walker, *Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium 1996: World Inventories, Capabilities and Policies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (1997).
237. G.T. Allison et al., *Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, (1996).
238. B. Bailin, *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy, and the Post-colonial State*, Zed Books, London, (1998).
239. P. Bidawi and A. Vanaik, *South Asia on a Short Fuse: Nuclear Politics and the Future of Global Disarmament*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2001).
240. F.A. Boyle, *The Criminality of Nuclear Deterrence: Could the U.S. War on Terrorism Go Nuclear?*, Clarity Press, Atlanta GA, (2002).
241. G. Burns, *The Atomic Papers: A Citizen's Guide to Selected Books and Articles on the Bomb, the Arms Race, Nuclear Power, the Peace Movement, and Related Issues*, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen NJ, (1984).
242. L. Butler, *A Voice of Reason*, The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, **54**, 58-61, (1998).
243. R. Butler, *Fatal Choice: Nuclear Weapons and the Illusion of Missile Defense*, Westview Press, Boulder CO, (2001).
244. R.P. Carlisle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Atomic Age*, Facts on File, New York, (2001).
245. G.A. Cheney, *Nuclear Proliferation: The Problems and Possibilities*, Franklin Watts, New York, (1999).
246. A. Cohen, *Israel and the Bomb*, Colombia University Press, New York, (1998).
247. S.J. Diehl and J.C. Moltz, *Nuclear Weapons and Nonproliferation: A Reference Handbook*, ABC-Clio Information Services, Santa Barbara CA, (2002).
248. H.A. Feiveson (Ed.), *The Nuclear Turning Point: A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-Alerting of Nuclear Weapons*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., (1999).
249. R. Hilsman, *From Nuclear Military Strategy to a World Without War: A History and a Proposal*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, (1999).
250. International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research *Plutonium: Deadly Gold of the Nuclear Age*, International Physicians Press, Cambridge MA, (1992).

251. R.W. Jones and M.G. McDonough, *Tracking Nuclear Proliferation: A Guide in Maps and Charts, 1998*, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1998).
252. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).
253. R.E. Powaski, *March to Armageddon: The United States and the Nuclear Arms Race, 1939 to the Present*, Oxford University Press, (1987).
254. J. Rotblat, J. Steinberger and B. Udgaonkar (Eds.), *A Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: Desirable? Feasible?*, Westview Press, (1993).
255. The United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, Graded Press, Nashville, (1986).
256. U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment (Ed.), *Dismantling the Bomb and Managing the Nuclear Materials*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., (1993).
257. S.R. Weart, *Nuclear Fear: A History of Images*, Harvard University Press, (1988).
258. P. Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*, University of North Carolina Press, (1985).
259. C. Perrow, *Normal Accidents: Living With High-Risk Technologies*, Basic Books, (1984).
260. P. Rogers, *The Risk of Nuclear Terrorism in Britain*, Oxford Research Group, Oxford, (2006).
261. MIT, *The Future of Nuclear Power: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study*, <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpow> (2003).
262. Z. Mian and A. Glaser, *Life in a Nuclear Powered Crowd*, INES Newsletter No. 52, 9-13, April, (2006).
263. K. Bergeron, *Nuclear Weapons: The Death of No Dual-use*, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 15-17, January, (2004).
264. E. Chivian, and others (eds.), *Last Aid: The Medical Dimensions of Nuclear War*, W.H. Freeman, San Fransisco, (1982).
265. Medical Association's Board of Science and Education, *The Medical Effects of Nuclear War*, Wiley, (1983).
266. Kevin Rudd, Prime Minister, Australia, "International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", Media Release, July 9, 2008.
267. Global Zero, www.globalzero.org/paris-conference
268. Helmut Schmidt, Richard von Weizäcker, Egon Bahr and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, "Towards a Nuclear-Free World: a German View", International Herald Tribune, January 9, 2009.
269. Hans M. Kristensen and Elliot Negin, "Support Growing for Removal of U.S. Nuclear Weapons from Europe", Common Dreams Newscenter, first posted May 6, 2005.
270. David Krieger, "President-elect Obama and a World Free of Nuclear Weapons", Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Website, 2008.
271. J.L. Henderson, *Hiroshima*, Longmans (1974).

272. A. Osada, *Children of the A-Bomb, The Testament of Boys and Girls of Hiroshima*, Putnam, New York (1963).
273. M. Hachiya, M.D., *Hiroshima Diary*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C. (1955).
274. M. Yass, *Hiroshima*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York (1972).
275. R. Jungk, *Children of the Ashes*, Harcourt, Brace and World (1961).
276. B. Hirschfield, *A Cloud Over Hiroshima*, Baily Brothers and Swinfin Ltd. (1974).
277. J. Hersey, *Hiroshima*, Penguin Books Ltd. (1975).
278. R. Rhodes, *Dark Sun: The Making of the Hydrogen Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1995).
279. R. Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1988).
280. D.V. Babst et al., *Accidental Nuclear War: The Growing Peril*, Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Ontario, (1984).
281. S. Britten, *The Invisible Event: An Assessment of the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Detonation of Nuclear Weapons and of War by Miscalculation*, Menard Press, London, (1983).
282. M. Dando and P. Rogers, *The Death of Deterrence*, CND Publications, London, (1984).
283. N.F. Dixon, *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*, Futura, London, (1976).
284. D. Frei and C. Catrina, *Risks of Unintentional Nuclear War*, United Nations, Geneva, (1982).
285. H. L'Etang, *Fit to Lead?*, Heinemann Medical, London, (1980).
286. SPANW, *Nuclear War by Mistake - Inevitable or Preventable?*, Swedish Physicians Against Nuclear War, Lulea, (1985).
287. J. Goldblat, *Nuclear Non-proliferation: The Why and the Wherefore*, (SIPRI Publications), Taylor and Francis, (1985).
288. IAEA, *International Safeguards and the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, (1985).
289. J. Schear, ed., *Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and Nuclear Risk*, Gower, London, (1984).
290. D.P. Barash and J.E. Lipton, *Stop Nuclear War! A Handbook*, Grove Press, New York, (1982).
291. C.F. Barnaby and G.P. Thomas, eds., *The Nuclear Arms Race: Control or Catastrophe*, Francis Pinter, London, (1982).
292. L.R. Beres, *Apocalypse: Nuclear Catastrophe in World Politics*, Chicago University press, Chicago, IL, (1980).
293. F. Blackaby et al., eds., *No-first-use*, Taylor and Francis, London, (1984).
294. NS, ed., *New Statesman Papers on Destruction and Disarmament* (NS Report No. 3), New Statesman, London, (1981).
295. H. Caldicot, *Missile Envy: The Arms Race and Nuclear War*, William Morrow, New York, (1984).
296. R. Ehrlich, *Waging the Peace: The Technology and Politics of Nuclear Weapons*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, (1985).

297. W. Epstein, *The Prevention of Nuclear War: A United Nations Perspective*, Gunn and Hain, Cambridge, MA, (1984).
298. W. Epstein and T. Toyoda, eds., *A New Design for Nuclear Disarmament*, Spokesman, Nottingham, (1975).
299. G.F. Kennan, *The Nuclear Delusion*, Pantheon, New York, (1983).
300. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).
301. J.R. Macy, *Despair and Personal Power in the Nuclear Age*, New Society Publishers, Philadelphia, PA, (1983).
302. A.S. Miller et al., eds., *Nuclear Weapons and Law*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, (1984).
303. MIT Coalition on Disarmament, eds., *The Nuclear Almanac: Confronting the Atom in War and Peace*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, (1984).
304. UN, *Nuclear Weapons: Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations*, United Nations, New York, (1980).
305. IC, *Proceedings of the Conference on Understanding Nuclear War*, Imperial College, London, (1980).
306. B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1959).
307. F. Barnaby, *The Nuclear Age*, Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, (1974).
308. D. Albright, F. Berkhout and W. Walker, *Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium 1996: World Inventories, Capabilities and Policies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (1997).
309. G.T. Allison et al., *Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, (1996).
310. B. Bailin, *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy, and the Post-colonial State*, Zed Books, London, (1998).
311. G.K. Bertsch and S.R. Grillot, (Eds.), *Arms on the Market: Reducing the Risks of Proliferation in the Former Soviet Union*, Routledge, New York, (1998).
312. P. Bidawi and A. Vanaik, *South Asia on a Short Fuse: Nuclear Politics and the Future of Global Disarmament*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2001).
313. F.A. Boyle, *The Criminality of Nuclear Deterrence: Could the U.S. War on Terrorism Go Nuclear?*, Clarity Press, Atlanta GA, (2002).
314. G. Burns, *The Atomic Papers: A Citizen's Guide to Selected Books and Articles on the Bomb, the Arms Race, Nuclear Power, the Peace Movement, and Related Issues*, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen NJ, (1984).
315. L. Butler, *A Voice of Reason*, The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, **54**, 58-61, (1998).
316. R. Butler, *Fatal Choice: Nuclear Weapons and the Illusion of Missile Defense*, Westview Press, Boulder CO, (2001).
317. R.P. Carlisle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Atomic Age*, Facts on File, New York, (2001).
318. G.A. Cheney, *Nuclear Proliferation: The Problems and Possibilities*, Franklin Watts, New York, (1999).
319. A. Cohen, *Israel and the Bomb*, Colombia University Press, New York, (1998).

320. S.J. Diehl and J.C. Moltz, *Nuclear Weapons and Nonproliferation: A Reference Handbook*, ABC-Clio Information Services, Santa Barbara CA, (2002).
321. H.A. Feiveson (Ed.), *The Nuclear Turning Point: A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-Alerting of Nuclear Weapons*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., (1999).
322. R. Hilsman, *From Nuclear Military Strategy to a World Without War: A History and a Proposal*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, (1999).
323. International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research *Plutonium: Deadly Gold of the Nuclear Age*, International Physicians Press, Cambridge MA, (1992).
324. R.W. Jones and M.G. McDonough, *Tracking Nuclear Proliferation: A Guide in Maps and Charts, 1998*, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., (1998).
325. R.J. Lifton and R. Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism*, Basic Books, New York, (1982).
326. J. Rotblat, J. Steinberger and B. Udgaonkar (Eds.), *A Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: Desirable? Feasible?*, Westview Press, (1993).
327. The United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, Graded Press, Nashville, (1986).
328. U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment (Ed.), *Dismantling the Bomb and Managing the Nuclear Materials*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., (1993).
329. S.R. Weart, *Nuclear Fear: A History of Images*, Harvard University Press, (1988).
330. P. Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*, University of North Carolina Press, (1985).
331. A. Makhijani and S. Saleska, *The Nuclear Power Deception: Nuclear Mythology From Electricity 'Too Cheap to Meter' to 'Inherently Safe' Reactors*, Apex Press, (1999).
332. C. Perrow, *Normal Accidents: Living With High-Risk Technologies*, Basic Books, (1984).
333. P. Rogers, *The Risk of Nuclear Terrorism in Britain*, Oxford Research Group, Oxford, (2006).
334. MIT, *The Future of Nuclear Power: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study*, <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpow> (2003).
335. Z. Mian and A. Glaser, *Life in a Nuclear Powered Crowd*, INES Newsletter No. 52, 9-13, April, (2006).
336. E. Chivian, and others (eds.), *Last Aid: The Medical Dimensions of Nuclear War*, W.H. Freeman, San Fransisco, (1982).
337. P.B. Smith, J.D. Schilling and A.P. Haines, *Introduction and Summary*, in *Draft Report of the Pugwash Study Group: The World at the Crossroads*, Berlin, (1992).
338. World Resources Institute, *World Resources*, Oxford University Press, New York, (published annually).
339. J.R. Craig, D.J. Vaughan and B.J. Skinner, *Resources of the Earth: Origin, Use and Environmental Impact, Third Edition*, Prentice Hall, (2001).

- 340. W. Youngquist, *Ge destinies: The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources Over Nations and Individuals*, National Book Company, Portland Oregon, (1997).
- 341. M. Tanzer, *The Race for Resources. Continuing Struggles Over Minerals and Fuels*, Monthly Review Press, New York, (1980).
- 342. C.B. Reed, *Fuels, Minerals and Human Survival*, Ann Arbor Science Publishers Inc., Ann Arbor Michigan, (1975).
- 343. A.A. Bartlett, *Forgotten Fundamentals of the Energy Crisis*, American Journal of Physics, **46**, 876-888, (1978).
- 344. N. Gall, *We are Living Off Our Capital*, Forbes, September, (1986).

Chapter 3

THE MEDIA SABOTAGE PROGRESSIVE POLITICS

3.1 Restoring Democracy in the United States

The Occupy Wall Street movement's slogan, "We are the 99 percent", points to the fact that a very small power elite, perhaps only 1 percent of the population, has a hugely disproportionate amount of economic and political power in the United States. In this sense, the United States is no longer a democracy, since neither the economic system nor the government serve the will and needs of the people. They serve instead the interests of the wealthy and powerful 1 percent, who control not only the mass media and the financial system, but also the politicians of both major parties. The situation in many other countries is very similar.

But as Occupy Wall Street tells us, this need not be so. After all we, the ordinary people, who long for reform, are an overwhelming majority. We are the 99 percent, and if we choose to exert ourselves, we have the power to change the system. The problem is that, having voted, we tend to lapse into several years of political inactivity, convinced that we are powerless. But nothing could be more false than our sense of powerlessness, and nothing could be more dangerous to true democracy. Voting is only a small part of our duty. We must also maintain constant political activity to ensure that those whom we have placed in office actually serve the will and the needs of the people. This means creating our own media, if the mass media are slaves to the power elite. It means constant activity, meetings, demonstrations, exhibitions, videos produced for U-tube, and whatever other means we can invent to constantly hold before the public and the government a vision of what is right.

When President Obama was elected for a second term, the majority of the world's peoples heaved a huge sigh of relief. Disaster had been avoided. But the newly re-elected President is faced with a House of Representatives controlled by the Republicans, and with a Senate which hardly differs from the House on most issues. Both the House and the Senate are powerfully influenced by lobbies, representing, for example, the interests of Wall

Street, the fossil fuel industry and the military-industrial complex. Therefore they take no action to regulate the banks, or to cut grossly bloated military budgets, or to address the vital issue of climate change. Instead they plan to cut social services for a population that already is in great distress.

3.2 Europe needs to be independent

Legacies from the First and Second World Wars and the Cold War

In both World War I and World War II, participation by the United States brought victory to the Allies. In the years that followed 1945, the Marshall Plan helped Europe to recover. During the Cold War period that followed, many people in Europe saw NATO, and a close alliance with the United States, as means for preventing a takeover by the Soviet Union.

However, whatever debt of gratitude Europe may owe to the United States for its past help, we must now ask whether the time has not now arrived for Europe to be independent. Just as the US once declared it is independence from England, Europe must now declare its independence from the United States.

The loss of democracy in the United States

Recent revelations by Edward Snowden, Wikileaks and other whistle-blowers have made it clear that the United States has suffered a decay of its political institutions. The US can hardly be called a democracy today, since it seems to be ruled by an extremely wealthy oligarchy rather than by its people. In fact, the people of the US do not really know what their government is doing because the activities of the CIA, the NSA, Secret Service, Homeland Security the FBI, and many other agencies are masked in secrecy. A country where the people do not know what their government is doing, and where the people have no control over their government's actions, cannot be said to be a democracy.

The history of this huge secret side of the US government goes back to the Cold War period, during which both sides engaged in both covert and military interference with the internal affairs of smaller countries. The Soviet Union and China also intervened in the internal affairs of many countries, for example in Korea in 1950-53, Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, and so on; very long list.

Meanwhile the US interfered, militarily or covertly, in the internal affairs of a large number of nations: China, 1945-49; Italy, 1947-48; Greece, 1947-49; Philippines, 1946-53; South Korea, 1945-53; Albania, 1949-53; Germany, 1950s; Iran, 1953; Guatemala, 1953-1990s; Middle East, 1956-58; Indonesia, 1957-58; British Guiana/Guyana, 1953-64; Vietnam, 1950-73; Cambodia, 1955-73; The Congo/Zaire, 1960-65; Brazil, 1961-64; Dominican Republic, 1963-66; Cuba, 1959-present; Indonesia, 1965; Chile, 1964-73; Greece, 1964-74; East Timor, 1975-present; Nicaragua, 1978-89; Grenada, 1979-84; Libya, 1981-89; Panama, 1989; Iraq, 1990-present; Afghanistan 1979-92; El Salvador, 1980-92; Haiti, 1987-94; Yugoslavia, 1999; and Afghanistan, 2001-present, Syria, 2013-present. Egypt,

2013-present, Venezuela, 2013-present. None of these interventions, from either side, can be justified, since people have a right to live under governments of their own choosing, regardless of whether those governments are optimal.¹

With the fall of the Soviet Union, intoxication with the idea of the United States as the sole superpower expressed itself in the form of contempt for international law and the United Nations, and especially in the declarations of the “Project for a New American Century”, which many people have compared to Hitler’s “Mein Kampf”.

NATO

Former UN Assistant Secretary General Hans Christof von Sponeck used the following words to express his opinion that NATO now violates the UN Charter and international law: “In the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty, the Charter of the United Nations was declared to be NATO’s legally binding framework. However, the United-Nations monopoly of the use of force, especially as specified in Article 51 of the Charter, was no longer accepted according to the 1999 NATO doctrine. NATO’s territorial scope, until then limited to the Euro-Atlantic region, was expanded by its members to include the whole world”

One might say that in recent years, participation in NATO has made European countries accomplices in US efforts to achieve global hegemony by means of military force, in violation of the UN Charter and international law.

Article 2 of the UN Charter requires that “All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.” This requirement is somewhat qualified by Article 51, which says that “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.”

Thus, in general, war is illegal under the UN Charter. Self-defense against an armed attack is permitted, but only for a limited time, until the Security Council has had time to act. The United Nations Charter does not permit the threat or use of force in preemptive wars, or to produce regime changes, or for so-called “democratization”, or for the domination of regions that are rich in oil. NATO must not be a party to the threat or use of force for such illegal purposes, but instead must support the authority of the United Nations Charter, and the fundamental authority of international law.

US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe

At present, NATO’s nuclear weapons policies violate both the spirit and the text of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in several respects: Today there are an estimated 200 US nuclear weapons still in Europe. The air forces of the nations in which they are based are

¹ <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article3249.htm>
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article29129.htm>

regularly trained to deliver the US weapons. This “nuclear sharing”, as it is called, violates Articles I and II of the NPT, which forbid the transfer of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon states. It has been argued that the NPT would no longer be in force if a crisis arose, but there is nothing in the NPT saying that the treaty would not hold under all circumstances.

Article VI of the NPT requires states possessing nuclear weapon to get rid of them within a reasonable period of time. This article is violated by fact that NATO policy is guided by a Strategic Concept, which visualizes the continued use of nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future.

The principle of no-first-use of nuclear weapons has been an extremely important safeguard over the years, but it is violated by present NATO policy, which permits the first-use of nuclear weapons in a wide variety of circumstances.

NSA spying on European leaders

The massive illegal collection of private data by the National Security Agency has produced worldwide anger. The targeting of European leaders has included the famous bugging of Angela Merkel’s cellphone.

In the words of former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Paul Craig Roberts, “Obama’s US Trade Representative, who has been negotiating secret trade agreements in Europe and Asia that give US corporations immunity to the laws of all countries that sign the agreements, has threatened WTO penalties if Europe’s communications network excludes the US companies that serve as spies for NSA. Washington in all its arrogance has told its most necessary allies that if you don’t let us spy on you, we will use WTO to penalize you.”

7

What will the future bring?

For many years, the US dollar has acted as a global currency. However, we can already see moves away from the “petrodollar”. When China, India, Russia, Iran and Brazil begin non-dollar trading, the value of the dollar will fall drastically, and US political and economic power will fall with it. This is just one more reason why European independence is desirable. But the most important reasons why we should wish for European independence are ethical ones: Europe must not be the close ally (or puppet?) of the world’s greatest purveyor of violence and war.

Must Europe really be dragged into a potentially catastrophic war with Russia?

At present the United States government is trying to force the European members of NATO to participate in aggressive operations in connection with the coup which it carried out in

Ukraine. Europe must refuse²

The hubris, and reckless irresponsibility of the US government in risking a catastrophic war with Russia is almost beyond belief, but the intervention in Ukraine is only one in a long series of US interventions:

Do the people of Europe really want to participate in the madness of aggression against Russia? Of course not! What about European leaders? Why don't they follow the will of the people and free Europe from bondage to the United States? Have our leaders been bribed? Or have they been blackmailed through personal secrets, discovered by the long arm of NSA spying?

3.3 Secrecy and democracy are incompatible

It is obvious, almost by definition, that excessive governmental secrecy and true democracy are incompatible. If the people of a country have no idea what their government is doing, they cannot possibly have the influence on decisions that the word "democracy" implies.

Dark government

Governmental secrecy is not something new. Secret diplomacy contributed to the outbreak of World War I, and the secret Sykes-Picot agreement later contributed to the bitterness of conflicts in the Middle East. However, in recent years, governmental secrecy has grown enormously.

The revelations of Edward Snowden and others have shown that the number of people involved in secret operations of the United States government is now as large as the entire population of Norway: roughly 5 million. The influence of this dark side of government has become so great that no president is able to resist it.

In a recent article, John Chuckman remarked that "The CIA is now so firmly entrenched and so immensely well financed (much of it off the books, including everything from secret budget items to the peddling of drugs and weapons) that it is all but impossible for a president to oppose it the way Kennedy did. Obama, who has proved himself to be a fairly weak character from the start, certainly has given the CIA anything it wants. The dirty business of ISIS in Syria and Iraq is one project. The coup in Ukraine is another. The pushing of NATO's face right against Russia's borders is another. Several attempted coups in Venezuela are still more. And the creation of a drone air force for extra-judicial killings in half a dozen countries is yet another. They don't resemble projects we would expect from a smiley-faced intelligent man who sometimes wore sandals and refused to wear a flag pin on his lapel during his first election campaign."³

Of course the United States government is by no means alone in practicing excessive secrecy: Scott Horton recently wrote an article entitled *How to Rein in a Secretive Shadow*

²<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2014/04/natos-aggression-against-russia-and-the-danger-of-war-in-europe/>

³ <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article41222.htm>

Government Is Our National Security Crisis. He dedicated the article to the Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov because, as he said, “Sakharov recognized that the Soviet Union rested on a colossal false premise: it was not so much socialism (though Sakharov was certainly a critic of socialism) as it was the obsession with secrecy, which obstructed the search for truth, avoided the exposure of mistakes, and led to the rise of powerful bureaucratic elites who were at once incompetent and prone to violence.”⁴

Censorship of the news

Many modern governments have become very expert in manipulating public opinion through mass media. They only allow the public to hear a version of the “news” that has been handed down by powerholders. Of course, people can turn to the alternative media that are available on the Internet. But on the whole, the vision of the world presented on television screens and in major newspapers is the “truth” that is accepted by the majority of the public, and it is this picture of events that influences political decisions. Censorship of the news by the power elite is a form of secrecy, since it withholds information that is needed for a democracy to function properly.

Coups, torture and illegal killing

During the period from 1945 to the present, the US interfered, militarily or covertly, in the internal affairs of at least 38 nations. Most of these interventions were explained to the American people as being necessary to combat communism (or more recently, terrorism), but an underlying motive was undoubtedly the desire to put in place governments and laws that would be favorable to the economic interests of the US and its allies.

For the sake of balance, we should remember that during the Cold War period, the Soviet Union and China also intervened in the internal affairs of many countries. These Cold War interventions were also unjustifiable. Nothing can justify military or covert interference by superpowers in the internal affairs of smaller countries, since people have a right to live under governments of their own choosing even if those governments are not optimal.

Many people in Latin America and elsewhere have been tortured: The long history of CIA torture was recently investigated, but only small portions of the 6000-page report are available to the public. The rest remains secret.⁵ Extrajudicial killing of civilians by means of drones is also shrouded by secrecy, and it too is a gross violation of democratic principles.⁶

⁴ <http://truth-out.org/progressivepicks/item/29636-scott-horton-how-to-rein-in-a-secretive-shadow-government-is-our-national-security-crisis>

⁵ <https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/03/the-cia-in-latin-america-from-coups-to-torture-and-preemptive-killings/>

⁶ <http://www.globalresearch.ca/lawless-drone-killings/5355535>

Secret trade deals

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is one of the trade deals that is being negotiated in secret. Not even the US congress is allowed to know the details of the document. However, enough information has been leaked to make it clear that if the agreement is passed, foreign corporations would be allowed to “sue” the US government for loss of profits because of (for example) environmental regulations. The “trial” would be outside the legal system, before a tribunal of lawyers representing the corporations.⁷

A similar secret trade deal with Europe, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), is also being “fast-tracked”. One can hardly imagine greater violations of democratic principles.

Secret land purchases in Africa

According to a report released by the Oakland Institute, in 2009 alone, hedge funds bought or leased nearly 60 million hectares of land in Africa, an area the size of France.⁸

As populations increase, and as water becomes scarce, China, and other countries, such as Saudi Arabia are also buying enormous tracts of agricultural land, not only in Africa, but also in other countries.⁹ These land purchases are very often kept secret from the local populations by corrupt governments.

Secrecy, democracy and nuclear weapons

Nuclear weapons were developed in secret. The decision to use them on the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in an already-defeated Japan was made in secret. Since 1945, secrecy has surrounded all aspects of nuclear weapons, and for this reason it is clear that they are essentially undemocratic.

Nuclear disarmament has been one of the core aspirations of the international community since the first use of nuclear weapons in 1945. A nuclear war, even a limited one, would have global humanitarian and environmental consequences, and thus it is a responsibility of all governments, including those of non-nuclear countries, to protect their citizens and engage in processes leading to a world without nuclear weapons.

Now a new process has been established by the United Nations General Assembly, an Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) to Take Forward Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament Negotiations. The OEWG convened at the UN offices in Geneva on May 14, 2013. Among the topics discussed was a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention.

The Model Nuclear Weapons Convention prohibits development, testing, production, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. States possessing nuclear

⁷ <http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=5411>
<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/03/world-at-a-crossroads-stop-the-fast-track-to-a-future-of-global-corporate-rule/>

⁸ <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-13688683>

⁹ <http://www.latimes.com/world/asia/la-fg-china-foreign-farmland-20140329-story.html>

weapons will be required to destroy their arsenals according to a series of phases. The Convention also prohibits the production of weapons usable fissile material and requires delivery vehicles to be destroyed or converted to make them non-nuclear capable.

Verification will include declarations and reports from States, routine inspections, challenge inspections, on-site sensors, satellite photography, radionuclide sampling and other remote sensors, information sharing with other organizations, and citizen reporting. Persons reporting suspected violations of the convention will be provided protection through the Convention including the right of asylum.

Thus we can see that the protection of whistleblowers is an integral feature of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention now being discussed. As Sir Joseph Rotblat (1908-2005, Nobel Laureate 1995) frequently emphasized in his speeches, societal verification must be an integral part of the process of “going to zero” (i.e, the total elimination of nuclear weapons). This is because nuclear weapons are small enough to be easily hidden. How will we know whether a nation has destroyed all of its nuclear arsenal? We have to depend on information from insiders, whose loyalty to the whole of humanity prompts them to become whistleblowers. And for this to be possible, they need to be protected.

In general, if the world is ever to be free from the threat of complete destruction by modern weapons, we will need a new global ethic, an ethic as advanced as our technology. Of course we can continue to be loyal to our families, our localities and our countries. But this must be supplemented by a higher loyalty: a loyalty to humanity as a whole.

Freedom from fear

In order to justify secrecy, enormous dark branches of government and mass illegal spying, governments say: “We are protecting you from terrorism”. But terrorism is not a real threat, since our chances of dying from a terrorist attack are vanishingly small compared to (for example) preventable disease or an automobile accident. If we are ever to reclaim our democracy, we must free ourselves from fear.

3.4 Democracy and freedom of information

The Icelandic parliamentarian, Birgitta Jonsdottir, has taken an important step towards solving one of the central problems that the world is facing today. The problem is this: How can we regain democratic government when the mainstream media are completely controlled the corporate oligarchy?

If anyone doubts that democratic government has been lost and needs to be regained, let them think of the recent US election, in which a large percentage of the voters stayed home because they were disillusioned with the political process. They knew that whomever they elected, their voices would not be heard.

The voters did not like to be told that they had power, which in fact they did not have. Both major political parties follow the dictates of the corporate oligarchs, rather than the will of the people. No doubt the Democrats in the US Congress are slightly better than

the Republicans, but both parties have essentially been bought by big money from lobbies representing the military-industrial complex, the fossil fuel companies, and Israel.

Contrary to the wishes of the people, social services continue to be cut in favor of obscenely bloated military budgets, perpetual foreign wars, and environment-destroying subsidization of the fossil fuel industry. Despite the will of the people, the US government exposes our beautiful earth to the deadly risks of all-destroying thermonuclear war and out-of-control global warming.

The United States is by no means the only country with an oligarchic non-democratic government. Globally, countries with truly democratic and sane governments are the exception rather than the rule. Therefore the problem is a global one, and let us repeat it: How can we regain democratic government when the mainstream media are completely controlled the corporate oligarchy?

Let us return to Birgitta Jonsdottir. Who is she? Birgitta is a popular and successful young Icelandic poet, writer, artist, publisher and anti-war activist, who had no inkling until quite recently that she was destined to become a politician. Then in 2008, Iceland underwent a financial crisis. It became clear that the crisis was due to corrupt links of politicians with Iceland's financial sector. In 2009, Birgitta ran for the Icelandic Parliament (Althingi, the oldest parliament in the world) as part of the reform movement.

Believing that lack of free information was the main cause of the corruption behind Iceland's 2008 crisis, Birgitta Jonsdottir persuaded her colleagues in the Althingi to pass unanimously a law calling for complete freedom of information in Iceland. She also worked closely with Julian Assange to produce the video "Collateral Murder".¹⁰

Under Birgitta Jonsdottir's leadership, Icelandic parliamentarians have passed laws which will make make Iceland a safe haven for journalistic freedom. In so doing, they will help to re-establish democratic government throughout the world, a vital step if nuclear and climatic disasters are to be averted.

3.5 Racism, colonialism and exceptionalism

It seems to be possible for nations, and the majority of their citizens, to commit the worst imaginable atrocities, including torture, murder and genocide, while feeling that what they are doing is both noble and good. Some understanding of how this is possible can be gained by watching the 3-part BBC documentary, "The History of Racism".

The series was broadcast by BBC Four in March 2007. and videos of the broadcasts are available on the Internet. Watching this eye-opening documentary can give us much insight into the link between racism and colonialism. We can also begin to see how both racism and colonialism are linked to US exceptionalism and neocolonialism.

Looking at the BBC documentary we can see how often in human history economic greed and colonial exploitation have been justified by racist theories. The documentary

¹⁰ <https://en.immi.is/media/documentaries-on-immi/>
<http://birgitta.is>
<http://en.immi.is>

describes almost unbelievable cruelties committed against the peoples of the Americas and Africa by Europeans. For example, in the Congo, a vast region which King Leopold II of Belgium claimed as his private property, the women of villages were held as hostages while the men were forced to gather rubber in the forests. Since neither the men nor the women could produce food under these circumstances, starvation was the result.

Leopold's private army of 90,000 men were issued ammunition, and to make sure that they used it in the proper way, the army was ordered to cut off the hands of their victims and send them back as proof that the bullets had not been wasted. Human hands became a kind of currency, and hands were cut off from men, women and children when rubber quotas were not fulfilled. Sometimes more than a thousand human hands were gathered in a single day. During the rule of Leopold, roughly 10,000,000 Congolese were killed, which was approximately half the population of the region.

According to the racist theories that supported these atrocities, it was the duty of philanthropic Europeans like Leopold to bring civilization and the Christian religion to Africa. Similar theories were used to justify the genocides committed by Europeans against the native inhabitants of the Americas. Racist theories were also used to justify enormous cruelties committed by the British colonial government in India. For example, during the great famine of 1876-1878, in which ten million people died, the Viceroy, Lord Lytton, oversaw the export from India to England of a record 6.4 million hundredweight of wheat.

Meanwhile, in Europe, almost everyone was proud of the role which they were playing in the world. All that they read in newspapers and in books or heard from the pulpits of their churches supported the idea that they were serving the non-Europeans by bringing them the benefits of civilization and Christianity. Kipling wrote: "Take up the White Man's burden, Send forth the best ye breed, Go bind your sons to exile, To serve your captives' need; To wait in heavy harness, On fluttered folk and wild, Your new-caught, sullen peoples, Half-devil and half-child." On the whole, the mood of Europe during this orgy of external cruelty and exploitation, was self-congratulatory.

Can we not see a parallel with the self-congratulatory mood of the American people and their allies, who export violence, murder, torture and neocolonialism to the whole world, and who justify it by thinking of themselves as "exceptional"?

The world urgently needs a new ethic, in which loyalty to humanity as a whole is fundamental. Racism, colonialism and exceptionalism can have no place in the future if humanity is to survive in an era of thermonuclear weapons.

3.6 Attacks on Iran, past and present

Iran has an ancient and beautiful civilization, which dates back to 7,000 BC, when the city of Susa was founded. Some of the earliest writing that we know of, dating from from approximately 3,000 BC, was used by the Elamite civilization near to Susa. Today's Iranians are highly intelligent and cultured, and famous for their hospitality, generosity and kindness to strangers. Over the centuries, Iranians have made many contributions to science, art and literature, and for hundreds of years they have not attacked any of

their neighbors. Nevertheless, for the last 90 years, they have been the victims of foreign attacks and interventions, most of which have been closely related to Iran's oil and gas resources. The first of these took place in the period 1921-1925, when a British-sponsored coup overthrew the Qajar dynasty and replaced it by Reza Shah.

Reza Shah (1878-1944) started his career as Reza Khan, an army officer. Because of his high intelligence he quickly rose to become commander of the Tabriz Brigade of the Persian Cossacks. In 1921, General Edmond Ironside, who commanded a British force of 6,000 men fighting against the Bolsheviks in northern Persia, masterminded a coup (financed by Britain) in which Reza Khan led 15,000 Cossacks towards the capital. He overthrew the government, and became minister of war. The British government backed this coup because it believed that a strong leader was needed in Iran to resist the Bolsheviks. In 1923, Reza Khan overthrew the Qajar Dynasty, and in 1925 he was crowned as Reza Shah, adopting the name Pahlavi.

Reza Shah believed that he had a mission to modernize Iran, in much the same way that Kamil Ata Turk had modernized Turkey. During his 16 years of rule in Iran, many roads were built, the Trans-Iranian Railway was constructed, many Iranians were sent to study in the West, the University of Tehran was opened, and the first steps towards industrialization were taken. However, Reza Shah's methods were sometimes very harsh.

In 1941, while Germany invaded Russia, Iran remained neutral, perhaps leaning a little towards the side of Germany. However, Reza Shah was sufficiently critical of Hitler to offer safety in Iran to refugees from the Nazis. Fearing that the Germans would gain control of the Abadan oil fields, and wishing to use the Trans-Iranian Railway to bring supplies to Russia, Britain invaded Iran from the south on August 25, 1941. Simultaneously, a Russian force invaded the country from the north. Reza Shah appealed to Roosevelt for help, citing Iran's neutrality, but to no avail. On September 17, 1941, he was forced into exile, and replaced by his son, Crown Prince Mohammed Reza Pahlavi. Both Britain and Russia promised to withdraw from Iran as soon as the war was over. During the remainder of World War II, although the new Shah was nominally the ruler of Iran, the country was governed by the allied occupation forces.

Reza Shah, had a strong sense of mission, and felt that it was his duty to modernize Iran. He passed on this sense of mission to his son, the young Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi. The painful problem of poverty was everywhere apparent, and both Reza Shah and his son saw modernization of Iran as the only way to end poverty.

In 1951, Mohammad Mosaddegh became Prime Minister of Iran through democratic elections. He was from a highly-placed family and could trace his ancestry back to the shahs of the Qajar dynasty. Among the many reforms made by Mosaddegh was the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's possessions in Iran. Because of this, the AIOC (which later became British Petroleum), persuaded the British government to sponsor a secret coup that would overthrow Mosaddegh. The British asked US President Eisenhower and the CIA to join M16 in carrying out the coup, claiming that Mosaddegh represented a communist threat (a ludicrous argument, considering Mosaddegh's aristocratic background). Eisenhower agreed to help Britain in carrying out the coup, and it took place in 1953. The Shah thus obtained complete power over Iran.

The goal of modernizing Iran and ending poverty was adopted as an almost-sacred mission by the young Shah, Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, and it was the motive behind his White Revolution in 1963, when much of the land belonging to the feudal landowners and the crown was distributed to landless villagers. However, the White Revolution angered both the traditional landowning class and the clergy, and it created fierce opposition. In dealing with this opposition, the Shah's methods were very harsh, just as his fathers had been. Because of alienation produced by his harsh methods, and because of the growing power of his opponents, Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi was overthrown in the Iranian Revolution of 1979. The revolution of 1979 was to some extent caused by the British-American coup of 1953.

One can also say that the westernization, at which both Shah Reza and his son aimed, produced an anti-western reaction among the conservative elements of Iranian society. Iran was "falling between two stools", on the one hand western culture and on the other hand the country's traditional culture. It seemed to be halfway between, belonging to neither. Finally in 1979 the Islamic clergy triumphed and Iran chose tradition.

Meanwhile, in 1963, the US had secretly backed a military coup in Iraq that brought Saddam Hussein's Ba'ath Party to power. In 1979, when the western-backed Shah of Iran was overthrown, the United States regarded the fundamentalist Shiite regime that replaced him as a threat to supplies of oil from Saudi Arabia. Washington saw Saddam's Iraq as a bulwark against the Shiite government of Iran that was thought to be threatening oil supplies from pro-American states such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

In 1980, encouraged to do so by the fact that Iran had lost its US backing, Saddam Hussein's government attacked Iran. This was the start of an extremely bloody and destructive war that lasted for eight years, inflicting almost a million casualties on the two nations. Iraq used both mustard gas and the nerve gases Tabun and Sarin against Iran, in violation of the Geneva Protocol. Both the United States and Britain helped Saddam Hussein's government to obtain chemical weapons.

The present attacks on Iran by Israel and the United States, both actual and threatened, have some similarity to the war against Iraq, which was launched by the United States in 2003. In 2003, the attack was nominally motivated by the threat that nuclear weapons would be developed, but the real motive had more to do with a desire to control and exploit the petroleum resources of Iraq, and with Israel's extreme nervousness at having a powerful and somewhat hostile neighbor. Similarly, hegemony over the huge oil and gas reserves of Iran can be seen as one of the main reasons why the United States is presently demonizing Iran, and this is combined with Israel's almost paranoid fear of a large and powerful Iran. Looking back on the "successful" 1953 coup against Mosaddegh, Israel and the United States perhaps feel that sanctions, threats, murders and other pressures can cause a regime change that will bring a more compliant government to power in Iran - a government that will accept US hegemony. But aggressive rhetoric, threats and provocations can escalate into full-scale war.

I do not wish to say that Iran's present government is without serious faults. However, any use of violence against Iran would be both insane and criminal. Why insane? Because the present economy of the US and the world cannot support another large-scale conflict;

because the Middle East is already a deeply troubled region; and because it is impossible to predict the extent of a war which, if once started, might develop into World War III, given the fact that Iran is closely allied with both Russia and China. Why criminal? Because such violence would violate both the UN Charter and the Nuremberg Principles. There is no hope at all for the future unless we work for a peaceful world, governed by international law, rather than a fearful world, where brutal power holds sway.

3.7 Some contributions of Islamic culture

At a time when the corporate-controlled media of Europe and the United States are doing their utmost to fill us with poisonous Islamophobia, it is perhaps a useful antidote to remember the great role that Islamic civilization played in preserving, enlarging and transmitting to us the knowledge and culture of the ancient world.

After the burning of the great library at Alexandria and the destruction of Hellenistic civilization, most of the books of the classical Greek and Hellenistic philosophers were lost. However, a few of these books survived and were translated from Greek, first into Syriac, then into Arabic and finally from Arabic into Latin. By this roundabout route, fragments from the wreck of the classical Greek and Hellenistic civilizations drifted back into the consciousness of the West.

The Roman empire was ended in the 5th century A.D. by attacks of barbaric Germanic tribes from northern Europe. However, by that time, the Roman empire had split into two halves. The eastern half, with its capital at Byzantium (Constantinople), survived until 1453, when the last emperor was killed vainly defending the walls of his city against the Turks.

The Byzantine empire included many Syriac-speaking subjects; and in fact, beginning in the 3rd century A.D., Syriac replaced Greek as the major language of western Asia. In the 5th century A.D., there was a split in the Christian church of Byzantium; and the Nestorian church, separated from the official Byzantine church. The Nestorians were bitterly persecuted by the Byzantines, and therefore they migrated, first to Mesopotamia, and later to south-west Persia. (Some Nestorians migrated as far as China.)

During the early part of the middle ages, the Nestorian capital at Gondisapur was a great center of intellectual activity. The works of Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Euclid, Archimedes, Ptolemy, Hero and Galen were translated into Syriac by Nestorian scholars, who had brought these books with them from Byzantium.

Among the most distinguished of the Nestorian translators were the members of a family called Bukht-Yishu (meaning "Jesus hath delivered"), which produced seven generations of outstanding scholars. Members of this family were fluent not only in Greek and Syriac, but also in Arabic and Persian.

In the 7th century A.D., the Islamic religion suddenly emerged as a conquering and proselytizing force. Inspired by the teachings of Mohammad (570 A.D. - 632 A.D.), the Arabs and their converts rapidly conquered western Asia, northern Africa, and Spain. During the initial stages of the conquest, the Islamic religion inspired a fanaticism in



Figure 3.1: An example of Iranian art

its followers which was often hostile to learning. However, this initial fanaticism quickly changed to an appreciation of the ancient cultures of the conquered territories; and during the middle ages, the Islamic world reached a very high level of culture and civilization.

Thus, while the century from 750 to 850 was primarily a period of translation from Greek to Syriac, the century from 850 to 950 was a period of translation from Syriac to Arabic. It was during this latter century that Yuhanna Ibn Masawiah (a member of the Bukht-Yishu family, and medical advisor to Caliph Harun al-Rashid) produced many important translations into Arabic.

The skill of the physicians of the Bukht-Yishu family convinced the Caliphs of the value of Greek learning; and in this way the family played an extremely important role in the preservation of the western cultural heritage. Caliph al-Mamun, the son of Harun al-Rashid, established at Baghdad a library and a school for translation, and soon Baghdad replaced Gondisapur as a center of learning.

The English word "chemistry" is derived from the Arabic words "al-chimia", which mean "the changing". The earliest alchemical writer in Arabic was Jabir (760-815), a friend of Harun al-Rashid. Much of his writing deals with the occult, but mixed with this is a certain amount of real chemical knowledge. For example, in his Book of Properties, Jabir gives a recipe for making what we now call lead hydroxycarbonate (white lead), which is used in painting and pottery glazes:

Another important alchemical writer was Rahzes (c. 860 - c. 950). He was born in the ancient city of Ray, near Teheran, and his name means "the man from Ray". Rhazes studied medicine in Baghdad, and he became chief physician at the hospital there. He wrote the first accurate descriptions of smallpox and measles, and his medical writings include methods for setting broken bones with casts made from plaster of Paris. Rahzes was the first person to classify substances into vegetable, animal and mineral. The word "al-kali", which appears in his writings, means "the calcined" in Arabic. It is the source of our word "alkali", as well as of the symbol K for potassium.

The greatest physician of the middle ages, Avicenna, (Abu-Ali al Hussain Ibn Abdullah Ibn Sina, 980-1037), was also a Persian, like Rahzes. More than a hundred books are attributed to him. They were translated into Latin in the 12th century, and they were among the most important medical books used in Europe until the time of Harvey. Avicenna also wrote on alchemy, and he is important for having denied the possibility of transmutation of elements.

In mathematics, one of the most outstanding Arabic writers was al-Khwarizmi (c. 780 - c. 850). The title of his book, *Ilm al-jabr wa'd muqabalah*, is the source of the English word "algebra". In Arabic al-jabr means "the equating". Al-Khwarizmi's name has also become an English word, "algorithm", the old word for arithmetic. Al-Khwarizmi drew from both Greek and Hindu sources, and through his writings the decimal system and the use of zero were transmitted to the West.

One of the outstanding Arabic physicists was al-Hazen (965-1038). He did excellent work in optics, and in this field he went far beyond anything done by the Greeks. Al-Hazen studied the reflection of light by the atmosphere, an effect which makes the stars appear displaced from their true positions when they are near the horizon; and he calculated the

height of the atmospheric layer above the earth to be about ten miles. He also studied the rainbow, the halo, and the reflection of light from spherical and parabolic mirrors. In his book, *On the Burning Sphere*, he shows a deep understanding of the properties of convex lenses. Al-Hazen also used a dark room with a pin-hole opening to study the image of the sun during an eclipse. This is the first mention of the camera obscura, and it is perhaps correct to attribute the invention of the camera obscura to al-Hazen.

Another Islamic philosopher who had great influence on western thought was Averroes, who lived in Spain from 1126 to 1198. His writings took the form of thoughtful commentaries on the works of Aristotle. He shocked both his Muslim and his Christian readers by maintaining that the world was not created at a definite instant, but that it instead evolved over a long period of time, and is still evolving.

In the 12th century, parts of Spain, including the city of Toledo, were reconquered by the Christians. Toledo had been an Islamic cultural center, and many Muslim scholars, together with their manuscripts, remained in the city when it passed into the hands of the Christians. Thus Toledo became a center for the exchange of ideas between east and west; and it was in this city that many of the books of the classical Greek and Hellenistic philosophers were translated from Arabic into Latin.

It is interesting and inspiring to visit Toledo. A tourist there can see ample evidence of a period of tolerance and enlightenment, when members of the three Abrahamic religions, Christianity, Judaism and Islam, lived side by side in harmony and mutual respect, exchanging important ideas which were to become the foundations of our modern civilization. One can also see a cathedral, a mosque and a synagogue, in each of which craftsmen from all three faiths worked cooperatively to produce a beautiful monument to human solidarity.

3.8 Politeness in multi-ethnic societies

The attack on Charlie Hebdo, in which 12 people were killed, claimed massive media attention worldwide. Everyone agreed that freedom of speech and democracy had been brutally attacked, and many people proclaimed “Je suis Charlie!”, in solidarity with the murdered members of the magazine’s staff.

In Denmark, it was proposed that the offending cartoons of the prophet Mohammad should be reprinted in major newspapers. However, in the United States, there was no such proposal, and in fact, US television viewers were not even allowed to see the drawings that had provoked the attack. How is this difference between Denmark and the US to be explained?

Denmark is a country with a predominantly homogeneous population, which only recently has become more diverse through the influx of refugees from troubled parts of the world. Thus, I believe, Denmark has not yet had time to learn that politeness is essential for preventing conflicts in a multi-ethnic society. On the other hand, the United States has lived with the problem for much longer.

During most of its history, the US has had substantial Spanish-speaking and Italian-

speaking minorities, as well as great religious diversity. During the 1960's the civil rights movement fought against racial prejudice and gradually achieved most of its goals. Thus, over a very long period of time, the United States learned to avoid racial and religious insults in its media, and this hard-earned wisdom has allowed the very markedly multi-ethnic US society to function with a minimum of racial and religious conflicts.

Is this a lesson that the world as a whole needs to learn? I strongly believe that it is. Globally, we are in great need of a new ethic, which regards all humans as brothers and sisters, regardless of race, religion or nationality. Human solidarity will become increasingly important in the future, as stress from climate change and the vanishing of nonrenewable resources becomes more pronounced.

To get through the difficult time ahead of us, we will need to face the dangers and challenges of the future arm in arm, respecting each other's differing beliefs, and emphasizing our common humanity rather than our differences.

3.9 The 2016 US presidential election

In the United States, campaigns for the presidential election of 2016 might have been an occasion for a realistic discussion of the enormously important challenges which we now face, not only in the America, but also throughout the world.

The most important issues

Most thoughtful people agree that the two most important issues facing humanity today are the threat of catastrophic and uncontrollable climate change, and the threat of nuclear war. Each of these threatened disasters has the potential to destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. But on the whole these vitally important issues were not discussed in an honest way in the mainstream media. Instead the campaign spectacle presented to us by the media was washed down into the murky depths of stupidity by rivers of money from the fossil fuel giants and the military industrial complex.

The Republican presidential candidates were almost single-voiced in denying the reality of climate change, and they were almost unanimously behind foreign policy options that would push the world to the brink of nuclear war. What about the Democrats and Independents? We will discuss this question in a moment, but first let us look at the two major issues:

The reality of climate change

Unless rapid action is taken, the world may soon pass a tipping point after which human efforts to avoid catastrophic climate change will be useless because feedback loops will have taken over. However, our present situation is by no means hopeless, because of the extremely rapid rate of growth of renewable energy. What can governments do to help? They can stop subsidizing the fossil fuel industry! Without massive fossil fuel

subsidies, renewables would be the cheaper option, and economic forces alone would drive the urgently-needed transition to 100% renewable energy.

A report by RNE21, a global renewable energy policy network, states that “Global subsidies for fossil fuels remain high despite reform efforts. Estimates range from USD 550 billion (International Energy Agency) to USD 5.6 trillion per year (International Monetary Fund), depending on how ‘subsidy’ is defined and calculated.”

“Growth in renewable energy (and energy efficiency improvements) is tempered by subsidies to fossil fuels and nuclear power, particularly in developing countries. Subsidies keep conventional energy prices artificially low, which makes it more difficult for renewable energy to compete...”

“Creating a level playing field can lead to a more efficient allocation of financial resources, helping to strengthen to advance the development of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. Removing fossil fuel and energy subsidies globally would reflect more accurately the true cost of energy generation.”¹¹

An Elephant in the room

There is, so to speak, an elephant in the room; but no one wants to talk about it. Everyone (with a very few exceptions) pretends not to see it. They pretend that it is not there. What is this metaphorical elephant? It is the Pentagon’s colossal budget, which is far too sacred a thing to be mentioned in an election campaign.

The size of this budget is almost beyond comprehension: 610 billion dollars per year. This does not include nuclear weapons research, maintenance, cleanup and production, which are paid for by the Department of Energy. Nor does it include payments in pensions to military retirees and widows, nor interest on debt for past wars, nor the State Department’s financing foreign arms sales and military-related development assistance, nor special emergency grants for current wars. Nor are the expenses of the Department of Homeland Security included in the Pentagon’s budget, nor those of the CIA, nor the huge budget of NSA and other dark branches of the US government. One can only guess at the total figure if everything should be included, but it is probably well over a trillion dollars per year.

The hidden presence in the room is a trillion-dollar elephant. Perhaps we should include subsidies to fossil fuel giants. Then we would have a multi-trillion-dollar elephant. But it is too sacred to be mentioned. Cut Medicare! Cut pensions! Cut Social Security! Abolish food stamps! Sacrifice support for education! We are running out of money! (Meanwhile the elephant stands there, too holy to be seen.)

Bernie Sanders and Jill Stein

I will not say anything about Hillary Clinton, because she is almost indistinguishable from the Republican presidential candidates, both on the issues related to war and on those

¹¹ <http://www.ren21.net/status-of-renewables/global-status-report/>



Figure 3.2: When Senator Bernie Sanders began his campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, few people believed that he could succeed. But as his campaign gained momentum, enormous crowds were attracted to his reformist speeches, and small individual donors supported his expenses. Although the crowds at Sanders' speeches were at least four times the size of those attending the rallies of other candidates, they were not reported in the mass media. Sanders' campaign was also sabotaged by the corporate-controlled Democratic National Committee. His huge popularity remains undimmed today, despite his loss in the 2016 primary. He advocates a social system for the United States similar to these which have made the Scandinavian countries leaders in both human development and human happiness indices.

related to the environment. But let us now have a look at the positions of Senator Bernie Sanders and Dr. Jill Stein.¹²

In May, when he started his campaign for nomination as the Democratic Party's presidential candidate, Bernie Sanders, seemed to be an outsider with no chance of winning. But on June 25, the New York Times reported that, in the New Hampshire primaries, Sanders was running in a statistical dead heat with heavily financed Hillary Clinton. On July 1, Bernie Sanders made history by drawing a capacity crowd of 10,000 wildly cheering supporters to a sports stadium in Madison Wisconsin, the largest crowd assembled by any candidate in the current presidential race. Bernie now seems to have a real chance of winning the nomination, and perhaps the 2016 election, because of an avalanche of popular support.

Here is Bernie's statement about income inequality: "What we have seen is that while the average person is working longer hours for lower wages, we have seen a huge increase in income and wealth inequality, which is now reaching obscene levels. This is a rigged economy, which works for the rich and the powerful, and is not working for ordinary Americans: "You know, this country just does not belong to a handful of billionaires."

Sanders believes that "no single financial institution should have holdings so extensive that its failure would send the world economy into crisis. If an institution is too big to fail, it is too big to exist."

Sanders is opposed to the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement, which he has called "a continuation of other disastrous trade agreements, like NAFTA and CAFTA..."

Concerning jobs, Bernie Sanders has said that "America once led the world in building and maintaining a nationwide network of safe and reliable bridges and roads. Today, nearly a quarter of the nation's 600,000 bridges have been designated as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete...Almost one-third of America's major roads are in poor or mediocre condition..." He believes that secure jobs can be created by developing transportation and renewable energy infrastructure. Sanders also supports the development of worker-owned cooperatives.

Sanders has stated that he believes that the Citizens United decision is "one of the Supreme Court's worst decisions ever" and that it has allowed big money to "deflect attention from the real issues" facing voters. He has proposed a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling, and he warns that "We now have a political situation where billionaires are literally able to buy elections and candidates."

Sanders strongly opposed the 2003 invasion of Iraq, saying: "I am opposed to giving the President a blank check to launch a unilateral invasion and occupation of Iraq... As a caring Nation, we should do everything we can to prevent the horrible suffering that a war will cause. War must be the last recourse in international relations, not the first. ...I am deeply concerned about the precedent that a unilateral invasion of Iraq could establish in terms of international law and the role of the United Nations."

¹² <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/07/01/politics/bernie-sanders-crowds-wisconsin-2016/>
<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/07/02/sanders-draws-10000-wisconsin-support-revolution-doubles-iowa>
<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/07/01/bernie-sanders-too-radical-america>

Bernie Sanders voted against the USA Patriot Act and all of its renewals and has characterized the National Security Agency as “out of control.” He has frequently criticized warrentless wiretapping and the collection of the phone, email, library, and Internet browsing records of American citizens without due process. Bernie says: “In my view, NSA is out of control and operating in an unconstitutional manner. I worry very much about kids growing up in a society where they think ‘I’m not going to talk about this issue, read this book, or explore this idea because someone may think I’m a terrorist’. That’s not the kind of free society I want for our children.”

You can find more information about Bernie, and other planks in his platform, in the Wikipedia article.

But who is Jill?

Dr. Jill Stein is a physician from Massachusetts, who ran twice for Governor of that state. She also ran for US President in 2012 as the Green Party’s candidate, and again in 2016. She is one of the few people who is willing to talk about the elephant in the room. Here are a few things that Dr. Stein has said:¹³

“Our Power to the People Plan lays out these solutions in a blueprint to move our economy from the greed and exploitation of corporate capitalism to a human-centered system that puts people, planet and peace over profit. This plan would end unemployment and poverty; avert climate catastrophe; build a sustainable and just economy; and recognize the dignity and human rights of everyone in our society. The plan affirms that we have the power to take back the future.”

“We have the power to create a Green New Deal, providing millions of jobs by transitioning to 100% clean renewable energy by 2030.”

“We have the power to provide a living-wage job and worker’s rights to every American.”

“We have the power to end poverty and guarantee economic human rights.”

“We have the power to make health-care a human right through an improved Medicare for All system.”

“We have the power to provide education as a right and abolish student debt.”

“We have the power to create a just economy.”

¹³ <http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/06/24/under-green-party-banner-jill-stein-officially-sets-sights-2016>



Figure 3.3: Dr. Jill Stein was the Green Party's presidential candidate in 2016. She was the only candidate who was willing to talk about the "elephant in the room" - the obscenely enormous military budget that consumed almost a trillion dollars that could otherwise have been used for social goals, health, education and infrastructure.

“We have the power to protect Mother earth.”

“We have the power to end institutional racism, police brutality and mass incarceration-”

“We have the power to restore our constitutional rights.”

“We have the power to end our wars of aggression, close foreign bases and cut military expenditures 50%.”

“We have the power to empower the people.”

But what happened in the disastrous 2016 election?

One is reminded of the words of Yeats: “Things fall apart. The centre cannot hold. The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity. And what rough beast, its time come round at last, slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?”

Here are some excerpts from the transcript of a Democracy Now! program¹⁴ in which Amy Goodman interviews Michael Moore:

AMY GOODMAN: This is Democracy Now! I’m Amy Goodman, as we return to our conversation with the Academy Award-winning filmmaker Michael Moore. His new film, out today, *Fahrenheit 11/9*. I spoke to him earlier this week.

AMY GOODMAN: In your film, you start with that remarkable day, but you actually start before. And you were talking about this way before. You wrote in July 2016, again before Trump was elected - *5 Reasons Why Trump Will Win*¹⁵. In it, you wrote “Donald J. Trump is going to win in November. This wretched, ignorant, dangerous part-time clown and full-time sociopath is going to be our next president. President Trump. Go ahead and say the words, ’cause you’ll be saying them for the next four years: PRESIDENT TRUMP.” You went on to list the five reasons you believed Trump would be president: Trump’s focus on the Midwest, the last stand of the angry white man, the Hillary problem, the depressed Sanders vote, and what you call the Jesse Ventura effect - people voting for Trump simply to disrupt the system. You were predicting this well in advance...

MICHAEL MOORE: Yes, OK. First of all, I take no pleasure in being right. I never wanted to be more wrong when I wrote that. But I had just come back from the UK, where my last film, *Where To Invade Next* had just opened, and so I went and did press throughout the UK, in London, in Sheffield, ending up in Belfast, and a lot of crowds and theater screenings with the working class of the United Kingdom.

¹⁴<https://truthout.org/video/michael-moore-democrats-fatal-mistake-was-not-taking-trump-seriously/>

¹⁵<https://michaelmoore.com/trumpwillwin/>



Figure 3.4: Against expectations, Donald Trump who, in the words of Michael Moore, is a “wretched, ignorant, dangerous part-time clown and full-time sociopath”, was elected in 2016. What happened? Disillusioned by the way in which the immensely popular Senator Bernie Sanders was sabotaged by the media and by the Democratic National Committee, and despising Hillary Clinton for her involvement in US wars and Wall Street banks, many progressive voters stayed away from the polls. In their absence, Trump won narrowly. He lost the popular vote, but won the electoral vote. Today, the White House is a morass of dissension, erratic decisions and lies.



Figure 3.5: Disillusioned progressive voters who stayed at home were responsible for Trump's victory.



Figure 3.6: The stain will be indelible. Kavanaugh is both a multiple perjurer under oath before congress and a multiple attempted rapist. His tenure on the US supreme court will always be tainted by the highly partisan and morally bankrupt process that forced through his US senate confirmation on October 7, 2018. The photo shows angry crowds protesting the confirmation. One fervently hopes that public action will restore democracy to the United States.

This was the week before Brexit, and I saw what I see and hear a lot in Michigan and Wisconsin and Pennsylvania and Ohio and elsewhere, where people didn't necessarily like or were in love with the idea of Brexit, but they loved being able to have a chance to go into the voting booth and throw a Molotov cocktail into the middle of a system that had left them broke and in despair.

And when we left the UK there just before the vote, we were all saying - my crew and friends - "Wow, this just sounds like many parts of the United States, and it looks like Brexit's going to pass." Even though all the polls said that it wasn't going to. We came back here and of course all the polls - Brexit did pass - and all of the polls here were saying that Hillary had it in the bag.

:

AMY GOODMAN: And you have people like Les Moonves, now disgraced, who is saying things like, "It's great for us. It just may not be great for America."¹⁶

MICHAEL MOORE: Les Moonves, who was the head of CBS, and Jeff Zucker, who is the head of CNN, both kind of copped to the fact that they were putting him on the air a lot for free. He didn't have to pay for any of this. It's why Hillary - if you look at what she spent, she spent - well, he spent about... \$300 million. She spent almost a billion on her campaign. He didn't have to spend a billion, because he got all this free airtime from the mainstream networks. And in the film, I show Moonves and Zucker yukking it up over how great it is that Donald Trump is running, because it was very good for business and they sold a lot more ads.

AMY GOODMAN: So you have the red carpet treatment from the networks. Wall-to-wall coverage of his speeches. Often - I mean, the other candidates, like for example Bernie Sanders, got nothing - nothing like this... Even though he had some of the largest crowds of any of the candidates, Republican and Democrat.

Moore's film *Fahrenheit 11/9* has received strongly positive reviews. Variety calls it "fearless and profound, and the reviewer adds: "Fahrenheit 11/9 is truly about something, and that's Michael Moore's fearless - and I would say accurate - perception that what's going on in our government today is more sinister than even a lot of liberals think. In Fahrenheit 11/9, Moore captures how the groundwork is being laid for a full-scale destruction of democracy... the movie, in its way, summons something ominous and powerful. It's not a screed - it's a warning. It says, quite wisely: Take action now, or you may no longer have the opportunity to do so."

New York Magazine proclaims *Fahrenheit 11/9* as "one the the most urgent films ever made. You need to see this film!"

Salon says: "This film really is Moore's tour de force - a forceful, moving, and compelling call to action. A number of Michael Moore's films have made history. This time he's asking

¹⁶He said: "Who would have thought that this circus would come to town? But, you know - it may not be good for America, but it's damn good for CBS. That's all I gotta say."

his audience to be the ones to do it.”

Other critics have called it “soul-stirring,” “blistering,” “ferocious,” “part exposé, part doomsday warning, and part call to arms,” “brutally honest..a powerfully blunt instrument” “incisively funny” and “a blistering broadside!”

Here are some excerpts from Glen Greenwald’s review of *Fahrenheit 11/9*¹⁷:

“Fahrenheit 11/9,” the title of Michael Moore’s new film that opens today in theaters, is an obvious play on the title of his wildly profitable Bush-era “Fahrenheit 9/11,” but also a reference to the date of Donald J. Trump’s 2016 election victory. Despite that, Trump himself is a secondary figure in Moore’s film, which is far more focused on the far more relevant and interesting questions of what - and, critically, who - created the climate in which someone like Trump could occupy the Oval Office.

For that reason alone, Moore’s film is highly worthwhile regardless of where one falls on the political spectrum. The single most significant defect in U.S. political discourse is the monomaniacal focus on Trump himself, as though he is the cause - rather than the by-product and symptom - of decades-old systemic American pathologies...

The lie-fueled destruction of Vietnam and Iraq, the worldwide torture regime, the 2008 financial collapse and subsequent bailout and protection of those responsible for it, the foreign kidnapping and domestic rounding up of Muslims, the record-setting Obama-era deportations and whistleblower prosecutions, the obliteration of Yemen and Libya, the embrace of Mubarak, Sisi, and Saudi despots, the years of bipartisan subservience to Wall Street at everyone else’s expense, the full-scale immunity vested on all the elites responsible for all those crimes - it’s all blissfully washed away as we unite to commemorate the core decency of America as George Bush gently hands a piece of candy to Michelle Obama at the funeral of the American War Hero and Trump-opponent-in-words John S. McCain, or as hundreds of thousands of us re-tweet the latest bromide of Americana from the leaders of America’s most insidious security state, spy and police agencies.

Beyond nationalistic myth-building, there are substantial commercial, political and reputational benefits to this Trump-centered mythology. An obsessive fixation on Trump has single-handedly saved an entire partisan cable news network from extinction, converting its once ratings-starved, close-to-being-fired prime-time hosts into major celebrities with contracts so obscenely lucrative as to produce envy among most professional athletes or Hollywood stars...

The overriding value of “Fahrenheit 11/9” is that it avoids - in fact, aggressively rejects - this ahistorical manipulation. Moore dutifully devotes a few minutes at the start of his film to Trump’s rise, and then asks the question that dominates the rest of it, the one the political and media establishment has steadfastly avoided examining except in the most superficial and self-protective ways: “how ... did this happen”?...

To Moore’s credit, virtually no powerful U.S. factions escape indictment in “Fahrenheit

¹⁷<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2018/09/michael-moores-fahrenheit-11-9-aims-not-at-trump-but-at-those-who-created-the-conditions-that-led-to-his-rise/>



11/9.” The villains of Flint and West Virginia are two Republican governors. But their accomplices, every step of the way, are Democrats. This, Moore ultimately argues, is precisely why people had lost faith in the ability of elections generally, and the Democratic Party specifically, to improve their lives.

3.10 Sabotaging Jeremy Corbyn

The mass media in England are currently using the false charge of antisemitism to sabotage the British Labour Party’s immensely popular leader Jeremy Corbyn. As an 11 August 2018 Media Lens editorial ¹⁸ noted:

Elite power cannot abide a serious challenge to its established position. And that is what Labour under Jeremy Corbyn represents to the Tory government, the corporate, financial and banking sectors, and the ‘mainstream’ media. The manufactured ‘antisemitism crisis’ is the last throw of the dice for those desperate to prevent a progressive politician taking power in the UK: someone who supports Palestinians and genuine peace in the Middle East, a strong National Health Service and a secure Welfare State, a properly-funded education system, and an economy in which people matter; someone who rejects endless war and complicity with oppressive, war criminal ‘allies’ such as the United States, Saudi Arabia and Israel.

In a thoroughly-researched article¹⁹, writer and academic Gavin Lewis has mapped a deliberate pro-Israel campaign to create a ‘moral panic’ around the issue of antisemitism.

¹⁸<http://medialens.org/index.php/alerts/alert-archive/2018/876-israel-is-the-real-problem.html>

¹⁹<https://zcomm.org/znetarticle/hijacking-victimhood-and-demonizing-dissent/>

The strategy can be traced all the way back to the horrendous Israeli bombardment of Gaza in the summer of 2014. A UN report estimated that 2,252 Palestinians were killed, around 65 per cent of them civilians. The death toll included 551 children. There was global public revulsion at Israel's war crimes and empathy with their Palestinian victims. Support rose for the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions movement (BDS) which campaigns 'to end international support for Israel's oppression of Palestinians and pressure Israel to comply with international law'...

In particular, as we noted in a media alert²⁰ in April, antisemitism has been 'weaponised' to attack Corbyn and any prospect of a progressive UK government critical of Israel. Around this time in Gaza, there were weekly 'Great March of Return' protests, with people demanding the right to reclaim ancestral homes in Israel. Many were mown down by Israeli snipers on the border firing into Gaza, with several victims shot in the back as they tried to flee. According to the Palestinian Ministry of Health, a total of 155 Palestinians were killed in the protests, including 23 children and 3 women. This is part of the brutal ongoing reality for Palestinians...

Despite the intense campaign against Corbyn - and perhaps, in part, because of its obviously cynical and manipulative nature - many people are perceptive enough to see what is going on. Israel is the real problem.

One has to ask how "antisemitism" is defined. Is it really defined as "criticism of Israel"? We must remember that the genocidal treatment of Palestinians by the government of Israel is far worse than actions of the universally-condemned Apartheid regime of South Africa. Israel is grossly in violation of United Nations resolutions and international law.

²⁰<http://medialens.org/index.php/alerts/alert-archive/2018/867-killing-mosquitoes-the-latest-gaza-massacres-pro-israel-media-bias-and-the-weapon-of-antisemitism.html>



Figure 3.7: Long-time British MP and social reformer Jeremy Corbyn. His landslide election as Leader of the Labour Party is an indication that restoring democracy may be possible in Britain.

3.11 The media are part of our educational system

The wealth and power of the establishment

The media are a battleground where reformers struggle for attention, but are defeated with great regularity by the wealth and power of the establishment. This is a tragedy because today there is an urgent need to make public opinion aware of the serious problems facing civilization, and the steps that are needed to solve these problems. The mass media could potentially be a great force for public education, but in general their role is not only unhelpful - it is often negative.

War and conflict are blatantly advertised by television and newspapers. Think, for example, of television programs like the National Geographic Channel's "Battleground" series or the Discovery Channel and National Geographic Channel's enthusiastic programs praising the deadliness and efficiency of various modern weapons systems. Such outright advertisements for the institution of war seem to have the wholehearted support of the networks. Meanwhile the peace movement has almost no access to the mainstream media.

Newspapers and war

There is a true story about the powerful newspaper owner William Randolph Hearst that illustrates the relationship between the mass media and the institution of war: When an explosion sank the American warship USS Maine in the harbor of Havana, Hearst anticipated (and desired) that the incident would lead to war between the United States and Spain. He therefore sent his best illustrator, Fredrick Remington, to Havana to produce drawings of the scene. After a few days in Havana, Remington cabled to Hearst, "All's quiet here. There will be no war." Hearst cabled back, "You supply the pictures. I'll supply the war." Hearst was true to his words. His newspapers inflamed American public opinion to such an extent that the Spanish-American War became inevitable. During the course of the war, Hearst sold many newspapers, and Remington many drawings. From this story one might almost conclude that newspapers thrive on war, while war thrives on newspapers.

Before the advent of widely-read newspapers, European wars tended to be fought by mercenary soldiers, recruited from the lowest ranks of society, and motivated by financial considerations. The emotions of the population were not aroused by such limited and decorous wars. However, the French Revolution and the power of newspapers changed this situation, and war became a total phenomenon that involved emotions. The media were able to mobilize on a huge scale the communal defense mechanism that Konrad Lorenz called "militant enthusiasm" - self-sacrifice for the defense of the tribe. It did not escape the notice of politicians that control of the media is the key to political power in the modern world. For example, Hitler was extremely conscious of the force of propaganda, and it became one of his favorite instruments for exerting power.

With the advent of radio and television, the influence of the mass media became still greater. Today, state-controlled or money-controlled newspapers, radio and television are




Figure 3.8: Goebbels said: “Propaganda works best when those who are being manipulated are confident that they are acting on their own free will”.

widely used by the power elite to manipulate public opinion. This is true in most countries of the world, even in those that pride themselves on allowing freedom of speech. For example, during the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, the official version of events was broadcast by CNN, and criticism of the invasion was almost absent from their transmissions.

The role of the mass media in creating values

In the mid-1950’s, television became cheap enough so that ordinary people in the industrialized countries could afford to own sets. During the infancy of television, its power was underestimated. The great power of television is due to the fact that it grips two senses simultaneously, both vision and hearing. The viewer becomes an almost-hypnotized captive of the broadcast. In the 1950’s, this enormous power, which can be used both for good and for ill, was not yet fully apparent. Thus insufficient attention was given to the role of television in education, in setting norms, and in establishing values. Television was not seen as an integral part of the total educational system.

It is interesting to compare the educational systems of traditional cultures with those of modern industrial societies. In traditional societies, multigenerational families often live together in the same dwelling. In general, there is a great deal of contact between grandparents and grandchildren, with much transmission of values and norms between generations. Old people are regarded with great respect, since they are considered to be repositories of wisdom, knowledge, and culture.

By contrast, modern societies usually favor nuclear families, consisting of only parents and children. Old people are marginalized. They live by themselves in communities or homes especially for the old. Their cultural knowledge and norms are not valued because they are “out of date”. In fact, during the life of a young person in one of the rapidly-changing industrial societies of the modern world, there is often a period when they rebel against the authority of their parents and are acutely embarrassed by their parents, who are “so old-fashioned that they don’t understand anything”.

Although the intergenerational transmission of values, norms, and culture is much less important in industrial societies than it is in traditional ones, modern young people of the west and north are by no means at a loss over where to find their values, fashions and role models. With every breath, they inhale the values and norms of the mass media, the norms of pop culture. Totally surrounded by a world of television and film images, they accept this world as their own. Unfortunately the culture of television, films and computer games is more often a culture of violence than a culture of peace, more often a culture of self-indulgence than an ethical culture, more often a culture of materialism than a culture of respect for nature.

Literature, art, architecture and music are capable of transmitting humanism and internationalism to our young people, but these values are being lost today, and replaced by a culture of power worship, violence and consumerism. As Prof. Robert Jensen of the University of Texas puts it, "Mass media corporations have eroticized violence and commodified intimacy at an unprecedented level globally". Today's pop culture is addictive, as we can see when we observe people walking down the street wearing a head set, with a constant, reassuring supply of it pouring into their ears.

Computer games designed for young boys often give the strongest imaginable support to our present culture of violence. For example, a game entitled "Full Spectrum Warrior" was recently reviewed in a Danish newspaper. According to the reviewer, "...An almost perfect combination of graphics, sound, band design, and gameplay makes it seem exactly like the film Black Hawk Down - with the player as the main character. This is not just a coincidence, because the game is based on an army training program... Full Spectrum Warrior is an extremely intense experience, and despite the advanced possibilities, the controls are simple enough so that young children can play it... The player is completely drawn into the screen, and remains there until the end of the mission." The reviewer gave the game six stars (the maximum).

If entertainment is evaluated only on the basis of immediate fascination and popularity, what might be called "the pornography of violence" gets high marks. However, there is another way of looking at entertainment. It is a part, and a very important part, of our total educational system.

Even animals undergo education, and often the playing of young animals is a part of the educational process. For example, when lion cubs play, they are learning skills that are useful to them in hunting. The same can be said of kittens playing with bits of yarn. Books of adventures read by young humans also have an educational value, and on a higher level, works of literature expand our ability to understand our fellow humans and to sympathize with them. Each culture, by means of oral traditions, songs, poems, and stories, as well as by means of formal education, tries to modify raw human nature and to mould it to the ideal of that particular society. In this process, entertainment and formal education go hand in hand, each contributing ethical values and norms that are desirable for the way of life of a particular group.

In modern industrial societies, this important educational function has been given by default to commercial interests. Instead of supporting socially desirable behavior, the entertainment industry, driven by the quest for higher popularity ratings and higher profits,

explores increasingly murky depths in the swamp of popular taste. We would not want Coca Cola to run our schools, but entertainment is just as important as the school or home environment in forming values and norms, and entertainment is in the hands of commerce.

The mass media and our present predicament

Today we are faced with the task of creating a new global ethic in which loyalty to family, religion and nation will be supplemented by a higher loyalty to humanity as a whole. In case of conflicts, loyalty to humanity as a whole must take precedence. In addition, our present culture of violence must be replaced by a culture of peace. To achieve these essential goals, we urgently need the cooperation of the mass media.

The predicament of humanity today has been called “a race between education and catastrophe”: Human emotions have not changed much during the last 40,000 years. As we saw in Chapter 8, human nature still contains an element of tribalism to which nationalistic politicians successfully appeal. The completely sovereign nation-state is still the basis of our global political system. The danger in this situation is due to the fact that modern science has given the human race incredibly destructive weapons. Because of these weapons, the tribal tendencies in human nature and the politically fragmented structure of our world have both become dangerous anachronisms.

After the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Albert Einstein said, “The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking, and thus we drift towards unparalleled catastrophes.” We have to learn to think in a new way. Will we learn this in time to prevent disaster? When we consider the almost miraculous power of our modern electronic media, we can be optimistic. Cannot our marvelous global communication network be used to change anachronistic ways of thought and anachronistic social and political institutions in time, so that the system will not self-destruct as science and technology revolutionize our world? If they were properly used, our instantaneous global communications could give us hope.

The success of our species is built on cultural evolution, the central element of which is cooperation. Thus human nature has two sides, tribal emotions are present, but they are balanced by the human genius for cooperation. The case of Scandinavia - once war-torn, now cooperative - shows that education is able to bring out either the kind and cooperative side of human nature, or the xenophobic and violent side. Which of these shall it be? It is up to our educational systems to decide, and the mass media are an extremely important part of education. Hence the great responsibility that is now in the hands of the media.

The dilemma of freedom and responsibility

One is faced with a dilemma, because on the one hand artistic freedom is desirable and censorship undesirable, but on the other hand some degree of responsibility ought to be exercised by the mass media because of their enormous influence in creating norms and values.

Even today, there exists some degree of self-restraint on the part of the entertainment industry. There is a self-imposed code according to which incitement to racial prejudice is not allowed. Today, when a figure of authority, for example a judge, is shown in a film or on a television program, the judge is likely to be a member of a minority group.

To do justice to the mass media, one also has to say that in recent years they have made efforts to educate the public about global warming and other environmental problems. Furthermore, today's heroes and heroines are not shown with cigarettes hanging from their lips. In fact we are a little shocked to see old Humphrey Bogart films where scenes of smoking are constantly on the screen. If the mass media can accept the degree of responsibility needed to delegitimize racism, to delegitimize unnecessary CO₂ emissions, and to delegitimize smoking, can they not also delegitimize nuclear weapons? One can hope for future restraint in the depiction of violence and war, and in the depiction of international conflicts. One can hope for future support for cross-cultural understanding.

Of course we cannot say to the entertainment industry, "From now on you must not show anything but David Attenborough and the life of Gandhi". However, it would be enormously helpful if every film or broadcast or computer game could be evaluated not only for its popularity and artistic merit, but also in terms of the good or harm that it does in the task of building a stable and peaceful future world. Of course, there must be entertainment and escapism - but there should also be insight. This must be made available for people who care about the fate of the world. At present it is not available.

Some years ago, when CNN was still owned by Ted Turner, the network introduced a global weather forecast. This feature is still continued by CNN even though its new owners are much less idealistic than Ted Turner. Furthermore, the BBC has also adopted the global weather forecast. When we see a map of the world with temperatures and storms, we receive much more information than we need to decide whether to take an umbrella with us tomorrow. For planning picnics, it is not necessary for us to know that in Beijing it will be warm and slightly overcast. Ted Turner was aware of this, and we are aware of it, but all of us realize that the global weather forecast is a simple and beautiful means for creating global consciousness.

A United Nations television channel?

Why doesn't the United Nations have its own global television network? Such a network could produce an unbiased version of the news. It could broadcast documentary programs on global problems. It could produce programs showing viewers the music, art and literature of other cultures than their own. It could broadcast programs on the history of ideas, in which the contributions of many societies were adequately recognized. At New Year, when people are in the mood to think of the past and the future, the Secretary General of the United Nations could broadcast a "State of the World" message, summarizing the events of the past year and looking forward to the new year, with its problems, and with his recommendations for their solution. A United Nations television network would at least give viewers a choice between programs supporting militarism and consumerism, and programs supporting a global culture of peace and sustainability. At present they have

little choice.

Responsibility

Whose responsibility is it to save the world by changing it? Whose responsibility is it to replace our anachronistic social, political and economic institutions by new institutions that will harmonize with the realities of the new world that modern science has created? If you ask politicians they say it is not their responsibility. They cannot act without popular support if they want to be re-elected. If you ask ordinary people they say it is not their responsibility. What can one person do? If you ask journalists, they say that if they ever reported the news in a way that did not please their employers, they would lose their jobs. But in reality, perhaps all three actors - politicians, ordinary people, and journalists - have a responsibility to be more courageous and far-sighted, and to act together. No one acting alone can achieve the changes that we so desperately need; but all of us together, joining hands, can do it.

3.12 Humanity betrayed by the mass media

The predicament of humanity today has been called “a race between education and catastrophe”: How do the media fulfil this life-or-death responsibility? Do they give us insight? No, they give us pop music. Do they give us an understanding of the sweep of evolution and history? No, they give us sport. Do they give us an understanding of the ecological catastrophes that threaten our planet because of unrestricted growth of population and industries? No, they give us sit-coms and soap operas. Do they give us unbiased news? No, they give us news that has been edited to conform with the interests of powerful lobbys. Do they present us with the urgent need to leave fossil fuels in the ground? No, they do not, because this would offend the powerholders. Do they tell of the danger of passing tipping points after which human efforts to prevent catastrophic climate change will be useless? No, they give us programs about gardening and making food.

A consumer who subscribes to the “package” of broadcasts sold by a cable company can often search through all 95 channels without finding a single program that offers insight into the various problems that are facing the world today. What the viewer finds instead is a mixture of pro-establishment propaganda and entertainment. Meanwhile the neglected global problems are becoming progressively more severe.

In general, the mass media behave as though their role is to prevent the peoples of the world from joining hands and working to change the world and to save it from thermonuclear war, environmental catastrophes and threatened global famine. The television viewer sits slumped in a chair, passive, isolated, disempowered and stupefied. The future of the world hangs in the balance, the fate of children and grandchildren hangs in the balance, but the television viewer feels no impulse to work actively to change the world or to save it. The Roman emperors gave their people bread and circuses to numb them into political inactivity. The modern mass media seem to be playing a similar role.

The most dangerous idea that the mass media peddle to a betrayed world is the there is no emergency, no crisis of civilization. Everything is fundamentally normal. We can continue to behave more or less as we always have behaved. We can continue to extract and use fossil fuels, continue to fly to vacations in foreign countries, and continue to rely on our trusted and most loved friend, the private automobile. But this is a lie. They are lying to us because no one wants to shoot Santa Claus. No one wants to undermine “consumer confidence”.

The true situation is that the future looks extremely dark, especially the long-term future, because of human greed and folly. The greatest threats are catastrophic climate change and thermonuclear war, but a large-scale global famine also has to be considered.

We give our children loving care, but it makes no sense do so and at the same time to neglect to do all that is within our power to ensure that they and their descendants will inherit an earth in which they can survive. We also have a responsibility to all the other living organisms with which we share the gift of life.

Inaction is not an option. We have to act with courage and dedication, even if the odds are against success, because the stakes are so high. No one is exempt from this duty. Every singly person on earth has the duty to work with dedication and courage to save the future.

None of us asked to be born at a time of crisis. But we have been born at such a time, and history has given us an enormous responsibility. If we do not work with courage and dedication to save our beautiful world for future generations, all the treasures that past generations have given us will be lost.

What are the great tasks that history has given to us? If true democracy has decayed into oligarchy in our own countries, democracy must be restored. Global population must be stabilized, and in the long run, reduced. Nuclear weapons must be completely abolished. The institution of war must be abolished by turning the United Nations into a federation. Our consumption of fossil fuels must quickly end, through changes in lifestyle, and through an all-out effort to rapidly develop renewable energy.

Soldiers in war are asked to give their lives for their countries. We, who are opposed to war, must be equally willing to devote our lives to a cause - the cause of saving civilization - the cause of saving the the biosphere - the cause of saving the future.

3.13 The propaganda model of the mass media

Here are some quotations from the Wikipedia article entitled “Propaganda model”:

The propaganda model is a conceptual model in political economy advanced by Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky to explain how propaganda and systemic biases function in corporate mass media. The model seeks to explain how populations are manipulated and how consent for economic, social, and political policies is “manufactured” in the public mind due to this propaganda. The theory posits that the way in which corporate media is structured (e.g. through advertising, concentration of media ownership, government sourcing) creates

an inherent conflict of interest that acts as propaganda for undemocratic forces.

*First presented in their 1988 book *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, the propaganda model views private media as businesses interested in the sale of a product-readers and audiences - to other businesses (advertisers) rather than that of quality news to the public. Describing the media's "societal purpose", Chomsky writes, "... the study of institutions and how they function must be scrupulously ignored, apart from fringe elements or a relatively obscure scholarly literature". The theory postulates five general classes of "filters" that determine the type of news that is presented in news media. These five classes are: Ownership of the medium, Medium's funding sources, Sourcing, Flak, and Anti-communism or "fear ideology".*

The first three are generally regarded by the authors as being the most important. In versions published after the 9/11 attacks on the United States in 2001, Chomsky and Herman updated the fifth prong to instead refer to the "War on Terror" and "counter-terrorism", although they state that it operates in much the same manner.

Although the model was based mainly on the characterization of United States media, Chomsky and Herman believe the theory is equally applicable to any country that shares the basic economic structure and organizing principles that the model postulates as the cause of media biases.

3.14 Institutional and cultural inertia

Why do we not respond to the crisis?

Today we are faced with multiple interrelated crises, for example the threat of catastrophic climate change or equally catastrophic thermonuclear war, and the threat of widespread famine. These threats to human existence and to the biosphere demand a prompt and rational response; but because because of institutional and cultural inertia, we are failing to take the steps that are necessary to avoid disaster.

Institutional inertia

Our collective failure to respond adequately to the current crisis is very largely due to institutional inertia. For example, international relations are still based based on the concept of absolutely sovereign nation states, even though this concept has become a dangerous anachronism in an era of instantaneous global communication and economic interdependence. Within nations, systems of law and education change very slowly, although present dangers demand rapid revolutions in outlook and lifestyle. Our financial system is deeply embedded and resistant to change. Our entire industrial infrastructure is based on fossil fuels; but if the future is to be saved, the use of fossil fuels must stop.

The failure of the recent COP20 climate conference in Lima to produce a strong final document can be attributed to the fact that the nations attending the conference felt themselves to be in competition with each other, when in fact they ought to have cooperated



Figure 3.9: **The heavy hand of the fossil fuel industry also made itself felt at the conference.**

in response to a common danger. The heavy hand of the fossil fuel industry also made itself felt at the conference.

Until the development of coal-driven steam engines in the 19th century humans lived more or less in harmony with their environment. Then, fossil fuels, representing many millions of years of stored sunlight, were extracted and burned in two centuries, driving a frenzy of growth of population and industry that has lasted until the present. But today, the party is over. Coal, oil and gas are nearly exhausted, and what remains of them must be left in the ground to avoid existential threats to humans and the biosphere. Big coal and oil corporations base the value of their stocks on ownership of the remaining resources that are still buried, and they can be counted on to use every trick, fair or unfair, turn those resources into money.

In general corporations represent a strong force resisting change. By law, the directors of corporations are obliged to put the profits of stockholders above every other consideration. No room whatever is left for an ecological or social conscience. Increasingly, corporations have taken control of our mass media and our political system. They intervene in such a way as to make themselves richer, and thus to increase their control of the system.

Polite conversation and cultural inertia

Each day, the conventions of polite conversation contribute to our sense that everything is as it always was. Politeness requires that we do not talk about issues that might be contrary to another person's beliefs. Thus polite conversation is dominated by trivia, entertainment, sports, the weather, gossip, food, and so on, Worries about the the distant future , the danger of nuclear war, the danger of uncontrollable climate change, or the danger of widespread famine seldom appear in conversations at the dinner table, over

coffee or at the pub. In conversations between polite people, the situation is exactly the same as in the mass media. We obtain the false impression that all is well with the world. But in fact, all is not well. We have to act promptly and adequately to save the future.

Shooting Santa Claus

No one wants to shoot Santa Claus. That goes without saying! Who would want to harm that jolly old man, with his reindeer and sleigh, and his workshop at the North Pole? Who would want to prevent him from bringing happiness to everyone? Who would want to stop him from making the children's eyes light up like stars? Surely no one!

But the sad truth today is that we have to get rid of Santa somehow, before he kills us, and before he kills most of the plants and animals with which we share our world. Perhaps shooting is too harsh. Perhaps we should just forget Santa and all that he stands for, with his red suit, invented by the advertising department of Coca Cola.

This is what Santa stands for: The customer is always right. Your wish is our command. You have a right to whatever you desire. If you feel like taking a vacation on the other side of the world, don't hesitate, just do it. If you feel like buying a SUV, just do it. Self-fulfillment is your birthright. Spending makes the economy grow, and growth is good. Isn't that right?

But sadly that isn't right. We have to face the fact that endless economic growth on a finite planet is a logical impossibility, and that we have reached or passed the sustainable limits to growth.

In today's world, we are pressing against the absolute limits of the earth's carrying capacity, and further growth carries with it the danger of future collapse. In the long run, neither the growth of industry nor that of population is sustainable; and we have now reached or exceeded the sustainable limits.

The size of the human economy is, of course, the product of two factors: the total number of humans, and the consumption per capita. Let us first consider the problem of reducing the per-capita consumption in the industrialized countries. The whole structure of western society seems designed to push its citizens in the opposite direction, towards ever-increasing levels of consumption. The mass media hold before us continually the ideal of a personal utopia, filled with material goods.

Every young man in a modern industrial society feels that he is a failure unless he fights his way to the "top"; and in recent years, women too have been drawn into the competition. Of course, not everyone can reach the top; there would not be room for everyone; but society urges us all to try, and we feel a sense of failure if we do not reach the goal. Thus, modern life has become a competition of all against all for power and possessions.

When possessions are used for the purpose of social competition, demand has no natural upper limit; it is then limited only by the size of the human ego, which, as we know, is boundless. This would be all to the good if unlimited industrial growth were desirable; but today, when further industrial growth implies future collapse, western society urgently



Figure 3.10: The mass media hold before us continually the ideal of a personal utopia, filled with material goods. Self-fulfillment is your birthright. Spending makes the economy grow, and growth is good. Isn't that right?

needs to find new values to replace our worship of power, our restless chase after excitement, and our admiration of excessive consumption.

If you turn on your television set, the vast majority of the programs that you will be offered give no hint at all of the true state of the world or of the dangers which we will face in the future. Part of the reason for this willful blindness is that no one wants to damage consumer confidence. No one wants to bring on a recession. No one wants to shoot Santa Claus.

But sooner or later a severe recession will come, despite our unwillingness to recognize this fact. Perhaps we should prepare for it by reordering the world's economy and infrastructure to achieve long-term sustainability, i.e. steady-state economics, population stabilization, and renewable energy.

Religious conservatism

All known human societies have religions; and this is true not only of societies that exist today, but also of all past societies of which we have any record. Therefore it seems reasonable to suppose that the tendency to be religious is an intrinsic part of human nature. It seems to be coded into our genes. If evolutionary forces have produced the human tendency to be religious, then it must have some survival value. My own belief is that religion helps us because it is a mechanism for the preservation and transmission of human cultures.

All living organisms on earth hand on information from one generation to the next in the form of messages coded into their DNA and RNA. Humans are unique in having also evolved extremely efficient non-genetic methods for transmitting information from one generation to the next through our highly developed languages.

Cultural evolution is responsible for the success of our species. We dominate the earth because of cultural evolution. Thus, if religion is a mechanism for the preservation and transmission of particular cultures, it must have conferred a great advantage to those societies that possessed religion, and a tendency to be religious would have been favored by the Darwinian forces of natural selection. This perhaps explains why it is now a universal part of human nature.

Throughout history, until recent times, the conservative role of religions in transmitting and preserving our cultural heritage has been a great advantage. However, the dangers that we are experiencing today demand quick changes in our patterns of thought and in our lifestyles; and here the conservatism of religion may be a disadvantage. For example, at a time when the exploding global population contributes to the severity of most of the dangers that we face, religious opposition to birth control has become inappropriate.

Furthermore, human history is drenched with blood from wars have been fought in the name of religion. We can think, for example, of the Crusades, or the Islamic conquests in the Middle East, North Africa and Spain, or the wars between Catholics and Protestants in Europe, or the brutal treatment of the indigenous populations of Africa, and the Americas in the name of religion. The list by no means stops there. This is because religion is so closely associated with ethnicity and nationalism.

The religious leaders of today have the opportunity to contribute importantly to the solution of the problem of war. They have the opportunity to powerfully support the concept of universal human brotherhood, to build bridges between religious groups by making intermarriage across ethnic boundaries easier, and to soften the distinctions between communities. If they fail to do this, they will have failed humankind in a time of crisis.

Although religion may be a part of the problems that we face today, it can potentially be part of the solution. Because of the all-destroying modern weapons developed through the misuse of science, we urgently need religious ethics, i.e. the traditional wisdom of humankind. Not only do the fundamental ethical principles of the world's great religions agree with each others, but they also do not conflict in any way with science. If practiced, these principles would make war impossible, thus eliminating one of the greatest dangers that we face today, the cause of much of the suffering that humans experience.

The central ethical principles of Christianity can be found in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Parable of the Good Samaritan. In the Sermon on the Mount, we are told that we must not only love our neighbors as much as we love ourselves; we must also love and forgive our enemies. This seemingly impractical advice is in fact of great practicality, since escalatory cycles of revenge and counter-revenge can only be ended by unilateral acts of kindness. In the Parable of the Good Samaritan, we are told that our neighbor, whom we must love, is not necessarily a member of our own ethnic group. Our neighbor may live on the other side of the world and belong to an entirely different race or culture; but he or she still deserves our love and care.

Contrast this with the idea of "massive retaliation" which is part of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence! In nuclear retaliation, the victims would include people of every kind: women, men, old people, and infants, completely irrespective to any degree of guilt that they might have. As the result of such an attack, many millions of people in neutral countries would also die. This type of killing has to be classified as genocide.

When a suspected criminal is tried for a wrongdoing, great efforts are made to clarify the question of guilt or innocence. Punishment only follows if guilt can be established beyond any reasonable doubt. Contrast this with the totally indiscriminate mass slaughter that results from a nuclear attack!

Thus both the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, and the very existence of nuclear weapons, are completely contrary to the central ethical principles of Christianity; and not only to the principles of Christianity, but to those of every other major religion.

The peoples of the industrialized nations urgently need to acquire a non-anthropocentric element in their ethics, similar to the reverence for all life found in the Hindu and Buddhist traditions, as well as in the teachings of St. Francis of Assisi and Albert Schweitzer. We need to value other species for their own sakes, and not because we expect to use them for our own economic goals. (The simple life-style that we associate with St. Francis can also teach us much. St. Francis and St. Claire and many others who have followed in their footsteps lived lives of voluntary poverty and service, close to the ideals of Jesus himself, who said "Lay not up treasures on earth...".)

Today a few societies follow a way of life similar to that of our hunter-gatherer ancestors. Anthropologists are able to obtain a vivid picture of the past by studying these




Figure 3.11: The peoples of the industrialized nations urgently need to acquire a non-anthropocentric element in their ethics, similar to the reverence for all life found in the Hindu and Buddhist traditions, as well as in the teachings of St. Francis of Assisi and Albert Schweitzer.

societies. Usually the religious ethics of the hunter-gatherers emphasize the importance of harmony with nature. As the expansion of industry threatens to produce an ecological mega-catastrophe, we can learn much from societies that live in balance with the natural world.

We can see from this discussion that religious conservatism cuts both ways. In some respects, it damages our response to the current crisis, for example when it supports war or opposes birth control. On the other hand, the ethical principles of the world's great religions can help to save us.

Our responsibility to future generations and to the biosphere

All of the technology needed for the replacement of fossil fuels by renewable energy is already in place. Although renewable sources currently supply only 19 percent of the world's energy requirements, they are growing rapidly. For example, wind energy is growing at the rate of 30 percent per year. Because of the remarkable properties of exponential growth, this will mean that wind will soon become a major supplier of the world's energy requirements, despite bitter opposition from the fossil fuel industry.

Both wind and solar energy have can now compete economically with fossil fuels, and this situation will become even more pronounced if more countries put a tax on carbon emissions, as Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Costa Rica, the United Kingdom and Ireland already have done.

<http://eruditio.worldacademy.org/issue-5/article/urgent-need-renewable-energy>

Much research and thought have also been devoted to the concept of a steady-state economy. The only thing that is lacking is political will. It is up to the people of the world to make their collective will felt.

<http://steadystate.org/category/herman-daly/>

History has given to our generation an enormous responsibility towards future generations. We must achieve a new kind of economy, a steady-state economy. We must stabilize global population. We must replace fossil fuels by renewable energy. We must abolish nuclear weapons. We must end the institution of war. We must reclaim democracy in countries where it has been lost. We must replace nationalism by a just system of international law. We must prevent degradation of the earth's environment. We must act with dedication and fearlessness to save the future of the earth for human civilization and for the plants and animals with which we share the gift of life.

Suggestions for further reading

1. Sir Percy Sykes, *A History of Persia - 2nd edition*, MacMillan, (1921).
2. Paula K. Byers, *Reza Shah Pahlavi*, Encyclopedia of World Biography, (1998)-
3. Roger Homan, *The Origins of the Iranian Revolution*, International Affairs **56/4**, 673-7, (Autumm, 1980).
4. Daniel Yergin, *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money and Power*, Simon and Schuster, (1991).

5. A. Sampson, *The Seven Sisters: The Great Oil Companies of the World and How They Were Made*, Hodder and Staughton, (1988).

Chapter 4

US WARS, INTERVENTIONS, AND COUPS

4.1 Harold Pinter's Nobel Lecture

Harold Pinter (1930-2008) was a British author who received the 2005 Nobel Prize in Literature. Here is the final section of his Nobel Lecture:

Political language, as used by politicians, does not venture into any of this territory since the majority of politicians, on the evidence available to us, are interested not in truth but in power and in the maintenance of that power. To maintain that power it is essential that people remain in ignorance, that they live in ignorance of the truth, even the truth of their own lives. What surrounds us therefore is a vast tapestry of lies, upon which we feed.

As every single person here knows, the justification for the invasion of Iraq was that Saddam Hussein possessed a highly dangerous body of weapons of mass destruction, some of which could be fired in 45 minutes, bringing about appalling devastation. We were assured that was true. It was not true. We were told that Iraq had a relationship with al-Qaeda and shared responsibility for the atrocity in New York of September 11th 2001. We were assured that this was true. It was not true. We were told that Iraq threatened the security of the world. We were assured it was true. It was not true.

The truth is something entirely different. The truth is to do with how the United States understands its role in the world and how it chooses to embody it.

But before I come back to the present I would like to look at the recent past, by which I mean United States foreign policy since the end of the Second World War. I believe it is obligatory upon us to subject this period to at least some kind of even limited scrutiny, which is all that time will allow here.

Everyone knows what happened in the Soviet Union and throughout Eastern

Europe during the post-war period: the systematic brutality, the widespread atrocities, the ruthless suppression of independent thought. All this has been fully documented and verified.

But my contention here is that the US crimes in the same period have only been superficially recorded, let alone documented, let alone acknowledged, let alone recognized as crimes at all. I believe this must be addressed and that the truth has considerable bearing on where the world stands now. Although constrained, to a certain extent, by the existence of the Soviet Union, the United States' actions throughout the world made it clear that it had concluded it had *carte blanche* to do what it liked.

Direct invasion of a sovereign state has never in fact been America's favoured method. In the main, it has preferred what it has described as 'low intensity conflict'. Low intensity conflict means that thousands of people die but slower than if you dropped a bomb on them in one fell swoop. It means that you infect the heart of the country, that you establish a malignant growth and watch the gangrene bloom. When the populace has been subdued - or beaten to death - the same thing - and your own friends, the military and the great corporations, sit comfortably in power, you go before the camera and say that democracy has prevailed. This was a commonplace in US foreign policy in the years to which I refer.

The tragedy of Nicaragua was a highly significant case. I choose to offer it here as a potent example of America's view of its role in the world, both then and now.

I was present at a meeting at the US embassy in London in the late 1980s.

The United States Congress was about to decide whether to give more money to the Contras in their campaign against the state of Nicaragua. I was a member of a delegation speaking on behalf of Nicaragua but the most important member of this delegation was a Father John Metcalf. The leader of the US body was Raymond Seitz (then number two to the ambassador, later ambassador himself). Father Metcalf said: 'Sir, I am in charge of a parish in the north of Nicaragua. My parishioners built a school, a health centre, a cultural centre. We have lived in peace. A few months ago a Contra force attacked the parish. They destroyed everything: the school, the health centre, the cultural centre. They raped nurses and teachers, slaughtered doctors, in the most brutal manner. They behaved like savages. Please demand that the US government withdraw its support from this shocking terrorist activity.'

Raymond Seitz had a very good reputation as a rational, responsible and highly sophisticated man. He was greatly respected in diplomatic circles. He listened, paused and then spoke with some gravity. 'Father,' he said, 'let me tell you something. In war, innocent people always suffer.' There was a frozen silence. We stared at him. He did not flinch.

Innocent people, indeed, always suffer.

Finally somebody said: 'But in this case "innocent people" were the victims

of a gruesome atrocity subsidised by your government, one among many. If Congress allows the Contras more money further atrocities of this kind will take place. Is this not the case? Is your government not therefore guilty of supporting acts of murder and destruction upon the citizens of a sovereign state?’

Seitz was imperturbable. ‘I don’t agree that the facts as presented support your assertions,’ he said.

As we were leaving the Embassy a US aide told me that he enjoyed my plays. I did not reply.

I should remind you that at the time President Reagan made the following statement: ‘The Contras are the moral equivalent of our Founding Fathers.’

The United States supported the brutal Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua for over 40 years. The Nicaraguan people, led by the Sandinistas, overthrew this regime in 1979, a breathtaking popular revolution.

The Sandinistas weren’t perfect. They possessed their fair share of arrogance and their political philosophy contained a number of contradictory elements. But they were intelligent, rational and civilised. They set out to establish a stable, decent, pluralistic society. The death penalty was abolished. Hundreds of thousands of poverty-stricken peasants were brought back from the dead. Over 100,000 families were given title to land. Two thousand schools were built. A quite remarkable literacy campaign reduced illiteracy in the country to less than one seventh. Free education was established and a free health service. Infant mortality was reduced by a third. Polio was eradicated.

The United States denounced these achievements as Marxist/Leninist subversion. In the view of the US government, a dangerous example was being set. If Nicaragua was allowed to establish basic norms of social and economic justice, if it was allowed to raise the standards of health care and education and achieve social unity and national self respect, neighbouring countries would ask the same questions and do the same things. There was of course at the time fierce resistance to the status quo in El Salvador.

I spoke earlier about ‘a tapestry of lies’ which surrounds us. President Reagan commonly described Nicaragua as a ‘totalitarian dungeon’. This was taken generally by the media, and certainly by the British government, as accurate and fair comment. But there was in fact no record of death squads under the Sandinista government. There was no record of torture. There was no record of systematic or official military brutality. No priests were ever murdered in Nicaragua. There were in fact three priests in the government, two Jesuits and a Maryknoll missionary. The totalitarian dungeons were actually next door, in El Salvador and Guatemala. The United States had brought down the democratically elected government of Guatemala in 1954 and it is estimated that over 200,000 people had been victims of successive military dictatorships.

Six of the most distinguished Jesuits in the world were viciously murdered at

the Central American University in San Salvador in 1989 by a battalion of the Alcatl regiment trained at Fort Benning, Georgia, USA. That extremely brave man Archbishop Romero was assassinated while saying mass. It is estimated that 75,000 people died. Why were they killed? They were killed because they believed a better life was possible and should be achieved. That belief immediately qualified them as communists. They died because they dared to question the status quo, the endless plateau of poverty, disease, degradation and oppression, which had been their birthright.

The United States finally brought down the Sandinista government. It took some years and considerable resistance but relentless economic persecution and 30,000 dead finally undermined the spirit of the Nicaraguan people. They were exhausted and poverty stricken once again. The casinos moved back into the country. Free health and free education were over. Big business returned with a vengeance. 'Democracy' had prevailed.

But this 'policy' was by no means restricted to Central America. It was conducted throughout the world. It was never-ending. And it is as if it never happened.

The United States supported and in many cases engendered every right wing military dictatorship in the world after the end of the Second World War. I refer to Indonesia, Greece, Uruguay, Brazil, Paraguay, Haiti, Turkey, the Philippines, Guatemala, El Salvador, and, of course, Chile. The horror the United States inflicted upon Chile in 1973 can never be purged and can never be forgiven.

Hundreds of thousands of deaths took place throughout these countries. Did they take place? And are they in all cases attributable to US foreign policy? The answer is yes they did take place and they are attributable to American foreign policy. But you wouldn't know it.

It never happened. Nothing ever happened. Even while it was happening it wasn't happening. It didn't matter. It was of no interest. The crimes of the United States have been systematic, constant, vicious, remorseless, but very few people have actually talked about them. You have to hand it to America. It has exercised a quite clinical manipulation of power worldwide while masquerading as a force for universal good. It's a brilliant, even witty, highly successful act of hypnosis.

I put to you that the United States is without doubt the greatest show on the road. Brutal, indifferent, scornful and ruthless it may be but it is also very clever. As a salesman it is out on its own and its most saleable commodity is self love. It's a winner. Listen to all American presidents on television say the words, 'the American people', as in the sentence, 'I say to the American people it is time to pray and to defend the rights of the American people and I ask the American people to trust their president in the action he is about to take on behalf of the American people.'

It's a scintillating stratagem. Language is actually employed to keep thought

at bay. The words 'the American people' provide a truly voluptuous cushion of reassurance. You don't need to think. Just lie back on the cushion. The cushion may be suffocating your intelligence and your critical faculties but it's very comfortable. This does not apply of course to the 40 million people living below the poverty line and the 2 million men and women imprisoned in the vast gulag of prisons, which extends across the US.

The United States no longer bothers about low intensity conflict. It no longer sees any point in being reticent or even devious. It puts its cards on the table without fear or favour. It quite simply doesn't give a damn about the United Nations, international law or critical dissent, which it regards as impotent and irrelevant. It also has its own bleating little lamb tagging behind it on a lead, the pathetic and supine Great Britain.

What has happened to our moral sensibility? Did we ever have any? What do these words mean? Do they refer to a term very rarely employed these days - conscience? A conscience to do not only with our own acts but to do with our shared responsibility in the acts of others? Is all this dead? Look at Guantanamo Bay. Hundreds of people detained without charge for over three years, with no legal representation or due process, technically detained forever. This totally illegitimate structure is maintained in defiance of the Geneva Convention. It is not only tolerated but hardly thought about by what's called the 'international community'. This criminal outrage is being committed by a country, which declares itself to be 'the leader of the free world'. Do we think about the inhabitants of Guantanamo Bay? What does the media say about them? They pop up occasionally - a small item on page six. They have been consigned to a no man's land from which indeed they may never return. At present many are on hunger strike, being force-fed, including British residents. No niceties in these force-feeding procedures. No sedative or anaesthetic. Just a tube stuck up your nose and into your throat. You vomit blood. This is torture. What has the British Foreign Secretary said about this? Nothing. What has the British Prime Minister said about this? Nothing. Why not? Because the United States has said: to criticise our conduct in Guantanamo Bay constitutes an unfriendly act. You're either with us or against us. So Blair shuts up.

The invasion of Iraq was a bandit act, an act of blatant state terrorism, demonstrating absolute contempt for the concept of international law. The invasion was an arbitrary military action inspired by a series of lies upon lies and gross manipulation of the media and therefore of the public; an act intended to consolidate American military and economic control of the Middle East masquerading - as a last resort - all other justifications having failed to justify themselves - as liberation. A formidable assertion of military force responsible for the death and mutilation of thousands and thousands of innocent people.

We have brought torture, cluster bombs, depleted uranium, innumerable acts of random murder, misery, degradation and death to the Iraqi people and

call it 'bringing freedom and democracy to the Middle East'.

How many people do you have to kill before you qualify to be described as a mass murderer and a war criminal? One hundred thousand? More than enough, I would have thought. Therefore it is just that Bush and Blair be arraigned before the International Criminal Court of Justice. But Bush has been clever. He has not ratified the International Criminal Court of Justice. Therefore if any American soldier or for that matter politician finds himself in the dock Bush has warned that he will send in the marines. But Tony Blair has ratified the Court and is therefore available for prosecution. We can let the Court have his address if they're interested. It is Number 10, Downing Street, London.

Death in this context is irrelevant. Both Bush and Blair place death well away on the back burner. At least 100,000 Iraqis were killed by American bombs and missiles before the Iraq insurgency began. These people are of no moment. Their deaths don't exist. They are blank. They are not even recorded as being dead. 'We don't do body counts,' said the American general Tommy Franks.

Early in the invasion there was a photograph published on the front page of British newspapers of Tony Blair kissing the cheek of a little Iraqi boy. 'A grateful child,' said the caption. A few days later there was a story and photograph, on an inside page, of another four-year-old boy with no arms. His family had been blown up by a missile. He was the only survivor. 'When do I get my arms back?' he asked. The story was dropped. Well, Tony Blair wasn't holding him in his arms, nor the body of any other mutilated child, nor the body of any bloody corpse. Blood is dirty. It dirties your shirt and tie when you're making a sincere speech on television.

The 2,000 American dead are an embarrassment. They are transported to their graves in the dark. Funerals are unobtrusive, out of harm's way. The mutilated rot in their beds, some for the rest of their lives. So the dead and the mutilated both rot, in different kinds of graves.

Here is an extract from a poem by Pablo Neruda, 'I'm Explaining a Few Things':

And one morning all that was burning,
one morning the bonfires
leapt out of the earth
devouring human beings
and from then on fire,
gunpowder from then on,
and from then on blood.
Bandits with planes and Moors,
bandits with finger-rings and duchesses,
bandits with black friars spattering blessings

came through the sky to kill children
and the blood of children ran through the streets
without fuss, like children's blood.

Jackals that the jackals would despise
stones that the dry thistle would bite on and spit out,
vipers that the vipers would abominate.

Face to face with you I have seen the blood
of Spain tower like a tide
to drown you in one wave
of pride and knives.

Treacherous
generals:
see my dead house,
look at broken Spain:
from every house burning metal flows
instead of flowers
from every socket of Spain
Spain emerges
and from every dead child a rifle with eyes
and from every crime bullets are born
which will one day find
the bull's eye of your hearts.

And you will ask: why doesn't his poetry
speak of dreams and leaves
and the great volcanoes of his native land.

Come and see the blood in the streets.
Come and see
the blood in the streets.
Come and see the blood
in the streets!

Let me make it quite clear that in quoting from Neruda's poem I am in no way comparing Republican Spain to Saddam Hussein's Iraq. I quote Neruda because nowhere in contemporary poetry have I read such a powerful visceral description of the bombing of civilians.

I have said earlier that the United States is now totally frank about putting its cards on the table. That is the case. Its official declared policy is now defined as 'full spectrum dominance'. That is not my term, it is theirs. 'Full

spectrum dominance' means control of land, sea, air and space and all attendant resources.

The United States now occupies 702 military installations throughout the world in 132 countries, with the honourable exception of Sweden, of course. We don't quite know how they got there but they are there all right.

The United States possesses 8,000 active and operational nuclear warheads. Two thousand are on hair trigger alert, ready to be launched with 15 minutes warning. It is developing new systems of nuclear force, known as bunker busters. The British, ever cooperative, are intending to replace their own nuclear missile, Trident. Who, I wonder, are they aiming at? Osama bin Laden? You? Me? Joe Dokes? China? Paris? Who knows? What we do know is that this infantile insanity - the possession and threatened use of nuclear weapons - is at the heart of present American political philosophy. We must remind ourselves that the United States is on a permanent military footing and shows no sign of relaxing it.

Many thousands, if not millions, of people in the United States itself are demonstrably sickened, shamed and angered by their government's actions, but as things stand they are not a coherent political force - yet. But the anxiety, uncertainty and fear which we can see growing daily in the United States is unlikely to diminish.

I know that President Bush has many extremely competent speech writers but I would like to volunteer for the job myself. I propose the following short address which he can make on television to the nation. I see him grave, hair carefully combed, serious, winning, sincere, often beguiling, sometimes employing a wry smile, curiously attractive, a man's man.

'God is good. God is great. God is good. My God is good. Bin Laden's God is bad. His is a bad God. Saddam's God was bad, except he didn't have one. He was a barbarian. We are not barbarians. We don't chop people's heads off. We believe in freedom. So does God. I am not a barbarian. I am the democratically elected leader of a freedom-loving democracy. We are a compassionate society. We give compassionate electrocution and compassionate lethal injection. We are a great nation. I am not a dictator. He is. I am not a barbarian. He is. And he is. They all are. I possess moral authority. You see this fist? This is my moral authority. And don't you forget it.'

A writer's life is a highly vulnerable, almost naked activity. We don't have to weep about that. The writer makes his choice and is stuck with it. But it is true to say that you are open to all the winds, some of them icy indeed. You are out on your own, out on a limb. You find no shelter, no protection - unless you lie - in which case of course you have constructed your own protection and, it could be argued, become a politician.

I have referred to death quite a few times this evening. I shall now quote a poem of my own called 'Death'.

Where was the dead body found?
Who found the dead body?
Was the dead body dead when found?
How was the dead body found?

Who was the dead body?

Who was the father or daughter or brother
Or uncle or sister or mother or son
Of the dead and abandoned body?

Was the body dead when abandoned?
Was the body abandoned?
By whom had it been abandoned?

Was the dead body naked or dressed for a journey?

What made you declare the dead body dead?
Did you declare the dead body dead?
How well did you know the dead body?
How did you know the dead body was dead?

Did you close both its eyes
Did you bury the body
Did you leave it abandoned
Did you kiss the dead body

When we look into a mirror we think the image that confronts us is accurate. But move a millimetre and the image changes. We are actually looking at a never-ending range of reflections. But sometimes a writer has to smash the mirror - for it is on the other side of that mirror that the truth stares at us.

I believe that despite the enormous odds which exist, unflinching, unswerving, fierce intellectual determination, as citizens, to define the real truth of our lives and our societies is a crucial obligation which devolves upon us all. It is in fact mandatory.

If such a determination is not embodied in our political vision we have no hope of restoring what is so nearly lost to us - the dignity of man.



Figure 4.1: Harold Pinter (1930-2008)

A letter from Prof. Anthony James Hall

Here is a quotation from a letter that I received from Prof. Anthony James Hall of the University of Lethbridge, Alberta Canada:

The global fiasco that has unfolded since the 9/11 debacle presents almost a text book case of public policy gone awry because of rushed decisions made without due diligence, made without the careful application of evidence-based science. The result has been an onslaught of murder and mayhem pressed against innocent people who have been disproportionately Muslim. The number of those killed, crippled, and displaced as a consequence can now be counted in the many millions.

Moreover our civil liberties and protections, including the human right to be treated as innocent until proven guilty, have basically become museum artifacts. In the name of the ongoing Global War on Terror citizens have been transformed en masse into suspects to be spied upon, incarcerated, tortured and killed, all in the name of specious applications of so-called “national security.”

We are fast losing any semblance of protection and enforcement of our right to free speech. Of special significance for this group, because of the abuses flowing from the specious interpretation of 9/11 we are ironically losing our academic freedom to pursue evidence-based research and debate on a variety of topics including 9/11.




Figure 4.2: Veteran's Affairs should be viewed as part of the "Defense" budget. Thus the total for military purposes is \$0.811 trillion, or 64% of the total budget. The Trump administration plans to slash all social services because "the money for them is not available".

There is no doubt that nuclear weapons and other WMDs have been and continue to be very much a factor in all the machinations undertaken in the name of the Global War on Terror. Its origins lie in a demonstrably false account of what transpired on 9/11. Indeed, the misrepresentation of the events of 9/11 followed by misrepresentations concerning the existence of supposed WMDs in Iraq gave rise to a US-led invasion whose appalling consequences continue yet.

4.2 List of US wars, interventions and coups

David Swanson's list

Here are some quotations from the website of the distinguished peace activist David Swanson:¹

Since World War II, during a supposed golden age of peace, the United States military has killed or helped kill some 20 million people, overthrown at least 36 governments, interfered in at least 84 foreign elections, attempted to assassinate over 50 foreign leaders, and dropped bombs on people in over 30 countries. The United States is responsible for the deaths of 5 million people in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and over 1 million just since 2003 in Iraq.

Since 2001, the United States has been systematically destroying a region of the globe, bombing Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Libya, Somalia, Yemen, and Syria, not to mention the Philippines. The United States has "special forces" operating in two-thirds of the world's countries and non-special forces in three-quarters of them.

The U.S. government as of 2017 provided military aid to 73% of the world's dictatorships.

U.S. weapons are used on both sides of many wars.

The supreme international crime according to 2017 U.S. media reporting is interfering nonviolently in a democratic election - at least if Russia does it. William Blum, in his book *Rogue State*, lists over 30 times that the United States has done that. Another study, however, says 81 elections in 47 countries. France 2017 makes that total at least 82. Honduras 2017 makes it 83. Russia 2018 makes it 84.

In a reality-based assessment of U.S. crimes, the serious offenses begin beyond that threshold. Here's Blum's list of over 50 foreign leaders whom the United States has attempted to assassinate:

- 1949 - Kim Koo, Korean opposition leader

¹<http://davidswanson.org/warlist/>

- 1950s - CIA/Neo-Nazi hit list of more than 200 political figures in West Germany to be “put out of the way” in the event of a Soviet invasion
- 1950s - Chou En-lai, Prime minister of China, several attempts on his life
- 1950s, 1962 - Sukarno, President of Indonesia
- 1951 - Kim Il Sung, Premier of North Korea
- 1953 - Mohammed Mossadegh, Prime Minister of Iran
- 1950s (mid) - Claro M. Recto, Philippines opposition leader
- 1955 - Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India
- 1957 - Gamal Abdul Nasser, President of Egypt
- 1959, 1963, 1969 - Norodom Sihanouk, leader of Cambodia
- 1960 - Brig. Gen. Abdul Karim Kassem, leader of Iraq
- 1950s-70s - José Figueres, President of Costa Rica, two attempts on his life
- 1961 - Francois “Papa Doc” Duvalier, leader of Haiti
- 1961 - Patrice Lumumba, Prime Minister of the Congo (Zaire)
- 1961 - Gen. Rafael Trujillo, leader of Dominican Republic
- 1963 - Ngo Dinh Diem, President of South Vietnam
- 1960s-70s - Fidel Castro, President of Cuba, many attempts on his life
- 1960s - Raúl Castro, high official in government of Cuba
- 1965 - Francisco Caamano, Dominican Republic opposition leader
- 1965-6 - Charles de Gaulle, President of France
- 1967 - Che Guevara, Cuban leader
- 1970 - Salvador Allende, President of Chile
- 1970 - Gen. Rene Schneider, Commander-in-Chief of Army, Chile
- 1970s, 1981 - General Omar Torrijos, leader of Panama
- 1972 - General Manuel Noriega, Chief of Panama Intelligence
- 1975 - Mobutu Sese Seko, President of Zaire
- 1976 - Michael Manley, Prime Minister of Jamaica
- 1980-1986 - Muammar Qaddafi, leader of Libya, several plots and attempts upon his life
- 1982 - Ayatollah Khomeini, leader of Iran
- 1983 - Gen. Ahmed Dlimi, Moroccan Army commander
- 1983 - Miguel d’Escoto, Foreign Minister of Nicaragua
- 1984 - The nine comandantes of the Sandinista National Directorate
- 1985 - Sheikh Mohammed Hussein Fadlallah, Lebanese Shiite leader (80 people killed in the attempt)
- 1991 - Saddam Hussein, leader of Iraq
- 1993 - Mohamed Farah Aideed, prominent clan leader of Somalia
- 1998, 2001-2 - Osama bin Laden, leading Islamic militant
- 1999 - Slobodan Milosevic, President of Yugoslavia
- 2002 - Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, Afghan Islamic leader and warlord
- 2003 - Saddam Hussein and his two sons
- 2011 - Muammar Qaddafi, leader of Libya

Here is Blum's list of U.S. attempts to overthrow governments (* indicates success): CIA

- China 1949 to early 1960s
- Albania 1949-53
- East Germany 1950s
- Iran 1953 *
- Guatemala 1954 *
- Costa Rica mid-1950s
- Syria 1956-7
- Egypt 1957
- Indonesia 1957-8
- British Guiana 1953-64 *
- Iraq 1963 *
- North Vietnam 1945-73
- Cambodia 1955-70 *
- Laos 1958 *, 1959 *, 1960 *
- Ecuador 1960-63 *
- Congo 1960 *
- France 1965
- Brazil 1962-64 *
- Dominican Republic 1963 * Cuba 1959 to present
- Bolivia 1964 *
- Indonesia 1965 *
- Ghana 1966 *
- Chile 1964-73 *
- Greece 1967 *
- Costa Rica 1970-71
- Bolivia 1971 *
- Australia 1973-75 *
- Angola 1975, 1980s
- Zaire 1975
- Portugal 1974-76 *
- Jamaica 1976-80 *
- Seychelles 1979-81
- Chad 1981-82 *
- Grenada 1983 *
- South Yemen 1982-84
- Suriname 1982-84
- Fiji 1987 *
- Libya 1980s
- Nicaragua 1981-90 *
- Panama 1989 *

- Bulgaria 1990 *
- Albania 1991 *
- Iraq 1991
- Afghanistan 1980s *
- Somalia 1993
- Yugoslavia 1999-2000 *
- Ecuador 2000 *
- Afghanistan 2001 *
- Venezuela 2002 * I
- Iraq 2003 *
- Haiti 2004 *
- Somalia 2007 to present
- Honduras 2009
- Libya 2011 *
- Syria 2012
- Ukraine 2014 *

The above list does not include numerous coups by U.S.-trained fighters, such as (other than Honduras) those discussed here: “from Isaac Zida of Burkina Faso, Haiti’s Philippe Biamby, and Yahya Jammeh of The Gambia to Egypt’s Abdel-Fattah el-Sisi, Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan, and the IMET-educated leaders of the 2009 coup in Honduras, not to mention Mali’s Amadou Sanogo.” These are just in very recent years, by no means a complete list, though the Haiti coup referenced here was earlier than the one included in the list above.

We might want to add Venezuela 2018. We should certainly add Bolivia 2019.

Here is Blum’s list of nations bombed by the United States:

- Korea and China 1950-53 (Korean War)
- Guatemala 1954
- Indonesia 1958
- Cuba 1959-1961
- Guatemala 1960
- Congo 1964
- Laos 1964-73
- Vietnam 1961-73
- Cambodia 1969-70
- Guatemala 1967-69
- Grenada 1983
- Lebanon 1983, 1984 (both Lebanese and Syrian targets)
- Libya 1986
- El Salvador 1980s

- Nicaragua 1980s
- Iran 1987
- Panama 1989
- Iraq 1991 (Persian Gulf War)
- Kuwait 1991
- Somalia 1993
- Bosnia 1994, 1995
- Sudan 1998
- Afghanistan 1998
- Yugoslavia 1999
- Yemen 2002
- Iraq 1991-2003 (US/UK on regular basis)
- Iraq 2003-2015
- Afghanistan 2001-2015
- Pakistan 2007-2015
- Somalia 2007-8, 2011
- Yemen 2009, 2011
- Libya 2011, 2015
- Syria 2014-2016

The Congressional Research Services Report

Here are some quotations from a report entitled *Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-2019*, compiled by Barbara Salazar Torreon and Sofia Plagakis. The report, which was published on July 17, 2019, shows how the US Government views its armed interventions.

- Persian Gulf. After the Iran-Iraq War resulted in several military incidents in the Persian Gulf, the United States increased U.S. joint military forces operations in the Persian Gulf and adopted a policy of reflagging and escorting Kuwaiti oil tankers through the Gulf. President Reagan reported that U.S. Navy ships had been fired upon or struck mines or taken other military action on September 23, October 10, and October 20, 1987, and April 19, July 4, and July 14, 1988. The United States gradually reduced its forces after a cease fire between Iran and Iraq on August 20, 1988.
- Panama. In mid-March and April 1988, during a period of instability in Panama and as pressure grew for Panamanian military leader General Manuel Noriega to resign, the United States sent 1,000 troops to Panama, to “further safeguard the canal, U.S. lives, property and interests in the area.” The forces supplemented 10,000 U.S. military personnel already in Panama.



Figure 4.3: U.S. soldiers take aim while searching people in Panama City, Panama on Dec. 26, 1989. Ezequiel Becerra / AP.

- Libya. On January 4, 1989, two U.S. Navy F-14 aircraft based on the USS John F. Kennedy shot down two Libyan jet fighters over the Mediterranean Sea about 70 miles north of Libya. The U.S. pilots said the Libyan planes had demonstrated hostile intentions.
- Panama. On May 11, 1989, in response to General Noriega's disregard of the results of the Panamanian election, President Bush ordered a brigade-sized force of approximately 1,900 troops to augment the estimated 11,000 U.S. forces already in the area.
- Andean Initiative in War on Drugs. On September 15, 1989, President Bush announced that military and law enforcement assistance would be sent to help the Andean nations of Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru combat illicit drug producers and traffickers. By mid-September there were 50-100 U.S. military advisers in Colombia in connection with transport and training in the use of military equipment, plus seven Special Forces teams of 2-12 persons to train troops in the three countries. Philippines.
- On December 2, 1989, President Bush reported that on December 1 U.S. fighter planes from Clark Air Base in the Philippines had assisted the Aquino government to repel a coup attempt. In addition, 100 marines were sent from the U.S. Navy base at Subic Bay to protect the U.S. embassy in Manila.
- Panama. On December 21, 1989, President Bush reported that he had ordered U.S. military forces to Panama to protect the lives of American citizens and bring General Noriega to justice. By February 13, 1990, all the invasion forces had been withdrawn.
- Liberia. On August 6, 1990, President Bush reported that a reinforced rifle company had been sent to provide additional security to the U.S. embassy in Monrovia, and that helicopter teams had evacuated U.S. citizens from Liberia.
- Saudi Arabia. On August 9, 1990, President Bush reported that he had ordered the forward deployment of substantial elements of the U.S. Armed Forces into the Persian Gulf region to help defend Saudi Arabia after the August 2 invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. On November 16, 1990, he reported the continued buildup of the forces to ensure an adequate offensive military option.
- Iraq. On January 18, 1991, President Bush reported that he had directed U.S. Armed Forces to commence combat operations on January 16 against Iraqi forces and military targets in Iraq and Kuwait, in conjunction with a coalition of allies and U.N. Security Council resolutions. On January 12 Congress had passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq Resolution (P.L. 102-1). Combat operations were suspended on February 28, 1991.
- Iraq. On May 17, 1991, President Bush stated in a status report to Congress that the Iraqi repression of the Kurdish people had necessitated a limited introduction of U.S. forces in to northern Iraq for emergency relief purposes.
- Zaire. On September 25-27, 1991, after widespread looting and rioting broke out in Kinshasa, U.S. Air Force C-141s transported 100 Belgian troops and equipment into Kinshasa. U.S. planes also carried 300 French troops into the Central African Re-

public and hauled back American citizens and third country nationals from locations outside Zaire.

- Sierra Leone. On May 3, 1992, U.S. military planes evacuated Americans from Sierra Leone, where military leaders had overthrown the government.
- Kuwait. On August 3, 1992, the United States began a series of military exercises in Kuwait, following Iraqi refusal to recognize a new border drawn up by the United Nations and refusal to cooperate with U.N. inspection teams.
- Iraq. On September 16, 1992, President Bush stated in a status report to Congress that he had ordered U.S. participation in the enforcement of a prohibition against Iraqi flights in a specified zone in southern Iraq, and aerial reconnaissance to monitor Iraqi compliance with the cease-fire resolution.
- Somalia. On December 10, 1992, President Bush reported that he had deployed U.S. Armed Forces to Somalia in response to a humanitarian crisis and a U.N. Security Council Resolution determining that the situation constituted a threat to international peace. This operation, called Operation Restore Hope, was part of a U.S.-led United Nations Unified Task Force (UNITAF) and came to an end on May 4, 1993. U.S. forces continued to participate in the successor United Nations Operations in Somalia (UNOSOM II), which the U.N. Security Council authorized to assist Somalia in political reconciliation and restoration of peace. ted Nations Operation.
- Iraq. On January 19, 1993, President Bush said in a status report that on December 27, 1992, U.S. aircraft had shot down an Iraqi aircraft in the prohibited zone; on January 13 aircraft from the United States and coalition partners had attacked missile bases in southern Iraq; and further military actions had occurred on January 17 and 18. Administration officials said the United States was deploying a battalion task force to Kuwait to underline the continuing U.S. commitment to Kuwaiti independence.
- Iraq. On January 21, 1993, shortly after his inauguration, President Clinton said the United States would continue the Bush policy on Iraq, and U.S. aircraft fired at targets in Iraq after pilots sensed Iraqi radar or anti-aircraft fire directed at them.
- Bosnia. On February 28, 1993, the United States began an airdrop of relief supplies aimed at Muslims surrounded by Serbian forces in Bosnia.
- Bosnia. On April 13, 1993, President Clinton reported U.S. forces were participating in a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) air action to enforce a U.N. ban on all unauthorized military flights over Bosnia-Herzegovina.
- Iraq. In a status report on Iraq of May 24, President Clinton said that on April 9 and April 18 U.S. planes had bombed or fired missiles at Iraqi anti-aircraft sites that had tracked U.S. aircraft.
- Somalia. On June 10, 1993, President Clinton reported that in response to attacks against U.N. forces in Somalia by a factional leader, the U.S. Quick Reaction Force in the area had participated in military action to quell the violence. On July 1 President Clinton reported further air and ground military operations on June 12 and June 17 aimed at neutralizing military capabilities that had impeded U.N. efforts to deliver

humanitarian relief and promote national reconstruction, and additional instances occurred in the following months.

- Iraq. On June 28, 1993, President Clinton reported that on June 26 U.S. naval forces had launched missiles against the Iraqi Intelligence Service's headquarters in Baghdad in response to an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate former President Bush in Kuwait in April 1993.
- Iraq. In a status report of July 22, 1993, President Clinton said on June 19 a U.S. aircraft had fired a missile at an Iraqi anti-aircraft site displaying hostile intent. U.S. planes also bombed an Iraqi missile battery on August 19, 1993.
- Macedonia. On July 9, 1993, President Clinton reported the deployment of 350 U.S. soldiers to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to participate in the U.N. Protection Force to help maintain stability in the area of former Yugoslavia.
- Haiti. On October 20, 1993, President Clinton reported that U.S. ships had begun to enforce a U.N. embargo against Haiti.
- Bosnia. On February 17, 1994, President Clinton reported that the United States had expanded its participation in United Nations and NATO efforts to reach a peaceful solution to the conflict in former Yugoslavia and that 60 U.S. aircraft were available for participation in the authorized NATO missions.
- Bosnia. On March 1, 1994, President Clinton reported that on February 28 U.S. planes patrolling the "no-fly zone" in former Yugoslavia under NATO shot down four Serbian Galeb planes.
- Bosnia. On April 12, 1994, President Clinton reported that on April 10 and 11, U.S. warplanes under NATO command had fired against Bosnian Serb forces shelling the "safe" city of Gorazde.
- Rwanda. On April 12, 1994, President Clinton reported that combat-equipped U.S. military forces had been deployed to Burundi to conduct possible non-combatant evacuation operations of U.S. citizens and other third-country nationals from Rwanda, where widespread fighting had broken out. By September 30, 1994, all U.S. troops had departed from Rwanda and surrounding nations. In the Defense Appropriations Act for FY1995 (P.L. 103-335, signed September 30, 1994), Congress barred use of funds for U.S. military participation in or around Rwanda after October 7, 1994, except for any action necessary to protect U.S. citizens.
- Macedonia. On April 19, 1994, President Clinton reported that the U.S. contingent in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had been augmented by a reinforced company of 200 personnel.
- Haiti. On April 20, 1994, President Clinton reported that U.S. naval forces had continued enforcement of the U.N. embargo in the waters around Haiti and that 712 vessels had been boarded since October 20, 1993.
- Bosnia. On August 22, 1994, President Clinton reported the use on August 5 of U.S. aircraft under NATO to attack Bosnian Serb heavy weapons in the Sarajevo heavy weapons exclusion zone upon request of the U.N. Protection Forces.

- Haiti. On September 21, 1994, President Clinton reported the deployment of 1,500 troops to Haiti to restore democracy in Haiti. The troop level was subsequently increased to 20,000.
- Bosnia. On November 22, 1994, President Clinton reported the use of U.S. combat aircraft on November 21, 1994, under NATO, to attack bases used by Serbs to attack the town of Bihac in Bosnia.
- Macedonia. On December 22, 1994, President Clinton reported that the U.S. Army contingent in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continued its peacekeeping mission and that the current contingent would soon be replaced by about 500 soldiers from the 3rd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, and 1st Armored Division from Kirchgoens, Germany.
- Somalia. On March 1, 1995, President Clinton reported that on February 27, 1995, 1,800 combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces personnel began deployment into Mogadishu, Somalia, to assist in the withdrawal of U.N. forces assigned there to the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II). This mission was completed on March 3, 1995.
- Haiti. On March 21, 1995, President Clinton reported that U.S. military forces in Haiti as part of a U.N. Multinational Force had been reduced to just fewer than 5,300 personnel. He noted that as of March 31, 1995, approximately 2,500 U.S. personnel would remain in Haiti as part of the U.N. Mission in Haiti (UNMIH).
- Bosnia. On May 24, 1995, President Clinton reported that U.S. combat-equipped fighter aircraft and other aircraft continued to contribute to NATO's enforcement of the no-fly zone in airspace over Bosnia-Herzegovina. U.S. aircraft, he noted, were also available for close air support of U.N. forces in Croatia. Roughly 500 U.S. soldiers continued to be deployed in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as part of the U.N. Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP). U.S. forces continued to support U.N. refugee and embargo operations in this region.
- Bosnia. On September 1, 1995, President Clinton reported that "U.S. combat and support aircraft" had been used beginning on August 29, 1995, in a series of NATO air strikes against Bosnian Serb Army (BSA) forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina that were threatening the U.N.-declared safe areas of Sarajevo, Tuzla, and Gorazde. He noted that during the first day of operations, "some 300 sorties were flown against 23 targets in the vicinity of Sarajevo, Tuzla, Gorazde and Mostar."
- Haiti. On September 21, 1995, President Clinton reported that currently the United States had 2,400 military personnel in Haiti as participants in UNMIH. In addition, 260 U.S. military personnel were assigned to the U.S. Support Group Haiti.
- Bosnia. On December 6, 1995, President Clinton reported to Congress that he had "ordered the deployment of approximately 1,500 U.S. military personnel" to Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia as part of a NATO "enabling force" to lay the groundwork for the prompt and safe deployment of the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR), which would be used to implement the Bosnian peace agreement after its signing. The President also noted that he had authorized deployment of roughly 3,000 other

U.S. military personnel to Hungary, Italy, and Croatia to establish infrastructure for the enabling force and the IFOR.

- Bosnia. On December 21, 1995, President Clinton reported to Congress that he had ordered the deployment of approximately 20,000 U.S. military personnel to participate in IFOR in the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and approximately 5,000 U.S. military personnel would be deployed in other former Yugoslav states, primarily in Croatia. In addition, about 7,000 U.S. support forces would be deployed to Hungary, Italy, and Croatia and other regional states in support of IFOR's mission.
- Albania. On March 15, 1997, President Clinton reported to Congress that on March 13, 1997, he had utilized U.S. military forces to evacuate certain U.S. government employees and private U.S. citizens from Tirana, Albania, and to enhance security for the U.S. embassy in that city.
- Congo and Gabon. On March 27, 1997, President Clinton reported to Congress that, on March 25, 1997, a standby evacuation force of U.S. military personnel had been deployed to Congo and Gabon to provide enhanced security for American private citizens, government employees, and selected third country nationals in Zaire, and to be available for any necessary evacuation operation.
- Sierra Leone. On May 30, 1997, President Clinton reported to Congress that on May 29 and May 30, 1997, U.S. military personnel were deployed to Freetown, Sierra Leone, to prepare for and undertake the evacuation of certain U.S. government employees and private U.S. citizens.
- Bosnia. On June 20, 1997, President Clinton reported to Congress that U.S. Armed Forces continued to support peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and other states in the region in support of the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR). He reported that currently most U.S. military personnel involved in SFOR were in Bosnia, near Tuzla, and about 2,800 U.S. troops were deployed in Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and other regional states to provide logistics and other support to SFOR. A U.S. Army contingent of about 500 also remained in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as part of the UNPREDEP.
- Cambodia. On July 11, 1997, President Clinton reported to Congress that in an effort to ensure the security of American citizens in Cambodia during a period of domestic conflict there, he had deployed a Task Force of about 550 U.S. military personnel to U-Tapao Air Base in Thailand. These personnel were to be available for possible emergency evacuation operations in Cambodia as deemed necessary.
- Bosnia. On December 19, 1997, President Clinton reported to Congress that he intended "in principle" to have the United States participate in a security presence in Bosnia when the NATO SFOR contingent withdrew in the summer of 1998.
- Guinea-Bissau. On June 12, 1998, President Clinton reported to Congress that, on June 10, 1998, in response to an army mutiny in Guinea-Bissau endangering the U.S. embassy, U.S. government employees, and U.S. citizens in that country, he had deployed a standby evacuation force of U.S. military personnel to Dakar, Senegal, to remove such individuals, as well as selected third country nationals, from the city of Bissau. The deployment continued until the necessary evacuations were completed.

- Bosnia. On June 19, 1998, President Clinton reported to Congress regarding activities in the last six months of combat-equipped U.S. forces in support of NATO's SFOR in Bosnia and surrounding areas of former Yugoslavia.
- Kenya and Tanzania. On August 10, 1998, President Clinton reported to Congress that he had deployed, on August 7, 1998, Joint Task Force of U.S. military personnel to Nairobi, Kenya, to coordinate the medical and disaster assistance related to the bombings of the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. He also reported that teams of 50-100 security personnel had arrived in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, to enhance the security of the U.S. Embassies and citizens there.
- Albania. On August 18, 1998, President Clinton reported to Congress that he had, on August 16, 1998, deployed 200 U.S. Marines and 10 Navy SEALs to the U.S. embassy compound in Tirana, Albania, to enhance security against reported threats against U.S. personnel.
- Afghanistan and Sudan. On August 21, 1998, by letter, President Clinton reported to Congress that he had authorized airstrikes on August 20 against camps and installations in Afghanistan and Sudan used by the Osama bin Laden terrorist organization. The President did so based on what he viewed as convincing information that the bin Laden organization was responsible for the bombings, on August 7, 1998, of the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.
- Liberia. On September 29, 1998, President Clinton reported to Congress that on September 27, 1998, he had, due to political instability and civil disorder in Liberia, deployed a stand-by response and evacuation force of 30 U.S. military personnel to augment the security force at the U.S. embassy in Monrovia, and to provide for a rapid evacuation capability, as needed, to remove U.S. citizens and government personnel from the country.
- Iraq. During the period from December 16-23, 1998, the United States, together with the United Kingdom, conducted a bombing campaign, termed Operation Desert Fox, against Iraqi industrial facilities deemed capable of producing weapons of mass destruction, and against other Iraqi military and security targets.
- Iraq. Beginning in late December 1998, and continuing during 1999, the United States, together with forces of the coalition enforcing the "no-fly" zones over Iraq, conducted military operations against the Iraqi air defense system on numerous occasions in response to actual or potential threats against aircraft enforcing the "no-fly" zones in northern and southern Iraq.
- Bosnia. On January 19, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress that he was continuing to authorize the use of combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces in Bosnia and other states in the region as participants in and supporters of the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR). He noted that the U.S. SFOR military personnel totaled about 6,900, with about 2,300 U.S. military personnel deployed to Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and other regional states. Also, some 350 U.S. military personnel remain deployed in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) as part of UNPREDEP.

- Kenya. On February 25, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress that he was continuing to deploy U.S. military personnel in that country to assist in providing security for the U.S. embassy and American citizens in Nairobi, pending completion of renovations of the American embassy facility in Nairobi, subject of a terrorist bombing in August 1998.
- Yugoslavia. On March 26, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress that, on March 24, 1999, U.S. military forces, at his direction, and in coalition with NATO allies, had commenced air strikes against Yugoslavia in response to the Yugoslav government's campaign of violence and repression against the ethnic Albanian population in Kosovo.
- Yugoslavia/Albania. On April 7, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress that he had ordered additional U.S. military forces to Albania, including rotary wing aircraft, artillery, and tactical missiles systems to enhance NATO's ability to conduct effective air operations in Yugoslavia. About 2,500 soldiers and aviators are to be deployed as part of this task force. The President also reported the deployment of U.S. military forces to Albania and Macedonia to support humanitarian disaster relief operations for Kosovar refugees.
- Yugoslavia/Albania. On May 25, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress, "consistent with the war Powers Resolution," that he had directed "deployment of additional aircraft and forces to support NATO's ongoing efforts [against Yugoslavia], including several thousand additional U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Albania in support of the deep strike force located there." He also directed that additional U.S. forces be deployed to the region to assist in "humanitarian operations".
- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On June 12, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress, "consistent with the War Powers Resolution," that he had directed the deployment of about "7,000 U.S. military personnel as the U.S. contribution to the approximately 50,000- member, NATO-led security force (KFOR)" currently being assembled in Kosovo. He also noted that about "1,500 U.S. military personnel, under separate U.S. command and control, will deploy to other countries in the region, as our national support element, in support of KFOR.
- Bosnia. On July 19, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress, "consistent with the War Powers Resolution" that about 6,200 U.S. military personnel were continuing to participate in the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia, and that another 2,200 personnel were supporting SFOR operations from Hungary, Croatia, and Italy. He also noted that U.S. military personnel remain in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to support the international security presence in Kosovo (KFOR).
- East Timor. On October 8, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress "consistent with the War Powers Resolution" that he had directed the deployment of a limited number of U.S. military forces to East Timor to support the U.N. multinational force (INTERFET) aimed at restoring peace to East Timor. U.S. support has been limited initially to "communications, logistics, planning assistance and transportation." The President further noted that he had authorized deployment of the amphibious ship

USS Belleau Wood, together with its helicopters and her complement of personnel from the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit (Special Operations Capable) (MEU SOC), to the East Timor region, to provide helicopter airlift and search and rescue support to the multinational operation. U.S. participation was anticipated to continue until the transition to a U.N. peacekeeping operation was complete.

- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On December 15, 1999, President Clinton reported to Congress “consistent with the War Powers Resolution” that U.S. combat-equipped military personnel continued to serve as part of the NATO-led security force in Kosovo (KFOR). He noted that the American contribution to KFOR in Kosovo was “approximately 8,500 U.S. military personnel.” U.S. forces were deployed in a sector around UroÅjevac (Ferizaj) in the eastern portion of Kosovo. “For U.S. KFOR forces,” maintaining public security is a key task.” Other U.S. military personnel are deployed to other countries in the region to serve in administrative and logistics support roles for U.S. forces in KFOR. Of these forces, about 1,500 U.S. military personnel are in Macedonia and Greece, and occasionally in Albania.
- Iraq. At various times during 1999, and continuing throughout 2000, the United States, together with forces of the coalition enforcing the “no-fly” zones over Iraq, conducted military operations against the Iraqi air defense system on numerous occasions in response to actual or potential threats against aircraft enforcing the “no-fly” zones in northern and southern Iraq.
- Bosnia. On January 25, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress “consistent with the War Powers Resolution” that the United States continued to provide combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces to Bosnia-Herzegovina and other states in the region as part of the NATO led Stabilization Force (SFOR). The President noted that the U.S. force contribution was being reduced from “approximately 6,200 to 4,600 personnel,” with the U.S. forces assigned to Multinational Division, North, around the city of Tuzla. He added that approximately 1,500 U.S. military personnel were deployed to Hungary, Croatia, and Italy to provide “logistical and other support to SFOR” and U.S. forces continue to support SFOR in “efforts to apprehend persons indicted for war crimes.”
- East Timor. On February 25, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress “consistent with the War Powers Resolution” that he had authorized the participation of a small number of U.S. military personnel in support of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), which has a mandate to maintain law and order throughout East Timor, and to facilitate establishment of an effective administration there, delivery of humanitarian assistance, and support the building of self-government. The President reported that the U.S. contingent was small: three military observers, and one judge advocate. To facilitate and coordinate U.S. military activities in East Timor, the President also authorized the deployment of a support group (USGET), consisting of 30 U.S. personnel. U.S. personnel would be temporarily deployed to East Timor, on a rotational basis, and through periodic ship visits, during which U.S. forces would conduct “humanitarian and assistance activities throughout East Timor.” Rotational activities should continue through the

summer of 2000.

- Sierra Leone. On May 12, 2000, President Clinton, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” reported to Congress that he had ordered a U.S. Navy patrol craft to deploy to Sierra Leone to be ready to support evacuation operations from that country if needed. He also authorized a U.S. C-17 aircraft to deliver “ammunition, and other supplies and equipment” to Sierra Leone in support of United Nations peacekeeping operations there.
- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On June 16, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the United States was continuing to provide military personnel to the NATO-led KFOR security force in Kosovo. U.S. forces were numbered at 7,500, but were scheduled to be reduced to 6,000 when ongoing troop rotations were completed. U.S. forces in Kosovo are assigned to a sector centered near Gnjilane (Gjilan) in eastern Kosovo. Other U.S. military personnel are deployed to other countries serving in administrative and logistics support roles, with approximately 1,000 U.S. personnel in Macedonia, Albania, and Greece.
- Bosnia. On July 25, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that combat-equipped U.S. military personnel continued to participate in the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia-Herzegovina, being deployed to Bosnia and other states in the region in support of peacekeeping efforts in former Yugoslavia. U.S. military personnel levels have been reduced from 6,200 to 4,600. Apart from the forces in Bosnia, approximately 1,000 U.S. personnel continue to be deployed in support roles in Hungary, Croatia, and Italy.
- East Timor. On August 25, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the United States was currently contributing three military observers to the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) that is charged by the U.N. with restoring and maintaining peace and security there. He also noted that the United States was maintaining a military presence in East Timor separate from UNTAET, comprised of about 30 U.S. personnel who facilitate and coordinate U.S. military activities in East Timor and rotational operations of U.S. forces there. U.S. forces currently conduct humanitarian and civic assistance activities for East Timor’s citizens. U.S. rotational presence operations in East Timor are presently expected, the President said, to continue through December 2000.
- Yemen. On October 14, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that on October 12, 2000, in the wake of an attack on the USS Cole in the port of Aden, Yemen, he had authorized deployment of about 45 military personnel from U.S. Naval Forces Central Command to Aden to provide “medical, security, and disaster response assistance.” The President further reported that on October 13, 2000, about 50 U.S. military security personnel arrived in Aden, and that additional “security elements” may be deployed to the area, to enhance the ability of the U.S. to ensure the security of the USS Cole and the personnel responding to the incident. In addition, two U.S. Navy surface combatant vessels are operating in or near Yemeni territorial waters to provide communications and other

support, as required.

- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On December 18, 2000, President Clinton reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the United States was continuing to provide approximately 5,600 U.S. military personnel in support of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo as part of KFOR. An additional 500 U.S. military personnel are deployed as the National Support Element in Macedonia, with an occasional presence in Albania and Greece. U.S. forces are assigned to a sector around Gnjilane in the eastern portion of Kosovo. The President noted that the mission for these U.S. military forces is maintaining a safe and secure environment through conducting “security patrols in urban areas and in the countryside throughout their sector.”
- East Timor. On March 2, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that U.S. Armed Forces were continuing to support the United Nations peacekeeping effort in East Timor aimed at providing security and maintaining law and order in East Timor, coordinating delivery of humanitarian assistance, and helping establish the basis for self-government in East Timor. The United States currently has three military observers attached to UNTAET. The United States also has a separate military presence, the U.S. Support Group East Timor (USGET), of approximately 12 U.S. personnel, including a security detachment, which “facilitates and coordinates” U.S. military activities in East Timor.
- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On May 18, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the United States was continuing to provide approximately 6,000 U.S. military personnel in support of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo as part of KFOR. An additional 500 U.S. military personnel are deployed as the National Support Element in Macedonia, with an occasional presence in Greece and Albania. U.S. forces in Kosovo are assigned to a sector around Gnjilane in the eastern portion. President Bush noted that the mission for these U.S. military forces is maintaining a safe and secure environment through conducting security patrols in urban areas and in the countryside through their sector.
- Bosnia. On July 25, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that about 3,800 combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces continued to be deployed in Bosnia-Herzegovina and other regional states as part of SFOR. Most were based at Tuzla in Bosnia. About 500 others were based in Hungary, Croatia, and Italy, providing logistical and other support.
- Iraq. At various times throughout 2001, the United States, together with forces of the coalition enforcing the “no-fly” zones over Iraq, conducted military operations against the Iraqi air defense system on numerous occasions in response to actual or potential threats against aircraft enforcing the “no-fly” zones in northern and southern Iraq.
- East Timor. On August 31, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that U.S. Armed Forces were continuing to support the United Nations peacekeeping effort in East Timor aimed at

providing security and maintaining law and order in East Timor, coordinating delivery of humanitarian assistance, and helping establish the basis for self-government in East Timor. The United States currently has three military observers attached to UNTAET. The United States also has a separate military presence, US GET, of approximately 20 U.S. personnel, including a security detachment, which “facilitates and coordinates” U.S. military activities in East Timor, as well as a rotational presence of U.S. forces through temporary deployments to East Timor. The President stated that U.S. forces would continue a presence through December 2001, while options for a U.S. presence in 2002 are being reviewed, with the President’s objective being redeployment of USGET personnel, as circumstances permit.

- **Terrorism threat.** On September 24, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution” and “Senate Joint Resolution 23, that in response to terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon he had ordered the “deployment of various combat-equipped and combat support forces to a number of foreign nations in the Central and Pacific Command areas of operations.” The President noted in efforts to “prevent and deter terrorism” he might find it necessary to order “additional forces into these and other areas of the world.” He stated that he could not now predict “the scope and duration of these deployments,” or the “actions necessary to counter the terrorist threat to the United States.”
- **Afghanistan.** On October 9, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution” and “Senate Joint Resolution 23,” that on October 7, 2001, U.S. Armed Forces “began combat action in Afghanistan against al-Qaida terrorists and their Taliban supporters.” The President stated that he had directed this military action in response to the September 11, 2001, attacks on U.S. “territory, our citizens, and our way of life, and to the continuing threat of terrorist acts against the United States and our friends and allies.” This military action was “part of our campaign against terrorism” and was “designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations.”
- **Yugoslavia/Kosovo.** On November 19, 2001, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the United States was continuing to provide approximately 5,500 U.S. military personnel in support of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo as part of KFOR. An additional 500 U.S. military personnel are deployed as the National Support Element in Macedonia, with an occasional presence in Greece and Albania. U.S. forces in Kosovo are assigned to a sector around Gnjilane in the eastern portion. President Bush noted that the mission for these U.S. military forces is maintaining a safe and secure environment through conducting security patrols in urban areas and in the countryside through their sector.
- **Bosnia.** On January 21, 2002, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that about 3,100 combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces continued to be deployed in Bosnia-Herzegovina and other regional states as part of the NATO- led Stabilization Force (SFOR). Most American forces

were based at Tuzla in Bosnia. About 500 others were based in Hungary, Croatia, and Italy, providing logistical and other support.

- East Timor. On February 28, 2002, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that U.S. Armed Forces were continuing to support the United Nations peacekeeping effort in East Timor aimed at providing security and maintaining law and order in East Timor, coordinating delivery of humanitarian assistance, and helping establish the basis for self-government in East Timor. The United States currently has three military observers attached to UNTAET. The United States also has a separate military presence, USGET, composed of approximately 10 U.S. personnel, including a security detachment, which “facilitates and coordinates” U.S. military activities in East Timor, as well as a rotational presence of U.S. forces through temporary deployments to East Timor. The President stated that U.S. forces would continue a presence through 2002. The President noted his objective was to gradually reduce the “rotational presence operations,” and to redeploy USGET personnel, as circumstances permitted.
- Terrorism threat. On March 20, 2002, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” on U.S. efforts in the “global war on Terrorism.” He noted that the “heart of the al-Qaeda training capability” had been “seriously degraded,” and that the remainder of the Taliban and the al-Qaeda fighters were being “actively pursued and engaged by the U.S., coalition and Afghan forces.” The United States was also conducting “maritime interception operations ... to locate and detain suspected al-Qaeda or Taliban leadership fleeing Afghanistan by sea.” At the Philippine government’s invitation, the President had ordered deployed “combat-equipped and combat support forces to train with, advise, and assist” the Philippines’ Armed Forces in enhancing their “existing counterterrorist capabilities.” The strength of U.S. military forces working with the Philippines was projected to be 600 personnel. The President noted that he was “assessing options” or assisting other nations, including Georgia and Yemen, in enhancing their “counterterrorism capabilities, including training and equipping their armed forces.” He stated that U.S. combat-equipped and combat support forces would be necessary for these efforts, if undertaken.
- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On May 17, 2002, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the U.S. military was continuing to support peacekeeping efforts of KFOR. He noted that the current U.S. contribution was about 5,100 military personnel, and an additional 468 personnel in Macedonia, with an occasional presence in Albania and Greece.
- Bosnia. On July 22, 2002, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that the U.S. military was continuing to support peacekeeping efforts of SFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina and other regional states. He noted that the current U.S. contribution was “approximately 2,400 personnel.” Most U.S. forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina are assigned to the Multinational Division, North, headquartered in Tuzla. An additional 60 U.S. military personnel are deployed to Hungary and Croatia to provide logistical and other support.

- Terrorism threat. On September 20, 2002, President Bush reported to Congress “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that U.S. “combat-equipped and combat support forces” had been deployed to the Philippines since January 2002 to train with, assist and advise the Philippines’ Armed Forces in enhancing their “counterterrorist capabilities.” He added that U.S. forces were conducting maritime interception operations in the Central and European Command areas to combat movement, arming, or financing of “international terrorists.” He also noted that U.S. combat personnel had been deployed to Georgia and Yemen to help enhance the “counterterrorist capabilities” of their armed forces.
- Cote d’Ivoire. On September 26, 2002, President Bush reported to Congress “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that in response to a rebellion in Cote d’Ivoire he had on September 25, 2002, sent U.S. military personnel into Cote d’Ivoire to assist in the evacuation of American citizens and third country nationals from the city of Bouake; and otherwise assist in other evacuations as necessary.
- Yugoslavia/Kosovo. On November 15, 2002, the President reported to Congress “consistent with the War Powers Resolution” that the United States was continuing to deploy combat equipped military personnel as part of KFOR. Currently there are approximately 4,350 U.S. military personnel in Kosovo, with an additional 266 military personnel in Macedonia. The United States also has an occasional presence in Albania and Greece, associated with the KFOR mission.
- Bosnia. On January 21, 2003, President George W. Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” that about 1,800 U.S. Armed Forces personnel continued to be deployed in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and other regional states as part of SFOR. Most were based at Tuzla in Bosnia. About 80 others were based in Hungary and Croatia, providing logistical and other support.
- Terrorism threat. On March 20, 2003, President Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” as well as P.L. 107-40, and “pursuant to” his authority as Commander-in-Chief, that he had continued a number of U.S. military operations globally in the war against terrorism. These military operations included ongoing U.S. actions against al-Qaeda fighters in Afghanistan; collaborative anti-terror operations with forces of Pakistan in the Pakistan/Afghanistan border area; “maritime interception operations on the high seas” in areas of responsibility of the Central and European Commands to prevent terrorist movement and other activities; and military support for the armed forces of Georgia and Yemen in counter-terrorism operations.
- Iraq War. On March 21, 2003, President Bush reported to Congress, “consistent with the War Powers Resolution,” as well as P.L. 102-1 and P.L. 107-243, and “pursuant to” his authority as Commander-in-Chief, that he had “directed U.S. Armed Forces, operating with other coalition forces, to commence operations on March 19, 2003, against Iraq.” He further stated that it was not possible to know at present the duration of active combat operations or the scope necessary to accomplish the goals of the operation “to disarm Iraq in pursuit of peace, stability, and security both in the Gulf region and in the United States.”

Oil and conflicts in the Middle East

Before discussing the role of oil in the conflicts of the Middle East, it is perhaps worthwhile to look briefly at the general global fossil-fuel picture. Tables 9.1 and 9.2 show the current consumption and use of petroleum, while Table 9.3 illustrates the ultimately recoverable reserves of coal, oil and natural gas, with an indication of how long these resources would last if used at the present rate. Although one can argue about the exact figures, the essential features of the tables are beyond dispute, and several important conclusions can be drawn from them.

The climate emergency

The threat to human civilization and to the biosphere from catastrophic climate change makes it essential that the extraction and use of fossil fuels must stop within the next few years. Nevertheless, it is useful to look at the size and placement of fossil fuel reserves in order to understand the motivation for wars in the Middle East which took place several decades ago, before the climate emergency gained its present place on the global agenda.

From Table 4.3, we can see that the global reserves of coal are very large, but that reserves of oil are so limited that at the 1990 rate of use they would last only 65 years.² One can predict that as the reserves of oil become exhausted, the price will rise to such an extent that production and consumption will diminish. Thus oil experts do not visualize a special date in the future after which oil will totally disappear, but rather a date at which the production and consumption of oil will reach a maximum and afterwards diminish because of scarcity of the resource and increase in price. Such a peak in the production of any nonrenewable resource is called a *Hubbert peak*, after Dr. M. King Hubbert, who applied the idea to oil reserves. Most experts agree that the Hubbert peak for oil will occur within a decade or two. Thus the era of cheap petroleum is rapidly approaching its end, and we must be prepared for the serious economic and political impacts of rising oil prices, as well as great changes in lifestyle in the industrialized countries. Halfway through the present century, petroleum will become too expensive and rare to be used as a fuel. It will be reserved almost exclusively for lubrication and as a starting material for the manufacture of plastics, paint, fertilizers and pharmaceuticals.

From Table 4.3 we can also see that the 1991 rate of energy use from fossil fuels was roughly 10.2 terawatts (TW). The total global rate of energy use at that time was 13.2 TW (as compared with roughly 1 TW in 1890). The 3.0 TW difference between fossil fuel use and total energy use in 1991 was distributed as follows: hydropower, 0.8 TW; nuclear, 0.7 TW; fuelwood, 0.9 TW; crop wastes, 0.4 TW; and dung, 0.2 TW. A terawatt is defined as 10^{12} Watts. With a global population of 6×10^9 , 13.2 TW corresponds to 2.2 kilowatts per person. But global energy use is very unevenly distributed: North Americans use energy at the rate of 12 kilowatts per person, while in Bangladesh, the corresponding figure is

²Notice that since $1 \text{ TWy} = 5 \text{ Gb}$, it follows that $300 \text{ TWy} = 1500 \text{ Gb}$. Thus the figure mentioned for the “Ultimately recoverable reserves” of oil in Table 4.3 is the same as the total at the bottom of the “Reserves and resources” column in Table 9.1

Table 4.1: *Oil production, reserves and resources in 1995 measured in billions of barrels (Gb). These data were originally published by Oil and Gas Journal and by US Geological Survey. 1 terawatt-year= 5Gb*

Country	Cumulative Production	Reserves	Undiscovered Resources	Reserves and Resources
Saudi Arabia	71.5	261.2	41.0	302.2
Iraq	22.8	112.5	45.0	157.5
Russia	92.6	100.0	68.0	168.0
Iran	42.9	93.0	22.0	115.0
UA Emirates	15.1	98.2	7.0	105.2
Kuwait	27.6	97.5	3.0	100.5
Venezuela	47.3	83.3	17.0	100.3
United States	165.8	50.7	49.0	99.7
Mexico	20.5	50.4	37.0	87.4
China	18.8	24.0	48.0	72.0
Kazakhstan	3.2	17.3	26.0	43.3
Canada	16.1	5.1	33.0	38.1
Libya	19.0	22.8	8.0	30.8
Nigeria	15.5	17.9	9.0	26.9
Norway	6.3	11.3	13.0	24.3
Indonesia	15.2	5.8	10.0	15.8
United Kingdom	12.3	4.6	11.0	15.6
Algeria	9.1	9.2	2.0	11.2
Totals	621.6	1052.3	449.0	1513.8

Table 4.2: *Main users of petroleum. (US Energy Information Agency, 2001.)*

Country	Yearly use in billions of barrels	Population (millions)	Per-capita yearly use in barrels
United States	7.17	276	26.0
China	1.82	1262	1.4
Germany	1.03	83	12.4
Japan	0.90	127	7.1
India	0.78	1014	0.8
France	0.74	59	12.5
Mexico	0.71	100	7.1
Canada	0.70	31	22.6
Italy	0.68	58	11.7
United Kingdom	0.63	60	10.5

only 0.1 kilowatts.

The contrast between energy use in the highly industrialized and less industrialized parts of the world can also be seen in Table 4.2. The US per-capita consumption of oil is currently 20 times that of China and 37 times the figure for India. One wonders what will happen when China and India, with their enormous populations, reach a rate of per-capita petroleum use approaching that of North America, Japan and Europe.

Petroleum accounts for 90% of the energy used in transportation, and it is also particularly important in agriculture. Thus it is worrying that we will encounter high and constantly increasing oil prices at just the moment when an unprecedentedly large global population will be putting pressure on the food supply. High oil prices will be reflected in high food costs. Even today we can see nations where famine occurs because their weak economies make the poorest countries unable to buy and import food. These vulnerable nations will be hit still harder by famine in the future.

Comparing Tables 4.1 and 4.2, we can see that the United States uses petroleum at the rate of more than 7 billion barrels (7 Gb) per year, while that country's estimated reserves and undiscovered resources are respectively 50.7 Gb and 49.0 Gb. Thus if the United States were to rely only on its own resources for petroleum, then, at the 2001 rate of use, these would be exhausted within 14 years. In fact, the United States already imports more than half of its oil. According to the "National Energy Policy" report (sometimes called the "Cheney Report" after its chief author) US domestic oil production will decline from 3.1 Gb/y in 2002 to 2.6 Gb/y in 2020, while US consumption will rise from 7.2 Gb/y to 9.3 Gb/y. Thus the United States today imports 57% of its oil, but the report predicts that

Table 4.3: *Ultimately recoverable coal, oil and natural gas reserves. 1 TWy = 10^{12} Watt-year = 5 billion barrels of oil = 1 billion tons of coal. (From BP Statistical Review of World Energy, London, 1991). US ultimately recoverable reserves of oil and domestic consumption (in 2001) are shown for comparison. If the US used only its domestic oil, its reserves would soon be exhausted. However, the United States imports much of its petroleum from the Middle East.*

	Global reserves	1990 global rate of consumption	Years left at 1990 rate of use
Coal	6700 TWy	3.2 TW	2000 years
Oil	300 TWy	4.6 TW	65 years
Natural gas	300 TWy	2.4 TW	125 years
Total	7300 TWy	10.2 TW	(716 years)
	US reserves	2001 US rate of consumption	Years left at 2001 rate of use
Oil	20 TWy	1.4 TW	14 years

by 2020 this will rise to 72%. The predicted increment in US imports of oil between 2002 and 2020 is greater than the present combined oil consumption of China and India.

It is clear from these figures that if the United States wishes to maintain its enormous rate of petroleum use, it will have to rely on imported oil, much of it coming from regions of the world that are politically unstable, or else unfriendly to America, or both. This fact does much to explain the massive US military presence in oil-rich regions of the world.

Speaking at a National Energy Summit, on March 19, 2001, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham stated that “America faces a major energy supply crisis over the next two decades. The failure to meet this challenge will threaten our nation’s economic prosperity, compromise our security, and literally alter the way we lead our lives.”

There is a close relationship between petroleum and war. James A. Paul, Executive Director of the Global Policy Forum, has described this relationship very clearly in the following words:

“Modern warfare particularly depends on oil, because virtually all weapons systems rely on oil-based fuel - tanks, trucks, armored vehicles, self-propelled artillery pieces, airplanes, and naval ships. For this reason, the governments and general staffs of powerful nations seek to ensure a steady supply of oil during wartime, to fuel oil-hungry military forces in far-flung operational theaters.”

“Just as governments like the US and UK need oil companies to secure fuel for their global war-making capacity, so the oil companies need their governments to secure control over global oilfields and transportation routes. It is no accident, then, that the world’s largest oil companies are located in the world’s most powerful countries.”

“Almost all of the world’s oil-producing countries have suffered abusive, corrupt and undemocratic governments and an absence of durable development. Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Iraq, Iran, Angola, Colombia, Venezuela, Kuwait, Mexico, Algeria - these and many other oil producers have a sad record, which includes dictatorships installed from abroad, bloody coups engineered by foreign intelligence services, militarization of government and intolerant right-wing nationalism.”

Iraq, in particular, has been the scene of a number of wars motivated by the West’s thirst for oil. During World War I, 1914-1918, the British captured the area (then known as Mesopotamia) from the Ottoman Empire after four years of bloody fighting. Although Lord Curzon³ denied that the British conquest of Mesopotamia was motivated by oil, there is ample evidence that British policy was indeed motivated by a desire for control of the region’s petroleum. For example, Curzon’s Cabinet colleague Sir Maurice Hankey stated in a private letter that oil was “a first-class war aim”. Furthermore, British forces continued to fight after the signing of the Mudros Armistice. In this way, they seized Mosul, the capital of a major oil-producing region, thus frustrating the plans of the French, who had been promised the area earlier in the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement. Lord Curzon was well aware of the military importance of oil, and following the end of the First World War he remarked: “The Allied cause has floated to victory on a wave of oil”.

During the period between 1918 and 1930, fierce Iraqi resistance to the occupation

³a member of the British War Cabinet who became Foreign Minister immediately after the war

was crushed by the British, who used poison gas, airplanes, incendiary bombs, and mobile armored cars, together with forces drawn from the Indian Army. Winston Churchill, who was Colonial Secretary at the time, regarded the conflict in Iraq as an important test of modern military-colonial methods.

In 1932, Britain granted nominal independence to Iraq, but kept large military forces in the country and maintained control of it through indirect methods. In 1941, however, it seemed likely that Germany might try to capture the Iraqi oilfields, and therefore the British again seized direct political power in Iraq by means of military force. It was not only Germany that Britain feared, but also US attempts to gain access to Iraqi oil.

The British fear of US interest in Iraqi oil was soon confirmed by events. In 1963 the US secretly backed a military coup in Iraq that brought Saddam Hussein's Ba'ath Party to power.⁴ In 1979 the western-backed Shah of Iran was overthrown, and the United States regarded the fundamentalist Shi'ite regime that replaced him as a threat to supplies of oil from Saudi Arabia. Washington saw Saddam's Iraq as a bulwark against the militant Shi'ite extremism of Iran that was threatening oil supplies from pro-American states such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

In 1980, encouraged to do so by the fact that Iran had lost its US backing, Saddam Hussein's government attacked Iran. This was the start of a extremely bloody and destructive war that lasted for eight years, inflicting almost a million casualties on the two nations. Iraq used both mustard gas and the nerve gases Tabun and Sarin against Iran, in violation of the Geneva Protocol.

Both the United States and Britain helped Saddam Hussein's government to obtain chemical weapons. A chemical plant, called Falluja 2, was built by Britain in 1985, and this plant was used to produce mustard gas and nerve gas. Also, according to the Riegel Report to the US Senate, May 25, (1994), the Reagan Administration turned a blind eye to the export of chemical weapon precursors to Iraq, as well as anthrax and plague cultures that could be used as the basis for biological weapons. According to the Riegel Report, "records available from the supplier for the period 1985 until the present show that during this time, pathogenic (meaning disease producing) and toxigenic (meaning poisonous), and other biological research materials were exported to Iraq pursuant to application and licensing by the US Department of Commerce."

In 1984, Donald Rumsfeld, Reagan's newly appointed Middle East Envoy, visited Saddam Hussein to assure him of America's continuing friendship, despite Iraqi use of poison gas. When (in 1988) Hussein went so far as to use poison gas against civilian citizens of his own country in the Kurdish village of Halabja, the United States worked to prevent international condemnation of the act. Indeed US support for Saddam was so unconditional that he obtained the false impression that he had a free hand to do whatever he liked in the region.

On July 25, 1990, US Ambassador April Glaspie met with Saddam Hussein to discuss oil prices and how to improve US-Iraq relations. According to the transcript of the meeting,

⁴This was not the CIA's first sponsorship of Saddam: In 1959 he had been part of a CIA-authorized six-man squad that tried to assassinate the Iraqi Prime Minister, Abd al-Karim Qasim.



Figure 4.4: Donald Rumsfeld and Saddam Hussein, the best of friends.

Ms Galspie assured Saddam that the US “had no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait.” She then left on vacation. Mistaking this conversation for a green light, Saddam invaded Kuwait eight days later.

By invading Kuwait, Hussein severely worried western oil companies and governments, since Saudi Arabia might be next in line. As George Bush senior said in 1990, at the time of the Gulf War, “Our jobs, our way of life, our own freedom and the freedom of friendly countries around the world would all suffer if control of the world’s great oil reserves fell into the hands of Saddam Hussein.”

On August 6, 1990, the UN Security Council imposed comprehensive economic sanctions against Iraq with the aim of forcing Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. Meanwhile, US Secretary of State James A. Baker III used arm-twisting methods in the Security Council to line up votes for UN military action against Iraq. In Baker’s own words, he undertook the process of “cajoling, extracting, threatening and occasionally buying votes”.

On November 29, 1990, the Council passed Resolution 678, authorizing the use of “all necessary means” (by implication also military means) to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. There was nothing at all wrong with this, since the Security Council had been set up by the UN Charter to prevent states from invading their neighbors. However, one can ask whether the response to Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait would have been so wholehearted if oil had not been involved.

There is much that can be criticized in the way that the Gulf War of 1990-1991 was carried out. Besides military targets, the US and its allies bombed electrical generation facilities with the aim of creating postwar leverage over Iraq. The electrical generating plants would have to be rebuilt with the help of foreign technical assistance, and this help could be traded for postwar compliance. In the meantime, hospitals and water-purification plants were without electricity. Also, during the Gulf War, a large number of projectiles




Figure 4.5: Deaths of children under five years of age in Iraq, measured in thousands. This graph is based on a study by UNICEF, and it shows the effect of sanctions on child mortality. From UNICEF's figures it can be seen that the sanctions imposed on Iraq caused the deaths of more than half a million children.

made of depleted uranium were fired by allied planes and tanks. The result was a sharp increase in cancer in Iraq. Finally, both Shi'ites and Kurds were encouraged by the Allies to rebel against Saddam Hussein's government, but were later abandoned by the allies and slaughtered by Saddam.

The most terrible misuse of power, however, was the US and UK insistence the sanctions against Iraq should remain in place after the end of the Gulf War. These two countries used their veto power in the Security Council to prevent the removal of the sanctions. Their motive seems to have been the hope that the economic and psychological impact would provoke the Iraqi people to revolt against Saddam. However that brutal dictator remained firmly in place, supported by universal fear of his police and by massive propaganda. The effect of the sanctions was to produce more than half a million deaths of children under five years of age, as is documented by the UNICEF data shown in Figure 1. The total number of deaths that the sanctions produced among Iraqi civilians probably exceeded a million, if older children and adults are included.

Ramsey Clark, who studied the effects of the sanctions in Iraq from 1991 onwards, wrote to the Security Council that most of the deaths "are from the effects of malnutrition including marasmas and kwashiorkor, wasting or emaciation which has reached twelve per cent of all children, stunted growth which affects twenty-eight per cent, diarrhea, dehydration from bad water or food, which is ordinarily easily controlled and cured, common communicable diseases preventable by vaccinations, and epidemics from deteriorating sanitary conditions. There are no deaths crueler than these. They are suffering slowly, helplessly, without simple remedial medication, without simple sedation to relieve pain, without mercy."

September 11, 2001

On the morning of September 11, 2001, two hijacked airliners were deliberately crashed into New York's World Trade Center, causing the collapse of of three skyscrapers and the deaths of more than three thousand people. Almost simultaneously, another hijacked airliner was driven into the Pentagon in Washington DC, and a fourth hijacked plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania. The fourth plane probably was to have made a suicide attack on the White House or the Capitol, but passengers on the airliner became aware what was happening through their mobile telephones, and they overpowered the hijackers.

Blame for the September 11 attacks soon centered on the wealthy Saudi Arabian Islamic extremist, Osama bin Laden, and on his terrorist organization, al-Qaeda. In a later statement acknowledging responsibility for the terrorist attacks, bin Ladin gave as his main reasons firstly the massive US support for Israel, a country that, in his view, was committing atrocities against the Palestinians, and secondly the presence of US troops in Saudi Arabia.

Like Saddam Hussein, Osama bin Ladin was an ex-protegé of the CIA, by whom he had previously been armed, trained, and supported. The history of bin Ladin's relationship with the CIA began in 1979, when the CIA, acting through Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency, began to train and arm the Mujaheddin, an international force of Islamic fundamentalists who were encouraged to attack Afghanistan's secular socialist government. US National Security Advisor Zbigniew Bryzinski anticipated that the Soviets would respond by sending troops to protect the socialist government of Afghanistan, and he believed that the resulting war would be the Soviet Union's version of Viet Nam: It would be a war that would fatally weaken the Soviet Union. Thus he saw the war that he was provoking in Afghanistan as an important step in the liberation of Eastern Europe. "What is most important in the history of the world?", Polish-born Bryzinski asked in a 1998 interview, "The Taliban, or the collapse of the Soviet empire? Some stirred-up Muslims, or the liberation of central Europe...?" It was, in fact, these same "stirred-up Muslims" who guided two hijacked aircraft into the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001.

Bin Ladin's father was the head of an extremely wealthy Saudi Arabian family, owner of a very large construction company, with close ties both to the Saudi royal family and the Bush family in America. Through his father's construction company, Osama bin Ladin became involved in building roads and bases for the Mujaheddin in Pakistan and Afghanistan. He also recruited Mujaheddin fighters and solicited support for them. After three years of fighting with covert US support, the Mujaheddin succeeded in defeating the Soviets and in gaining control of Afghanistan. Over eight years, the CIA had spent almost three billion dollars to support and train Islamic militants.

Despite his father's close connections with the Saudi ruling family, Osama bin Laden became progressively more radical in his views, which were influenced by the Wahhabi sect⁵. He wished to expel the US from the Middle East, and especially to expel US troops

⁵The Wahhabi sect of Islam was founded by Abdul Wahhab (1703-1792). It is known for extremely strict observance of the Koran, and it flourishes mainly in Saudi Arabia.

from Saudi Arabia. He also dreamed of leading a popular revolt to overthrow the Saudi rulers. He perhaps also visualized the formation of an Islamic superstate with control of much of the world's oil.

After the defeat of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, Osama bin Laden returned to Saudi Arabia, where he worked in his family's construction business. However, in 1991 he was expelled from Saudi Arabia for anti-government activities. He took refuge in Sudan, where he spent the next five years.

Bin Ladin is suspected of arranging a bomb attack on the World Trade Center in 1993, and the bombings of two US embassies in Africa in 1998, as well as an attack on the USS Cole in Yemen in 2000. When Sudan became unsafe for Osama and his organization, he moved to Afghanistan, where the Taliban movement had gained power. Because of his connection with the Mujaheddin, he was welcomed by the Taliban.

The Taliban began as predominantly Pashtun students of the religious madrasa schools of Pakistan, where an extreme Saudi-style Islamic fundamentalism was taught. In fact, the word "Taliban" means "student". Many of the Taliban had been born in refugee camps in Pakistan, and had thus lived with war all their lives. They became an ultraconservative militia, and when they gained control of much of Afghanistan, they reversed many of the liberties and reforms that had been achieved by the previous secular government. In particular, the position of Afghan women was greatly worsened by the Taliban, and production of heroin was much increased.

In discussing Iraq, we mentioned oil as a motivation for western interest. Similar considerations hold also for Afghanistan. US-controlled oil companies have long had plans for an oil pipeline from Turkmenistan, passing through Afghanistan to the Arabian Sea, as well as plans for a natural gas pipeline from Turkmenistan through Afghanistan to Pakistan.

The September 11 terrorist attacks resulted in a spontaneous worldwide outpouring of sympathy for the United States, and within the US, patriotic support of President George W. Bush at a time of national crisis. Bush's response to the attacks seems to have been to inquire from his advisors whether he was now free to invade Iraq. According to former counterterrorism chief, Richard Clarke, Bush was "obsessed" with Iraq as his principal target after 9/11.

The British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, was a guest at a private White House dinner nine days after the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington. Sir Christopher Meyer, former UK Ambassador to Washington, was also present at the dinner. According to Meyer, Blair said to Bush that they must not get distracted from their main goal - dealing with the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, and Bush replied: "I agree with you Tony. We must deal with this first. But when we have dealt with Afghanistan, we must come back to Iraq." Faced with the prospect of wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan, Blair did not protest, according to Meyer.

During the summer of 2002, Bush and Blair discussed Iraq by telephone. A senior official from Vice-President Dick Cheney's office who read the transcript of the call is quoted by the magazine *Vanity Fair* as saying: "The way it read was that come what may, Saddam was going to go; they said that they were going forward, they were going to take

out the regime, and they were doing the right thing. Blair did not need any convincing. There was no ‘Come on, Tony, we’ve got to get you on board’. I remember reading it and then thinking, ‘OK, now I know what we’re going to be doing for the next year.’”

On June 1, 2002, Bush announced a new US policy which not only totally violated all precedents in American foreign policy but also undermined the United Nations Charter and international law⁶. Speaking at the graduation ceremony of the US Military Academy at West Point he asserted that the United States had the right to initiate a preemptive war against any country that might in the future become a danger to the United States. “If we wait for threats to fully materialize,” he said, “we will have waited too long.” He indicated that 60 countries might fall into this category, roughly a third of the nations of the world.

The assertion that the United States, or any other country, has the right to initiate preemptive wars specifically violates Chapter 1, Articles 2.3 and 2.4, of the United Nations Charter. These require that “All members shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security and justice are not endangered”, and that “All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.” The UN Charter allows a nation that is actually under attack to defend itself, but only until the Security Council has had time to act.

Bush’s principle of preemptive war was promptly condemned by the Catholic Church. Senior Vatican officials pointed to the Catholic teaching that “preventive” war is unjustifiable, and Archbishop Renato Martino, prefect of the Vatican Council for Justice and Peace, stated firmly that “unilateralism is not acceptable”. However, in the United States, the shocking content of Bush’s West Point address was not fully debated. The speech was delivered only a few months after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and the US supported whatever exceptional measures its President thought might be necessary for the sake of national security. American citizens, worried by the phenomenon of terrorism, did not fully appreciate that the principle of preemptive war could justify almost any aggression, and that in the long run, if practiced by all countries, it would undermine the security of the United States as well as that of the entire world.

During the spring of 2003, our television and newspapers presented us with the spectacle of an attack by two technologically superior powers on a much less industrialized nation, a nation with an ancient and beautiful culture. The ensuing war was one-sided. Missiles guided by laser beams and signals from space satellites were more than a match for less sophisticated weapons. Speeches were made to justify the attack. It was said to be needed because of weapons of mass destruction (some countries are allowed to have them, others not). It was said to be necessary to get rid of a cruel dictator (whom the attacking powers had previously supported and armed). But the suspicion remained that the attack was resource-motivated. It was about oil.

⁶He had previously abrogated a number of important treaties.



Figure 4.6: **The attack on Iraq.**

Empire?

The empires of the ancient world were made possible by the technology of the periods during which they flourished. For example, the Roman Empire was made possible by Roman achievements in road-building and bridge-building which allowed imperial legions to move quickly and to crush rebellions wherever they might occur within the boundaries of the Empire. Similarly, the world-wide British Empire, larger than any previous empire, was made possible by the technology of its era. Machine guns gave those who possessed them military superiority over forces armed with more primitive weapons, steam ships carried troops rapidly to trouble spots so that rebellions could be crushed, and naval power was used to bombard recalcitrant cities.

Technology played an additional role in motivating and supporting the empires of the 19th and 20th centuries: As the Industrial Revolution developed momentum, local sources were no longer sufficient for supplying raw materials to the factories of developed countries, nor were local markets sufficient as outlets for their manufactured goods. Colonies were needed not only to supply the industrialized countries with minerals, timber, rubber, hemp, etc., but also to buy cloth, shoes, tools, toys, clocks, chemicals, and other factory-made products⁷. This division of labor was usually far more advantageous to the industrialized countries than to their colonies. Today, the same unfair economic relationships persist between the highly industrialized countries and the less developed parts of the world, and they contribute to today's painful contrasts between extremes of wealth and poverty.

After serving in the British police force in Burma, George Orwell concluded that Empire is a system in which the soldier holds down the poor Asian, while the merchant goes through his pockets. He resigned his post and wrote a book about his colonial experiences - *Burmese Days*. It is still relevant and worth reading. The same can be said of Orwell's prophetic book *1984*.

⁷During the 18th and early 19th centuries, the mercantile system prohibited colonies from either manufacturing industrial goods or trading for them in countries other than the mother country.

For a long time, Britain held its position as the leading industrial and colonial power, but from 1890 onwards its dominance was challenged by Germany, the United States, Belgium, France, Italy, Russia and Japan. Rivalry between these industrial powers, competing with each other for colonies, natural resources, markets, and military power, contributed to the start of World War I. At the end of “the Great War”, the League of Nations assigned “protectorates” to the victors. These “protectorates” were, in fact, colonies with a new name, although in principle protectorates were supposed to be temporary.

The Second World War was terrible enough to make world leaders resolve to end the institution of war once and for all, and the United Nations was set up for this purpose. Despite the flaws and weaknesses of the UN Charter, the organization was successful in formally ending the era of colonialism. One must say “formally ending” rather than “ending”, because colonialism persisted in a new guise: During the classical era of colonialism, there was direct political power, with Viceroy and Governors General acting as formal rulers of colonies. During the decades following the Second World War, almost all colonies were granted formal independence, but nevertheless the influence of the industrialized nations was strongly felt in the developing world. Direct political power was replaced by indirect methods.

The United States emerged from the two global wars as the world’s dominant industrial power, taking over the position that Britain had held during the 19th century. The economies of its rivals had been destroyed by the two wars, but no fighting had taken place on American soil. Because of its unique position as the only large country whose economy was completely intact in 1945, the United States found itself suddenly thrust, almost unwillingly, into the center of the world’s political stage.

The new role as “leader of the free world” was accepted by the United States with a certain amount of nervousness. America’s previous attitude had been isolationism - a wish to be “free from the wars and quarrels of Europe”. After the Second World War, however, this was replaced by a much more active international role. Perhaps the new US interest in the rest of the world reflected the country’s powerful and rapidly growing industrial economy and its need for raw materials and markets (the classical motive for empires). Publicly, however, it was the threat of Communism that was presented to American voters as the justification for interference in the internal affairs of other countries. (Today, after the end of the Cold War, it has become necessary to find another respectable motivation that can be used to justify foreign intervention, and the “Crusade Against Communism” has now been replaced by the “War on Terror”.)

During the period from 1945 to the present the US interfered, militarily or covertly, in the internal affairs of a large number of nations: China, 1945-49; Italy, 1947-48; Greece, 1947-49; Philippines, 1946-53; South Korea, 1945-53; Albania, 1949-53; Germany, 1950s; Iran, 1953; Guatemala, 1953-1990s; Middle East, 1956-58; Indonesia, 1957-58; British Guiana/Guyana, 1953-64; Vietnam, 1950-73; Cambodia, 1955-73; The Congo/Zaire, 1960-65; Brazil, 1961-64; Dominican Republic, 1963-66; Cuba, 1959-present; Indonesia, 1965; Chile, 1964-73; Greece, 1964-74; East Timor, 1975-present; Nicaragua, 1978-89; Grenada, 1979-84; Libya, 1981-89; Panama, 1989; Iraq, 1990-present; Afghanistan 1979-92; El Salvador, 1980-92; Haiti, 1987-94; Yugoslavia, 1999; and Afghanistan, 2001-present. Most



of these interventions were explained to the American people as being necessary to combat communism (or more recently, terrorism), but an underlying motive was undoubtedly the desire to put in place governments and laws that would be favorable to the economic interests of the US and its allies ⁸.

For the sake of balance, we should remember that during the Cold War period, the Soviet Union and China also intervened in the internal affairs of many countries, for example in Korea in 1950-53, Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, and so on. These Cold War interventions were also unjustifiable, like those mentioned above. Neither a fervently-held conviction that capitalism is wicked and communism good nor an equally fervently-held conviction that the opposite is true can justify military or covert interference by superpowers in the internal affairs of smaller countries, since people have a right to live under governments of their own choosing even if those governments are not optimal.

Today United States is the only nation in the world that maintains large numbers of its troops on the soil of other countries. Only 46 nations lack a US military presence.

⁸The recent US-led invasion of Iraq, illegal in itself, has been followed by an illegal revision of Iraq's fundamental laws to favor the economic interests of large US and UK corporations. The revision of an occupied country's laws violates the Hague Regulations of 1907 and the Geneva Conventions of 1949 (both signed by the US), as well as the US Army's own Code of War. Article 43 of the Hague Regulations requires an occupying power to "re-establish and insure, as far as possible, public order and safety, while respecting, unless absolutely prevented, the laws in force in the country". Resolution 1483 of the UN Security Council (March 26, 2003) specifically instructs the powers occupying Iraq to respect the Hague Regulations and the Geneva Conventions. Britain's Attorney General, Lord Goldsmith, also warned Tony Blair that "the imposition of major structural economic reforms would not be authorized by international law". Naomi Klein has expressed the same principle more simply: "Bombing something does not give you the right to sell it", she wrote. Nevertheless, despite the illegality of their actions, the occupying powers in Iraq are making wholesale changes in the constitution and laws of the country and are awarding its public assets to private corporations such as BearingPoint, Bechtel and Haliburton.

Many, but by no means all, of the current US military bases on foreign soil are listed in the Defense Department's 2003 *Base Structure Report*. According to this report, the United States owns or rents 702 bases in 130 countries. In the US itself and its territories, there are an additional 6000 bases. The overseas bases are staffed by 253,288 men and women in uniform who have an approximately equal number of dependents. The number of foreign bases listed in the Pentagon's *Base Structure Report* is far less than the true number for 2004, since the report omits several hundred recently-established bases in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar and Uzbekistan⁹. The Pentagon estimates that it would cost \$591 billion to replace all its bases. One of the important companies that construct bases is Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of the Haliburton Corporation of Houston Texas.

In February, 2004, President George W. Bush asked the US Congress for \$401.7 billion for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 2005¹⁰. This figure, colossal as it is, underestimates the true burden that the military establishment places on the US economy. Economic historian Robert Higgs believes as a rule of thumb, one should double the figures given for military budgets to find the true cost. This is primarily because of the increased interest on the national debt incurred by military spending, but hidden expenses, such as clean-up costs, and care of veterans etc. also play a role.

The Pentagon's *Joint Vision for 2020* states that "The US military today is a force of superbly trained men and women who are ready to deliver victory for our Nation. In support of the objectives of our National Security Strategy, it is routinely employed to shape the international security environment and stands ready to respond across the full range of military potential... The global interests and responsibilities of the United States will endure, and there is no indication that threats to those interests and responsibilities or to our allies will disappear¹¹... The overarching vision is full spectrum dominance."

The result of the enormous (and enormously costly) growth of the US military establishment has been the militarization of American foreign policy. Two symptoms of this militarization of foreign policy are the concept of an endless "war on terror", and George W. Bush's West Point speech calling for preemptive wars. In a campaign speech in 1999, Bush had previously embraced the concept of permanent militarism: "Our forces in the next century must be agile, lethal, readily deployable and require a minimum of logistical support", Bush had said in this speech. "We must be able to project our power over long distances, in days or weeks rather than months. Our military must be able to identify targets by a variety of means [and] ... to destroy those targets almost instantly with an array of weapons¹²."

Right-wing journalist Charles Krauthammer, one of the advocates of a militarized US

⁹It is fair to note that the number of US bases is substantially reduced from the number at the end of the Cold War.

¹⁰According to the US Congressional Budget Office, the yearly US expenditure for military purposes is likely to grow to \$600 billion in 2013.

¹¹One is reminded of the vision of endless war in George Orwell's *1984*.

¹²As Mark Twain once remarked, "When the only instrument in the toolbox is a hammer, all problems begin to look like nails."

foreign policy recently wrote that “America is no mere international citizen. It is the dominant power in the world, more dominant than any since Rome. Accordingly, America is in a position to reshape norms - How? By unapologetic and implacable demonstrations of will.”

The Project for a New American Century (a group including Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, and Paul Wolfowitz) has this to say about the US military presence in Iraq: “The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf security. While the unresolved conflict in the Gulf provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein.”

Another (more critical) comment come from Michael Stohl, writing in *Current Perspectives on International Terrorism*: “We must recognize that by convention - and it must be emphasized only by convention - great power use of the threat of force is normally described as coercive diplomacy and not as a form of terrorism [though it involves] the threat and often the use of violence for what would be described as terroristic purposes if it were not great powers who were pursuing the very same tactic.”

Richard Falk, Professor of International Relations, Princeton, comments: “From Machiavelli to Niebuhr, Morgenthau and Kissinger, there has been inculcated in public consciousness an ethos of violence that is regulated, if at all, only by perceptions of effectiveness. ... A weapon or tactic is acceptable, and generally beyond scrutiny, if it works in the sense of bringing the goals of the state more closely toward realization. ... Considerations of innocence, of human suffering, or on limits of state policy are treated as irrelevant, [and to be] scorned.”

The rise of militarism in the United States has been accompanied by attacks on civil liberties. Since the 1970's a massive electronic surveillance system codenamed ECHELON has been operated by the US in collaboration with Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Each of the partners in this system frequently breaks its own laws against arbitrary and unlimited eavesdropping, as well as the laws of other countries and international laws, but since the operations of ECHELON are secret, no one is able to stop them.

ECHELON intercepts telephone conversations, e-mail messages etc. and feeds the enormous quantities of information thus gathered into arrays of supercomputers that search for key words. Selected conversations or messages are then listened to by humans to determine whether anything useful to “security” can be gleaned. Targets of ECHELON have included (for example) organizations like Amnesty International and Christian Aid. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, US spying on its own citizens has been greatly increased under the provisions of the Patriot Act, passed by Congress on October 25, 2001. One danger of the massive spying on their own citizens by governments is that ruling elites may use the information thus gathered to maintain themselves in power.

The British author Niall Ferguson has written several books comparing the American Empire with the British and Roman Empires. He feels that empires are not necessarily a bad thing, and that if any country deserves to have an empire today, it is the United States. According to Niall Ferguson, the benevolent global hegemony of the United States is good for the world, and we live today under a “Pax Americana” analogous to the Pax

Romana imposed by the Roman Empire.

What is wrong with this? What is wrong with the idea of a “Pax Americana”? If the Americans want to act as a world government, why not let them? In the first place, any world government based exclusively on military power rather than on globally democratic principles deserves to be called a tyranny. Furthermore, can any single country be truly objective in its evaluation of international issues? Certainly the Islamic world does not feel that American Middle East policy is even-handed. In fact, anger and frustration over what is perceived to be massive US bias in favour of Israel was the main reason for the September 11 attacks. Finally, “Pax Americana” is a misnomer, since US foreign policy has become increasingly based on war.

The United States maintains that it is a democracy, and that its aim is to spread democratic principles throughout the world, but there is something intrinsically undemocratic about the idea of global US hegemony. Why should the inhabitants of a single chosen country have more political power than other citizens of the world? Is it democratic for enormous wealth to be gained at the expense of third world poverty through the military enforcement of unfair economic relationships? Why are the three thousand innocent lives lost in the New York terrorist attacks so much more tragic than the million innocent Iraqi lives lost through the effects of sanctions, or for that matter the ten million lives of third world children who die each year from malnutrition and preventable disease?

Those of us who love the United States - and there are many reasons for loving the great idealism, generosity and energy of the American people, as well as the enlightened principles of the US Constitution - those of us who love the United States are sad to see militarism growing like a cancer within the country - the same militarism against which President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned in his farewell address.

4.3 An empire of bases

Here are some quotations from an article entitled *America's Empire of Bases* by Chalmers Johnson, published in TomDispatch in January, 2004¹³:

As distinct from other peoples, most Americans do not recognize – or do not want to recognize – that the United States dominates the world through its military power. Due to government secrecy, our citizens are often ignorant of the fact that our garrisons encircle the planet. This vast network of American bases on every continent except Antarctica actually constitutes a new form of empire – an empire of bases with its own geography not likely to be taught in any high school geography class. Without grasping the dimensions of this globe-girdling Baseworld, one can't begin to understand the size and nature of our imperial aspirations or the degree to which a new kind of militarism is undermining our constitutional order.

¹³<https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/153/26119.html>

Our military deploys well over half a million soldiers, spies, technicians, teachers, dependents, and civilian contractors in other nations. To dominate the oceans and seas of the world, we are creating some thirteen naval task forces built around aircraft carriers whose names sum up our martial heritage – Kitty Hawk, Constellation, Enterprise, John F. Kennedy, Nimitz, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Carl Vinson, Theodore Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, John C. Stennis, Harry S. Truman, and Ronald Reagan. We operate numerous secret bases outside our territory to monitor what the people of the world, including our own citizens, are saying, faxing, or e-mailing to one another.

Our installations abroad bring profits to civilian industries, which design and manufacture weapons for the armed forces or, like the now well-publicized Kellogg, Brown & Root company, a subsidiary of the Halliburton Corporation of Houston, undertake contract services to build and maintain our far-flung outposts. One task of such contractors is to keep uniformed members of the imperium housed in comfortable quarters, well fed, amused, and supplied with enjoyable, affordable vacation facilities. Whole sectors of the American economy have come to rely on the military for sales. On the eve of our second war on Iraq, for example, while the Defense Department was ordering up an extra ration of cruise missiles and depleted-uranium armor-piercing tank shells, it also acquired 273,000 bottles of Native Tan sunblock, almost triple its 1999 order and undoubtedly a boon to the supplier, Control Supply Company of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and its subcontractor, Sun Fun Products of Daytona Beach, Florida.

It's not easy to assess the size or exact value of our empire of bases. Official records on these subjects are misleading, although instructive. According to the Defense Department's annual "Base Structure Report" for fiscal year 2003, which itemizes foreign and domestic U.S. military real estate, the Pentagon currently owns or rents 702 overseas bases in about 130 countries and HAS another 6,000 bases in the United States and its territories. Pentagon bureaucrats calculate that it would require at least \$113.2 billion to replace just the foreign bases – surely far too low a figure but still larger than the gross domestic product of most countries – and an estimated \$591,519.8 million to replace all of them. The military high command deploys to our overseas bases some 253,288 uniformed personnel, plus an equal number of dependents and Department of Defense civilian officials, and employs an additional 44,446 locally hired foreigners. The Pentagon claims that these bases contain 44,870 barracks, hangars, hospitals, and other buildings, which it owns, and that it leases 4,844 more.

These numbers, although staggeringly large, do not begin to cover all the actual bases we occupy globally. The 2003 Base Status Report fails to mention, for instance, any garrisons in Kosovo – even though it is the site of the huge Camp Bondsteel, built in 1999 and maintained ever since by Kellogg, Brown &

Root. The Report similarly omits bases in Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, and Uzbekistan, although the U.S. military has established colossal base structures throughout the so-called arc of instability in the two-and-a-half years since 9/11.

For Okinawa, the southernmost island of Japan, which has been an American military colony for the past 58 years, the report deceptively lists only one Marine base, Camp Butler, when in fact Okinawa "hosts" ten Marine Corps bases, including Marine Corps Air Station Futenma occupying 1,186 acres in the center of that modest-sized island's second largest city. (Manhattan's Central Park, by contrast, is only 843 acres.) The Pentagon similarly fails to note all of the \$5-billion-worth of military and espionage installations in Britain, which have long been conveniently disguised as Royal Air Force bases. If there were an honest count, the actual size of our military empire would probably top 1,000 different bases in other people's countries, but no one – possibly not even the Pentagon – knows the exact number for sure, although it has been distinctly on the rise in recent years...

4.4 Operation Condor

Wikipedia states that "Operation Condor was a United States-backed campaign of political repression and state terror involving intelligence operations and assassination of opponents, officially and formally implemented in November 1975 by the right-wing dictatorships of the Southern Cone of South America.

"The program, nominally intended to eradicate communist or Soviet influence and ideas, was created to suppress active or potential opposition movements against the participating governments' neoliberal economic policies, which sought to reverse the economic policies of the previous era.

"Due to its clandestine nature, the precise number of deaths directly attributable to Operation Condor is highly disputed. Some estimates are that at least 60,000 deaths can be attributed to Condor, roughly 30,000 of these in Argentina, and the so-called "Archives of Terror" list 50,000 killed, 30,000 disappeared and 400,000 imprisoned. American political scientist J. Patrice McSherry gives a figure of at least 402 killed in operations which crossed national borders in a 2002 source, and mentions in a 2009 source that of those who "had gone into exile" and were 'kidnapped, tortured and killed in allied countries or illegally transferred to their home countries to be executed... hundreds, or thousands, of such persons-the number still has not been finally determined-were abducted, tortured, and murdered in Condor operations.' Victims included dissidents and leftists, union and peasant leaders, priests and nuns, students and teachers, intellectuals and suspected guerrillas. Although it was described by the CIA as "a cooperative effort by the intelligence/security services of several South American countries to combat terrorism and subversion," guerrillas were used as an excuse, as they were never substantial enough to control territory, gain material support by any foreign power, or otherwise threaten national security. Condor's




Figure 4.7: Former military men hide their faces during a session of their trial, after being accused of crimes against humanity committed during Condor.



Figure 4.8: Mirta Clara, a former Argentine political prisoner. In custody she was tortured while pregnant with her second son, who was born in prison; her husband was executed. She was released after eight years in 1983, and today she works as a human rights advocate and psychologist in Buenos Aires.



Figure 4.9: Families of disappeared people, near the mass graves where 26 political prisoners have been buried by the Chilean military. After the 1973 military coup organized by Augusto Pinochet, the military formed a special taskforce known as Caravan of Death. It swept the north of Chile, picking up political prisoners to interrogate and torture, executing most of them and burying them in remote locations.

key members were the governments in Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia and Brazil. Ecuador and Peru later joined the operation in more peripheral roles.

Suggestions for further reading

1. W.B. Gallie, *Understanding War: Points of Conflict*, Routledge, London, (1991).
2. R. Falk and S.S. Kim, eds., *The War System: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Westview, Boulder, CO, (1980).
3. J.D. Clarkson and T.C. Cochran, eds., *War as a Social Institution*, Colombia University Press, New York, (1941).
4. S. Melman, *The Permanent War Economy*, Simon and Schuster, (1974).
5. D. Yergin, *The Prize*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1991).
6. A. Sampson, *The Seven Sisters: The Great Oil Companies of the World and How They Were Made*, Hodder and Staughton, London, (1988).
7. J.D. Rockefeller, *Random Remaniscences of Men and Events*, Doubleday, New York, (1909).
8. M.B. Stoff, *Oil, War and American Security: The Search for a National Policy on Oil, 1941-1947*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (1980).
9. W.D. Muscable, *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (1992).
10. J. Stork, *Middle East Oil and the Energy Crisis*, Monthly Review, New York, (1976).
11. F. Benn, *Oil Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1986).
12. R. Sale, *Saddam Key in Early CIA Plot*, United Press International, April 10, (2003).
13. K. Roosevelt, *Countercoup: The Struggle for the Control of Iran*, McGraw-Hill, New York, (1979).
14. E. Abrahamian, *Iran Between Two Revolutions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (1982).
15. J. Fitchett and D. Ignatius, *Lengthy Elf Inquiry Nears Explosive Finish*, International Herald Tribune, February 1, (2002).
16. J.M. Blair, *The Control of Oil*, Random House, New York, (1976).
17. M.T. Klare, *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict*, Owl Books reprint edition, New York, (2002).
18. P. Grose, *Allen Dulles: The Life of a Gentleman Spy*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, (1994).
19. H. Mejcher, *Imperial-Quest for Oil: Iraq, 1910-1928*, Ithaca Books, London, (1976).
20. P. Sluglett, *Britain in Iraq, 1914-1932*, Ithaca Press, London, (1976).
21. D.E. Omissi, *British Air Power and Colonial Control in Iraq, 1920-1925*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, (1990).
22. V.G. Kiernan, *Colonial Empires and Armies, 1815-1960*, Sutton, Stroud, (1998).
23. R. Solh, *Britain's 2 Wars With Iraq*, Ithaca Press, Reading, (1996).
24. D. Hiro, *The Longest War: The Iran-Iraq Military Conflict*, Routledge, New York, (1991).

25. S. Warren, *Exxon's Profit Surged in 4th Quarter*, Wall Street Journal, February 12, (2004).
26. R. Suskind, *The Price of Loyalty: George W. Bush, the White House and the Education of Paul O'Neill*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (2004).
27. D. Morgan and D.B. Ottaway, *In Iraqi War Scenario, Oil is Key Issue as U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool*, Washington Post, September 15, (2002).
28. D. Rose, *Bush and Blair Made Secret Pact for Iraqi War*, The Observer, April 4, (2004).
29. E. Vulliamy, P. Webster and N.P. Walsh, *Scramble to Carve Up Iraqi Oil Reserves Lies Behind US Diplomacy*, The Observer, October 6, (2002).
30. Y. Ibrahim, *Bush's Iraq Adventure is Bound to Backfire*, International Herald Tribune, November 1, (2002).
31. P. Beaumont and F. Islam, *Carve-Up of Oil Riches Begins*, The Observer, November 3, (2002).
32. C.J. Cleveland, *Physical and Economic Aspects of Natural Resource Scarcity: The Cost of Oil Supply in the Lower 48 United States 1936-1987*, Resources and Energy **13**, 163-188, (1991).
33. C.J. Cleveland, *Yield Per Effort for Additions to Crude Oil Reserves in the Lower 48 States, 1946-1989*, American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, **76**, 948-958, (1992).
34. M.K. Hubbert, *Technique of Prediction as Applied to the Production of Oil and Gas*, in *NBS Special Publication 631*, US Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, (1982).
35. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Oil Discovery Indices and Projected Discoveries*, Oil and Gas Journal, **11**, 19, (1984).
36. L.F. Ivanhoe, *Future Crude Oil Supplies and Prices*, Oil and Gas Journal, July 25, 111-112, (1988).
37. Energy Information Administration, *International Energy Outlook, 2001*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
38. Energy Information Administration, *Caspian Sea Region*, US Department of Energy, (2001).
39. National Energy Policy Development Group, *National Energy Policy*, The White House, (2004). (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/energy/>)
40. M. Klare, *Bush-Cheney Energy Strategy: Procuring the Rest of the World's Oil*, Foreign Policy in Focus, (Interhemispheric Resource Center/Institute for Policy Studies/SEEN), Washington DC and Silver City NM, January, (2004).
41. M. Dobbs, *US Had Key Role in Iraq Buildup*, Washington Post, December 30, (2002).
42. R. Sale, *Saddam Key in Early CIA Plot*, United Press International, April 10, (2003).
43. R. Morris, *A Tyrant Forty Years in the Making*, New York Times, March 14, (2003).
44. H. Batatu, *The Old Social Classes and the Revolutionary Movements of Iraq*, Princeton University Press, (1978).

45. D.W. Riegel, Jr., and A.M. D'Amato, *US Chemical and Biological Warfare-Related Dual Use Exports to Iraq and their Possible Impact on the Health Consequences of the Persian Gulf War*, Report to US Senate ("The Riegel Report"), May 25, (1994).
46. P.E. Tyler, *Officers Say US Aided Iraq in War Despite Use of Gas*, New York Times, August 18, (2002).
47. D. Priest, *Rumsfeld Visited Baghdad in 1984 to Reassure Iraqis, Documents Show*, Washington Post, December 19, (2003).
48. S. Zunes, *Saddam's Arrest Raises Troubling Questions*, Foreign Policy in Focus, (<http://www.globalpolicy.org/>), December (2003).
49. D. Leigh and J. Hooper, *Britain's Dirty Secret*, Guardian, March 6, (2003).
50. J. Battle, (Ed.), *Shaking Hands With Saddam Hussein: The US Tilts Towards Iraq, 1980-1984*, National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 82, February 25, (2003).
51. J.R. Hiltermann, *America Didn't Seem to Mind Poison Gas*, International Herald Tribune, January 17, (2003).
52. D. Hiro, *Iraq and Poison Gas*, Nation, August 28, (2002).
53. T. Weiner, *Iraq Uses Techniques in Spying Against its Former Tutor, the US*, Philadelphia Inquirer, February 5, (1991).
54. S. Hussein and A. Glaspie, *Excerpts From Iraqi Document on Meeting with US Envoy*, The New York Times, International, September 23, (1990).
55. T.E. Lawrence, *A Report on Mesopotamia by T.E. Lawrence*, Sunday Times, August 22, (1920).
56. T. Rajamoorthy, *Deceit and Duplicity: Some Reflections on Western Intervention in Iraq*, Third World Resurgence, March-April, (2003).
57. P. Knightley and C. Simpson, *The Secret Lives of Lawrence of Arabia*, Nelson, London, (1969).
58. G. Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs*, Cornell University Press, (1962).
59. Y. Nakash, *The Shi'is of Iraq*, Princeton University Press, (1994).
60. D. Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*, Owl Books, (2001).
61. S.K. Aburish, *Saddam Hussein: The Politics of Revenge*, Bloomsbury, London, (2001).
62. M. Muffti, *Sovereign Creations: Pan-Arabism and Political Order in Syria and Iraq*, Cornell University Press, (1996).
63. C. Clover, *Lessons of the 1920 Revolt Lost on Bremer*, Financial Times, November 17, (2003).
64. J. Kifner, *Britain Tried First. Iraq Was No Picnic Then*, New York Times, July 20, (2003).
65. D. Omissi, *Baghdad and British Bombers*, Guardian, January 19, (1991).
66. D. Vernet, *Postmodern Imperialism*, Le Monde, April 24, (2003).
67. J. Buchan, *Miss Bell's Lines in the Sand*, Guardian, March 12, (2003).
68. C. Tripp, *Iraq: The Imperial Precedent*, Le Monde Diplomatique, January, (2003).

69. G.H.W. Bush and B. Scowcroft, *Why We Didn't Remove Saddam*, Time, 2 March, (1998).
70. J.A. Baker III, *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War and Peace, 1989-1992*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1995).
71. D. Rose, *Bush and Blair Made Secret Pact for Iraq War*, Observer, April 4, (2004).
72. B. Gellman, *Allied Air War Struck Broadly in Iraq; Officials Acknowledge Strategy Went Beyond Purely Military Targets*, Washington Post, June 23, (1991).
73. M. Fletcher and M. Theodoulou, *Baker Says Sanctions Must Stay as Long as Saddam Holds Power*, Times, May 23, (1991).
74. J. Pienaar and L. Doyle, *UK Maintains Tough Line on Sanctions Against Iraq*, Independent, May 11, (1991).
75. C. Johnson, *America's Empire of Bases*, TomDispatch.com, January, (2004).
76. B. Blum (translator), *Ex-National Security Chief Brzezinski Admits: Afghan Islamism Was Made in Washington*, Nouvel Observateur, January 15, (1998).
77. D. Rose, *Bush and Blair Made Secret Pact for Iraq War*, The Observer, Sunday April 4, (1994).
78. G. Vidal, *Dreaming War: Blood for Oil and the Bush-Cheney Junta*, Thunder's Mouth Press, (2002).
79. H. Thomas, *Preventive War Sets Serious Precedent*, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, March 20, (2003).
80. C. Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic*, Henry Hold and Company, New York, (2004).
81. C. Johnson, *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*, Henry Hold and Company, New York, (2000).
82. M. Parenti, *Against Empire: The Brutal Realities of U.S. Global Domination*, City Lights Books, 261 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, CA94133, (1995).
83. E. Ahmad, *Confronting Empire*, South End Press, (2000).
84. W. Greider, *Fortress America*, Public Affairs Press, (1998).
85. R. Mahajan, *Full Spectrum Dominance: U.S. Power in Iraq and Beyond*, Seven Stories Press, (2003).
86. J. Pilger, *Hidden Agendas*, The New Press, (1998).
87. S.R. Shalom, *Imperial Alibis*, South End Press, (1993).
88. C. Boggs (editor), *Masters of War: Militarism and Blowback in the Era of American Empire*, Routledge, (2003).
89. J. Pilger, *The New Rulers of the World*, Verso, (1992).
90. G. Vidal, *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace: How We Got To Be So Hated*, Thunder's Mouth Press, (2002).
91. W. Blum, *Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower*, Common Courage Press, (2000).
92. M. Parenti, *The Sword and the Dollar*, St. Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010, (1989).
93. K. Grossman, *Weapons in Space*, Seven Stories Press, (2001).

94. R.J. Barnet, *Intervention and Revolution: The United States in the Third World*, World Publishing, (1968).
95. T. Bodenheimer and R. Gould, *Rollback: Right-wing Power in U.S. Foreign Policy*, South End Press, (1989).
96. G. Guma, *Uneasy Empire: Repression, Globalization, and What We Can Do*, Toward Freedom, (2003).
97. W. Blum, *A Brief History of U.S. Interventions: 1945 to the Present*, Z magazine, June, (1999).
98. W. Blum, *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Intervention Since World War II*
99. M. Klare, *Endless Military Superiority*, The Nation magazine, July 15, (2002).
100. J.M. Cypher, *The Iron Triangle: The New Military Buildup*, Dollars and Sense magazine, January/February, (2002).
101. L. Meyer, *The Power of One*, (World Press Review), Reforma, Mexico City, August 5, (1999).
102. C. Johnson, *Time to Bring the Troops Home*, The Nation magazine, May 14, (2001).
103. W. Hartung, F. Berrigan and M. Ciarrocca, *Operation Endless Deployment: The War With Iraq Is Part of a Larger Plan for Global Military Dominance*, The Nation magazine, October 21, (2002).
104. I. Ramonet, *Servile States*, Le Monde diplomatique, Paris, October (2002), World Press Review, December, (2002).
105. J.K. Galbraith, *The Unbearable Costs of Empire*, American Prospect magazine, November, (2002).
106. G. Monbiot, *The Logic of Empire*, The Guardian, August 6, (2002), World Press Review, October, (2002).
107. W.R. Pitt and S. Ritter, *War on Iraq*, Context Books
108. W.R. Pitt, *The Greatest Sedition is Silence*, Pluto Press, (2003).
109. J. Wilson, *Republic or Empire?*, The Nation magazine, March 3, (2003).
110. R. Dreyfuss, *Just the Beginning: Is Iraq the Opening Salvo in a War to Remake the World?*, The American Prospect magazine, April, (2003).
111. D. Moberg, *The Road From Baghdad: The Bush Team Has Big Plans For the 21st Century. Can the Rest of the World Stop Them?*, These Times magazine, May, (2003).
112. P. Cain and T. Hopkins, *British Imperialism, 1688-200*, Longman, (2000).
113. N. Ferguson, *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and the Lessons for Global Power*, Basic Books, (2003).
114. E.J. Hobsbawn, *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914*, Vintage Books, (1989).
115. L. James, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, St Martin's Press, (1997).
116. S. Schama, *The Fate of Empire, 1776-2000*, Miramax, (2002).
117. A.P. Thorton, *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies: A Study in British Power*, Palgrave Macmillan, (1985).
118. G. Kolko, *Another Century of War*, New Press, (2002).
119. G. Kolko, *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1980*, Pantheon Books, (1988).

120. J. Feffer, B. Egrenreich and M.T. Klare, *Power Trip: US Unilateralism and Global Strategy After September 11*, Seven Stories Press, (2003).
121. R.S. Foot, S.N. MacFarlane and M. Mastanduno, *US Hegemony and International Organizations: The United States and Multilateral Institutions*, Oxford University Press, (2003).
122. P. Bennis and N. Chomsky, *Before and After: US Foreign Policy and the September 11th Crisis*, Olive Branch Press, (2002).
123. J. Garrison, *America as Empire: Global Leader or Rouge Power?*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, (2004).
124. A.J. Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of US Diplomacy*, Harvard University Press, (2002).
125. D.R. Francis, *Hidden Defense Costs Add Up to Double Trouble*, Christian Science Monitor, February 23, (2004).

Chapter 5

THE DEEP STATE

5.1 Edward Snowden's revelations

Can a government, many of whose operations are secret, be a democracy? Obviously this is impossible. The recent attempts of the United States to arrest whistleblower Edward Snowden call attention to the glaring contradiction between secrecy and democracy.

In a democracy, the power of judging and controlling governmental policy is supposed to be in the hands of the people. It is completely clear that if the people do not know what their government is doing, then they cannot judge or control governmental policy, and democracy has been abolished. There has always been a glaring contradiction between democracy and secret branches of the government, such as the CIA, which conducts its assassinations and its dirty wars in South America without any public knowledge or control.

The gross, wholesale electronic spying on citizens revealed by Snowden seems to be specifically aimed at eliminating democracy. It is aimed at instilling universal fear and conformity, fear of blackmail and fear of being out of step, so that the public will not dare to oppose whatever the government does, no matter how criminal or unconstitutional.

Henry Kissinger famously remarked: "The illegal we do at once. The unconstitutional takes a little longer". Well, Henry, that may have been true in your time, but today the unconstitutional does not take long at all.

The Magna Carta is trashed. No one dares to speak up. Habeas Corpus is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The United Nations Charter is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The Fourth Amendment to the US Constitution is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The President claims the right to kill both US and foreign citizens, at his own whim. No one dares to speak up.

But perhaps this is unjust. Perhaps some people would dare to protest, except that they cannot get their protests published in the mainstream media. We must remember that the media are owned by the same corporate oligarchs who own the government.

George Orwell, you should be living today! We need your voice today! After Snowden's revelations, the sale of Orwell's "1984" soared. It is now on the bestseller list. Sadly,

Orwell's dystopian prophesy has proved to be accurate in every detail.

What is the excuse for the massive spying reported by Snowden, spying not only on US citizens but also on the citizens of other countries throughout the world? "We want to protect you from terrorism.", the government answers. But terrorism is not a real threat, it is an invented one. It was invented by the military-industrial complex because, at the end of the Cold War, this enormous money-making conglomerate lacked enemies.

Globally, the number of people killed by terrorism is vanishingly small compared to the number of children who die from starvation every year. It is even vanishingly small compared with the number of people who are killed in automobile accidents. It is certainly small compared with the number of people killed in wars aimed at gaining western hegemony over oil-rich regions of the world.

But in Shelley's words, "We are many; they are few!" The people who want democracy greatly outnumber those who profit from maintaining a government based on secrecy and fear. Let us "rise like lions after slumbers, in unvanquishable numbers". Let us abolish governmental secrecy and reclaim our democracy.

5.2 Secrecy and dark acts

Can a government, many of whose operations are secret, be a democracy? Obviously this is impossible. The recent attempts of the United States to arrest whistleblower Edward Snowden call attention to the glaring contradiction between secrecy and democracy.

In a democracy, the power of judging and controlling governmental policy is supposed to be in the hands of the people. It is completely clear that if the people do not know what their government is doing, then they cannot judge or control governmental policy, and democracy has been abolished. There has always been a glaring contradiction between democracy and secret branches of the government, such as the CIA, which conducts its assassinations and its dirty wars in South America without any public knowledge or control.

The gross, wholesale electronic spying on citizens revealed by Snowden seems to be specifically aimed at eliminating democracy. It is aimed at instilling universal fear and conformity, fear of blackmail and fear of being out of step, so that the public will not dare to oppose whatever the government does, no matter how criminal or unconstitutional.

Henry Kissinger famously remarked: "The illegal we do at once. The unconstitutional takes a little longer". Well, Henry, that may have been true in your time, but today the unconstitutional does not take long at all.

The Magna Carta is trashed. No one dares to speak up. Habeas Corpus is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The United Nations Charter is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The Fourth Amendment to the US Constitution is trashed. No one dares to speak up. The President claims the right to kill both US and foreign citizens, at his own whim. No one dares to speak up.

But perhaps this is unjust. Perhaps some people would dare to protest, except that



Figure 5.1: **The sales of George Orwell’s 1984 soared after Snowden’s revelations.**

they cannot get their protests published in the mainstream media. We must remember that the media are owned by the same corporate oligarchs who own the government.

George Orwell, you should be living today! We need your voice today! After Snowden’s revelations, the sale of Orwell’s “1984” soared. It is now on the bestseller list. Sadly, Orwell’s dystopian prophesy has proved to be accurate in every detail.

What is the excuse for for the massive spying reported by Snowden, spying not only on US citizens but also on the citizens of other countries throughout the world? “We want to protect you from terrorism.”, the government answers. But terrorism is not a real threat, it is an invented one. It was invented by the military-industrial complex because, at the end of the Cold War, this enormous money-making conglomerate lacked enemies.

Globally, the number of people killed by terrorism is vanishingly small compared to the number of children who die from starvation every year. It is even vanishingly small compared with the number of people who are killed in automobile accidents. It is certainly small compared with the number of people killed in wars aimed at gaining western hegemony over oil-rich regions of the world.

In order to make the American people really fear terrorism, and in order to make them



willing to give up their civil liberties, a big event was needed, something like the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center.

There is strong evidence, available on the Internet for anyone who wishes to look at it, that the US government knew well in advance that the 9/11 attacks would take place, and that government agents made the disaster worse than it otherwise would have been by planting explosives in the buildings of the World Trade Center. For example, CIA insider Susan Lindauer has testified that the US government knew about the planned attacks as early as April, 2001. Other experts have testified that explosives must have been used to bring the buildings down.

Numerous samples of the dust from the disaster were collected by people in New York City, and chemical analysis of the dust has shown the presence of nanothermite, a compound that produces intense heat. Pools of recently-melted steel were found in the ruins of the buildings before these were sealed off from the public. An ordinary fire does not produce temperatures high enough to melt steel.

Thus it seems probable that the US government participated in the 9/11 attacks, and used them in much the same way that the Nazis used the Reichstag fire, to abridge civil liberties and to justify a foreign invasion. Soon afterward, the Patriot Act was passed. It's Orwellian name is easily understood by anyone who has read "1984".

But in Shelley's words, "We are many; they are few!" The people who want democracy greatly outnumber those who profit from maintaining a government based on secrecy and fear. Let us "rise like lions after slumbers, in unvanquishable numbers". Let us abolish governmental secrecy and reclaim our democracy.

Governmental secrecy is not something new. Secret diplomacy contributed to the outbreak of World War I, and the secret Sykes-Picot agreement later contributed to the bitterness of conflicts in the Middle East. However, in recent years, governmental secrecy has grown enormously.



Figure 5.2: Susan Lindauer

The revelations of Edward Snowden and others have shown that the number of people involved in secret operations of the United States government is now as large as the entire population of Norway: roughly 5 million. The influence of this dark side of government has become so great that no president is able to resist it.

In a recent article, John Chuckman remarked that “The CIA is now so firmly entrenched and so immensely well financed (much of it off the books, including everything from secret budget items to the peddling of drugs and weapons) that it is all but impossible for a president to oppose it the way Kennedy did. Obama, who has proved himself to be a fairly weak character from the start, certainly has given the CIA anything it wants. The dirty business of ISIS in Syria and Iraq is one project. The coup in Ukraine is another. The pushing of NATO’s face right against Russia’s borders is another. Several attempted coups in Venezuela are still more. And the creation of a drone air force for extra-judicial killings in half a dozen countries is yet another. They don’t resemble projects we would expect from a smiley-faced intelligent man who sometimes wore sandals and refused to wear a flag pin on his lapel during his first election campaign.”¹

Of course the United States government is by no means alone in practicing excessive secrecy: Scott Horton recently wrote an article entitled *How to Rein in a Secretive Shadow Government Is Our National Security Crisis*. He dedicated the article to the Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov because, as he said, “Sakharov recognized that the Soviet Union rested on a colossal false premise: it was not so much socialism (though Sakharov was certainly a critic of socialism) as it was the obsession with secrecy, which obstructed the search for truth, avoided the exposure of mistakes, and led to the rise of powerful bureaucratic elites who were at once incompetent and prone to violence.”

¹<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article41222.htm>




Figure 5.3: The revelations of Edward Snowden and others have shown that the number of people involved in secret operations of the United States government is now as large as the entire population of Norway: roughly 5 million.




Figure 5.4: One of the power points used by NSA to sell their comprehensive collection of private data.



Figure 5.5: The data of major Internet corporations was stolen without their knowledge or consent.



Figure 5.6: These huge buildings in Fort Meade, Maryland, are the main headquarters of NSA.



Figure 5.7: Angela Merkel's telephone was bugged by NSA. In a cartoon depicting the incident, she says "Tell the Americans to stop listening to our telephone conversations". Her aide replies, "You just did".



Figure 5.8: Big Brother is watching you.

5.3 *The United States of Secrets*

A review by Variety

Here are some excerpts from *Variety's* review of the first two parts of the series:

“Methodical and comprehensive, *Frontline's* documentary *The United States of Secrets* offers a blow-by-blow account of the Bush administration's embrace of potentially illegal spying/eavesdropping techniques, President Obama's decision to continue them (despite campaign promises to the contrary) and, most compellingly, those who sought to blow the whistle on government overreach, culminating with Edward Snowden's unprecedented dump of classified documents. If the two-part project breaks little new ground, it's an utterly thorough primer on what transpired that almost plays like a John Le Carre thriller, with remarkably candid interviews from participants on all sides...

“*United States of Secrets* also details the role played by the Fourth Estate, as frustrated officials reluctantly began going to the press, feeling they had no other recourse to beat back constitutional intrusions. Yet the New York Times, after nailing down the story, ultimately balked at running it, at the urging of the Bush administration...”

A review by Network Knowledge

Another review, by *Network Knowledge*, makes the following comments:

“WSEC/PBS Springfield will premiere a compelling two-part series entitled FRONTLINE - United States of Secrets. These programs go behind the headlines to reveal the dramatic story of how the U.S. government came to monitor and collect the communications of millions of people around the world - including ordinary Americans - and the lengths they went to trying to hide the massive surveillance program from the public.

“In part one, premiering Tuesday, May 13 at 8PM on WSEC/PBS Springfield, FRONTLINE filmmaker Michael Kirk goes inside Washington and the National Security Agency,

piecing together the secret history of the unprecedented surveillance program that began in the wake of September 11 and continues today even after the revelations of its existence by NSA contractor Edward Snowden.

“Then, in part two, premiering Tuesday, May 20 at 9PM, veteran FRONTLINE filmmaker Martin Smith continues the story, exploring the secret relationship between Silicon Valley and the National Security Agency, and investigating how the government and tech companies have worked together to gather and warehouse your data.

“Part political thriller and part spy novel, *United States of Secrets* series is the definitive history of domestic surveillance in a post 9/11 world. With new revelations about government spying coming out almost daily, the series will be gripping viewing for those who want to understand the context of the Snowden affair and what it means for all Americans.”

5.4 Censorship of the news

Many modern governments have become very expert in manipulating public opinion through mass media. They only allow the public to hear a version of the “news” that has been handed down by powerholders. Of course, people can turn to the alternative media that are available on the Internet. But on the whole, the vision of the world presented on television screens and in major newspapers is the “truth” that is accepted by the majority of the public, and it is this picture of events that influences political decisions. Censorship of the news by the power elite is a form of secrecy, since it withholds information that is needed for a democracy to function properly.

5.5 Coups, torture and illegal killing

During the period from 1945 to the present, the US interfered, militarily or covertly, in the internal affairs of a large number of nations: China, 1945-49; Italy, 1947-48; Greece, 1947-49; Philippines, 1946-53; South Korea, 1945-53; Albania, 1949-53; Germany, 1950s; Iran, 1953; Guatemala, 1953-1990s; Middle East, 1956-58; Indonesia, 1957-58; British Guiana/Guyana, 1953-64; Vietnam, 1950-73; Cambodia, 1955-73; The Congo/Zaire, 1960-65; Brazil, 1961-64; Dominican Republic, 1963-66; Cuba, 1959-present; Indonesia, 1965; Chile, 1964-73; Greece, 1964-74; East Timor, 1975-present; Nicaragua, 1978-89; Grenada, 1979-84; Libya, 1981-89; Panama, 1989; Iraq, 1990-present; Afghanistan 1979-92; El Salvador, 1980-92; Haiti, 1987-94; Yugoslavia, 1999; and Afghanistan, 2001-present, Syria, 2013-present; Egypt, 2013-present, and Ukraine, 2013-present. Most of these interventions were explained to the American people as being necessary to combat communism (or more recently, terrorism), but an underlying motive was undoubtedly the desire to put in place governments and laws that would be favorable to the economic interests of the US and its allies.

For the sake of balance, we should remember that during the Cold War period, the Soviet Union and China also intervened in the internal affairs of many countries, for ex-



Figure 5.9: **Extrajudicial killing of civilians by means of drones is also shrouded by secrecy, and it too is a gross violation of democratic principles.**

ample in Korea in 1950-53, Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, and so on; another very long list. These Cold War interventions were also unjustifiable, like those mentioned above. Nothing can justify military or covert interference by superpowers in the internal affairs of smaller countries, since people have a right to live under governments of their own choosing even if those governments are not optimal.

Many people in Latin America and elsewhere have been tortured: The long history of CIA torture was recently investigated, but only small portions of the 6000-page report are available to the public. The rest remains secret.

Extrajudicial killing of civilians by means of drones is also shrouded by secrecy, and it too is a gross violation of democratic principles.²

5.6 Secret trade deals

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is one of the trade deals that is currently being negotiated in secret. Not even the US congress is allowed to know the details of the document. However, enough information has been leaked to make it clear that if the agreement is passed, foreign corporations would be allowed to “sue” the US government for loss of profits because of (for example) environmental regulations. The “trial” would be outside the legal system, before a tribunal of lawyers representing the corporations. A similar secret trade deal with Europe, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), is also being “fast-tracked”. One can hardly imagine greater violations of democratic principles.³

²<http://www.globalresearch.ca/lawless-drone-killings/5355535>

³<http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=5411>

<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/03/world-at-a-crossroads-stop-the-fast-track-to-a-future-of-global-corporate-rule/>

<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/princeton-experts-say-us-no-longer-democracy>

We can also consider the “non-discrimination” principle adopted by GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). This principle states that participating countries “cannot discriminate between like products on the basis of the method of production”. This single principle allows multinational commerce to escape from all the humanitarian and environmental reforms that have been achieved since the start of the Industrial Revolution. No matter if the method of production involves destruction of a tropical rain forest, no matter if forced labor was used, we are not allowed to discriminate “on the basis of the method of production”.

The present situation is that agriculture, trade and industry have become global, but the world still lacks adequate institutions at the global level to watch over what is happening and to ensure respect for human needs and respect for the natural environment. Today’s global economic interdependence, instantaneous worldwide communication, and the need for peaceful resolution of international conflicts all call for strong governmental institutions at the global level, but the United Nations today lacks many things that would be necessary if it is to perform such a role: It lacks a legislature with the power to make laws binding on individuals and corporations. It lacks mechanisms for enforcing such laws. And it lacks a large and dependable source of income.

It would be logical to improve the United Nations by giving it the things just mentioned, and by giving it at the same time the task of regulating multinational corporations to ensure that they act in a socially and ecologically responsible manner. It would also be logical to entitle the UN to a fee for acting as a referee in relationships between multinationals and the developing countries. These reforms must come someday because of the logic of our present situation. I hope that they will come soon.

The CEO’s of Wall Street call for less government, more deregulation and more globalization. They are delighted that the work of the reform movement is being undone in the name of “freedom”. But is this really what is needed? We need instead to reform our economic system and to give it both a social conscience and an ecological conscience. Governments already accept their responsibility for education. In the future they must also accept the responsibility for ensuring that their citizens can make a smooth transition from education to secure jobs. The free market alone cannot do this the powers of government are needed. Let us restore democracy! Let us have governments that work for the welfare of all their citizens, rather than for the enormous enrichment of the few!

5.7 Secrecy, democracy and nuclear weapons

Nuclear weapons were developed in secret. The decision to use them on the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in an already-defeated Japan was made in secret. Since 1945, secrecy has surrounded all aspects of nuclear weapons, and for this reason it is clear that they are essentially undemocratic.

Nuclear disarmament has been one of the core aspirations of the international community since the first use of nuclear weapons in 1945. A nuclear war, even a limited one, would have global humanitarian and environmental consequences, and thus it is a responsibility

of all governments, including those of non-nuclear countries, to protect their citizens and engage in processes leading to a world without nuclear weapons.

Now a new process has been established by the United Nations General Assembly, an Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) to Take Forward Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament Negotiations. The OEWG convened at the UN offices in Geneva on May 14, 2013. Among the topics discussed was a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention.

The Model Nuclear Weapons Convention prohibits development, testing, production, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons. States possessing nuclear weapons will be required to destroy their arsenals according to a series of phases. The Convention also prohibits the production of weapons usable fissile material and requires delivery vehicles to be destroyed or converted to make them non-nuclear capable.

Verification will include declarations and reports from States, routine inspections, challenge inspections, on-site sensors, satellite photography, radionuclide sampling and other remote sensors, information sharing with other organizations, and citizen reporting. Persons reporting suspected violations of the convention will be provided protection through the Convention including the right of asylum.

Thus we can see that the protection of whistleblowers is an integral feature of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention now being discussed. As Sir Joseph Rotblat (1908-2005, Nobel Laureate 1995) frequently emphasized in his speeches, societal verification must be an integral part of the process of “going to zero” (i.e, the total elimination of nuclear weapons). This is because nuclear weapons are small enough to be easily hidden. How will we know whether a nation has destroyed all of its nuclear arsenal? We have to depend on information from insiders, whose loyalty to the whole of humanity prompts them to become whistleblowers. And for this to be possible, they need to be protected.

In general, if the world is ever to be free from the threat of complete destruction by modern weapons, we will need a new global ethic, an ethic as advanced as our technology. Of course we can continue to be loyal to our families, our localities and our countries. But this must be supplemented by a higher loyalty: a loyalty to humanity as a whole.

5.8 Freedom from fear

In order to justify secrecy, enormous dark branches of government and mass illegal spying, governments say: “We are protecting you from terrorism”. But terrorism is not a real threat, since our chances of dying from a terrorist attack are vanishingly small compared to (for example) preventable disease or an automobile accident. If we are ever to reclaim our democracy, we must free ourselves from fear.

5.9 *Inside Job*

Peter Bradshaw's review in *The Guardian*

"If you're growing, you're not in recession ... right?" The speaker is Hank Paulson, the former US treasury secretary, and, as it happens, the former CEO of Goldman Sachs. In Charles Ferguson's documentary about the great financial crash, Paulson's shrugging remark sums up the attitude of the super-rich banking apparatchiks and their eager political supporters. As long as the bubble's getting bigger, there's no worry about the bubble contracting ... right? But that is not what happens to bubbles. In 2008, the pop was heard around the world.

This film is as gripping as any thriller. Aided by some fascinating interviews, Ferguson lays out an awful story. In the 1980s, the markets and financial services were deregulated, and the driving force for this liberalization was Alan Greenspan, formidable chairman of the US federal reserve board from 1987 to 2006. Banks and loan companies were freer to gamble with their depositors' money; they were themselves freer to borrow more; they were free to offer investors dizzyingly complex financial instruments, with income streams from different debts bundled up, including high-interest home loans offered to high-risk borrowers - the so-called "sub-prime" market that offered mouthwateringly high returns.

The good times rolled. The banks ballooned. They offered their traders mind-blowing bonuses to encourage risk-taking chutzpah, corporate loyalty, and a neurotically driven pursuit of profit. Ferguson argues that crucially, the banks were allowed to insure against bad debts with credit default swaps - any number of these insurance policies could be purchased against one particular risk. Chillingly, the banks now had a vested interest in selling insanely risky products, as they themselves were lavishly insured with these swaps.

Perhaps the most sensational aspect of this film is Ferguson's contention that the crash corrupted the discipline of economics itself. Distinguished economists from America's Ivy League universities were drafted in by banks to compose reports sycophantically supporting reckless deregulation. They were massively paid for these consultancies. The banks bought the prestige of the academics, and their universities' prestige, too. Ferguson speaks to many of these economists, who clearly thought they were going to be interviewed as wry, dispassionate observers. It is really something to see the expression of shock, outrage and fear on their faces as they realize they're in the dock. One splutters with vexation; another gives vent to a ripe Freudian slip. Asked by Ferguson if he has any regrets about his behaviour, he says: "I have no comments ... uh, no regrets."

This is what Ferguson means by "inside job". There is a revolving door between the banks and the higher reaches of government, and to some extent

the groves of academe. Bank CEOs become government officials, creating laws convenient for their once and future employers.

Perhaps only the pen of Tom Wolfe could do justice to these harassed, bald, middle-aged masters of the universe, as they appear in Ferguson's film. The director shows how their body-language is always the same: somehow more guilty-looking when they are in the White House rose garden in their career pomp, being introduced to the press, than when they are facing openly hostile Senate hearings. They look uneasy, shifty, in weirdly ill-fitting suits, as if they are oppressed by the scrutiny, and worn out, possibly, by the strain of suppressing their own scruples. Their financial capacity far outstrips their capacity for enjoying themselves. They look very unhappy. Occasionally, British figures including Mervyn King and Alistair Darling are to be glimpsed in these photos, reminding us that we Brits have been ardent deregulators, as well.

One of Ferguson's interviewees is Charles Morris, author of *The Two Trillion Dollar Meltdown*, who amusingly discusses the effects this mega-windfall has on the individual banker's mind. He became absurdly rich and "he thought it was because he was smart".

I was reminded of Michael Lewis's *Liar's Poker*, his very funny book about the financial mentality of the 80s boom. He noted that if a regular person won the lottery, he might roll around on the floor, kicking his legs up with glee, but when bankers won their arbitrary lottery, they instead became solemn, pompous, overwhelmed with their own importance and stateliness. Their recklessness and excess coexisted with an almost priestly sense of worth. Even more than rich lawyers, rich bankers felt that their money proved their superior cleverness and also moral worthiness as the generators of prosperity. Yet that prosperity didn't trickle down very far.

Generally, this is the sort of film that is praised because it is not as wacky and tricky as Michael Moore. Yet it is clearly influenced by him - it's like a Moore film with the gags and stunts removed. And it's worth noting that without Moore's pioneering work, this documentary could not have been made.

Once again, the phrase that comes to mind is Milton Friedman's: socialism for the rich, free enterprise for the rest. An ordinary person defaults on his debt, he gets to live in his car. A banker defaults, and the taxpayer can be relied on to bail him out. No wonder the bonuses are back. But what can be done about all this? Ferguson has no answers, other than a faintly unedifying hint that bankers could be brought low if rumours about their systemic addiction to drugs and prostitutes could be made to stick legally - like Al Capone's tax evasion. But only a new political mood for regulation will do, and this still seems far away.




Figure 5.10: A poster advertising the Academy-Award-winning documentary film *Inside Job*.



Figure 5.11: John Perkins was an economic hit man employed by the US Government. Image source: www.whale.to

5.10 *Confessions of an economic hit-man*

A book by John Perkins, “Confessions of an Economic Hit-Man”, can give us a good understanding of the way in which our present economic system operates to further enrich wealthy nations and impoverish poor ones. Here are some excerpts:

“Economic hit men (EHMs) are highly paid professionals who cheat countries around the globe out of trillions of dollars. They funnel money from the World Bank, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and other foreign ‘aid’ organizations into the coffers of huge corporations and the pockets of a few wealthy families who control the planet’s natural resources.”

“Their tools included fraudulent financial reports, rigged elections, payoffs, extortion, sex, and murder. They play a game as old as empire, but one that has taken on new and terrifying dimensions during this time of globalization. I was initially recruited while I was in business school back in the late sixties by the National Security Agency, the nation’s largest and least understood spy organization; but ultimately I worked for private corporations.”

“The first real economic hit man was back in the early 1950s, Kermit Roosevelt, Jr., the grandson of Teddy, who overthrew the government of Iran, a democratically elected government, Mossadegh’s government, who was Time magazine’s person of the year; and he was so successful at doing this without any bloodshed, well, there was a little bloodshed, but no military intervention, just spending millions of dollars and replaced Mossadegh with

the Shah of Iran.”

“At that point, we understood that this idea of economic hit man was an extremely good one. We didn’t have to worry about the threat of war with Russia when we did it this way. The problem with that was that Roosevelt was a C.I.A. agent. He was a government employee. Had he been caught, we would have been in a lot of trouble. It would have been very embarrassing. So, at that point, the decision was made to use organizations like the C.I.A. and the N.S.A. to recruit potential economic hit men like me and then send us to work for private consulting companies, engineering firms, construction companies, so that if we were caught, there would be no connection with the government.”⁴

Suggestions for further reading

1. Marc Ambinder and D.B. Grady, *Deep State: Inside the Government Secrecy Industry*, Wiley, (2013).
2. Michael J. Glennon *National Security and Double Government* (PDF), Harvard National Security Journal. 5, (2014).
3. Jordan Michael Smith. *Vote all you want. The secret government won’t change.* The Boston Globe,(October 19, 2014).
4. Amanda Taub and Max Fisher, *As Leaks Multiply, Fears of a ‘Deep State’ in America.* The New York Times, (February 16, 2017).
5. Bob Jessop, *The State: Past, Present, Future*, John Wiley & Sons, (2015).
6. Jeremy Scahill, *Donald Trump and the Coming Fall of the American Empire.* The Intercept, (2017-07-22).
7. Alana Abramson, *President Trump’s Allies Keep Talking About the ‘Deep State.’ What’s That?.* Time, (8 March 2017).
8. Ishaan Tharoor, *Is Trump fighting the deep state or creating his own?.* The Washington Post, (February 1, 2017).
9. Michael Crowley, *The Deep State Is Real.* Politico Magazine, (September-October 2017).
10. Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *Rumblings of a ‘Deep State’ Undermining Trump? It Was Once a Foreign Concept.* The New York Times, (March 6, 2017).

⁴<http://techrig.blogspot.dk/2013/11/confessions-of-economic-hit-man.html>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yTbdnNgqfs8>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corporatocracy>

Chapter 6

TORTURE AND MURDER


6.1 Torture in the name of fighting terrorism

Here are some excerpts from the Wikipedia article entitled *Senate Intelligence Committee report on CIA torture*:

The Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency’s Detention and Interrogation Program is a report compiled by the bipartisan United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) about the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)’s Detention and Interrogation Program and its use of various forms of torture (“enhanced interrogation techniques” in U.S. government communiques) on detainees in CIA custody. The report covers CIA activities before, during, and after the “War on Terror”. The initial report was approved on December 13, 2012, by a vote of 9-6, with seven Democrats, one Independent, and one Republican voting in favor of the report and six Republicans voting in opposition.

The more-than 6,700-page report (including 38,000 footnotes) details the history of the CIA’s Detention and Interrogation Program and the Committee’s 20 findings and conclusions. On December 9, 2014, the SSCI released a 525-page portion that consisted of key findings and an executive summary of the full report. It took five years and the CIA spent \$40 million in connection with the Senate investigation. The full unredacted report remains classified.

The report details actions by CIA officials, including torturing prisoners, providing misleading or false information about classified CIA programs to the President, Department of Justice, Congress, and the media, impeding government oversight and internal criticism, and mismanaging the program. It also revealed the existence of previously unknown detainees, that more detainees were subjected to “enhanced interrogation techniques” than was previously disclosed, and that more forms of torture were used without Department of Justice approval. It concluded that torturing prisoners did not yield unique



intelligence that saved lives (as the CIA claimed), nor was torture useful in gaining cooperation from detainees, and that the program damaged the United States' international standing...

Examples of torture and the abuse of prisoners

- The CIA had force-fed some prisoners orally and/or anally in order to establish “total control over the detainee.” The report notes that CIA documents indicate “Chief of Interrogations [redacted] also ordered the rectal rehydration of KSM without a determination of medical need, a procedure that the chief of interrogations would later characterize as illustrative of the interrogator’s ‘total control over the detainee.’”
- The Committee found that “[a]t least five CIA detainees were subjected to ‘rectal rehydration’ or rectal feeding without documented medical necessity.” These detainees are listed as Abu Zubaydah, Khalid Shaykh Mohammad, Majid Khan, and Marwan al-Jabbur.
- At least one prisoner was “diagnosed with chronic hemorrhoids, an anal fissure and symptomatic rectal prolapse,” symptoms normally associated with a violent rape. The report identified this detainee as Mustafa al-Hawsawi.
- CIA officials, including general counsel Scott Miller and deputy director of operations James Pavitt, were told that rectal exams of at least two prisoners had been conducted with “excessive force.” A CIA attorney was asked to follow up on these incidents, but the report states that “CIA records do not indicate any resolution of the inquiry.”
- CIA interrogators threatened to rape and murder children and/or family members of prisoners. For example, according to the CIA’s Inspector General, a CIA interrogator told Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri that if he did

not provide information, "We could get your mother in here," and "We can bring your family in here." The interrogator also led al-Nashiri to believe that he was being held in a Middle Eastern country whose interrogators sexually abused female family members in front of detainees.

- In November 2002 the CIA killed Gul Rahman during interrogation by hypothermia.[The detainee, Gul Rahman, was tortured by CIA officers and contractors, and left wearing only a sweatshirt, chained to a wall in a seating position on a cold floor. No CIA employees were disciplined as a result of his death,..
- At least four prisoners with injuries to their legs (two with broken feet, one with a sprained ankle and one with an amputated leg) were forced to stand on their injuries. Interrogators subjected these detainees to extended periods of standing sleep deprivation without prior headquarters approval.
- Interrogators told prisoners that they would be killed. For example: one prisoner, Abu Zubaydah, was told "We can never let the world know what I have done to you", another was told that the only way he would be allowed to leave the prison would be in a coffin-shaped confinement box.
- One CIA interrogator who was subsequently sent home early threatened prisoner Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri with a gun and power drill, racking a handgun and revving the drill next to al-Nashiri's hooded head. The interrogator had not sought Headquarters approval for these unauthorized actions.
- At least two prisoners were victims of "mock executions." According to the CIA's Inspector General, the same debriefer who used the gun and drill on al-Nashiri claimed that he had witnessed other CIA interrogators stage an execution to scare a detainee, and several other CIA officers also said that they had witnessed or participated in mock executions.
- Several prisoners almost died and became completely unresponsive or nearly drowned during waterboarding. Multiple CIA communications described CIA interrogators waterboarding Abu Zubaydah and in one session, Zubaydah "becoming completely unresponsive, with bubbles rising through his open, full mouth." He remained unresponsive until given medical attention, when he regained consciousness and expelled "copious amounts of liquid."
- Abu Zubaydah's eye was so badly damaged during his time in prison that it was surgically removed.
- The CIA kept some prisoners awake for over one week (180 hours), as well as shorter extended periods of time. This included the use of sitting or standing stress positions that prevented sleep. Sleep deprivation caused at least five to experience "disturbing" hallucinations. The CIA claimed in

its 2013 response that when detainees experienced hallucinations during sleep deprivation, medical staff intervened and allowed the detainee to sleep. However, CIA records indicate that this was not always true.

- After more than a month of torture, including loud music, dietary and temperature manipulation, sleep and sensory deprivation, and shackling, prisoner Ridha al-Najjar was psychologically traumatized to the point of being described as “a broken man.”
- Prisoners were forced to use buckets for toilets. As punishment, interrogators could remove the waste bucket from a prisoner’s cell. In one case, CIA interrogators told a detainee that he could earn a bucket by cooperating, and those undergoing standing sleep deprivation were routinely put in diapers. This contradicts CIA Director Michael Hayden’s assertion that “Detainees have never been denied the means - at a minimum, they’ve always had a bucket - to dispose of their human waste.”
- On visiting one of the CIA black sites, CIA records indicate that Federal Bureau of Prisons representatives stated “they [had] never been in a facility where individuals were so sensory deprived i.e., constant white noise, no talking, everyone in the dark, with the guards wearing a light on their head when they collected and escorted a detainee to an interrogation cell, detainees constantly being shackled to the wall or floor, and the starkness of each cell (concrete and bars). There is nothing like this in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. They then explained that they understood the mission and it was their collective assessment that in spite of all this sensory deprivation, the detainees were not being treated in humanely [sic].” This evaluation was of the same black site where Gul Rahman died after CIA interrogators beat him and left him shackled half nude on a cold floor.
- Janat Gul was tortured for months based on false accusations made by an informant known as Asset Y. According to CIA documents, senior CIA officers had expressed doubt about the source’s credibility and Gul denied having information about imminent threats to the United States, but interrogators proceeded to subject Gul to numerous torture techniques. Even after CIA staff at the site stated that they believed Gul was not withholding information, CIA Headquarters ordered continued use of torture tactics. Gul never provided the information the CIA thought he possessed, and Asset Y admitted to fabricating the accusations against him.
- CIA interrogators forced detainee Abu Zubaydah into a box the size of a coffin for a total of 266 hours (over 11 days) and also forced him to stay for 29 hours in a box measuring 21 inches (53 cm) wide, 2.5 feet (76 cm) deep and 2.5 feet (76 cm) high. Interrogators told him that the only way he was leaving the facility was in a coffin-shaped box.
- CIA interrogators used unauthorized forms of torture, or used authorized techniques for more time or in more extreme ways than were approved,



and usually faced no disciplinary action. These unauthorized techniques included forcing detainee Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri to stand with his hands shackled over his head for 2 1/2 days, racking a handgun next to his head and operating a power drill near his body. Other unauthorized techniques and divergence from authorized applications of techniques included improvised stress positions, longer sleep deprivation than approved, punitive water dousing and nudity, temperature, dietary manipulation, application of the waterboard that differed from the approved methods. CIA interrogators also subjected multiple detainees to unauthorized torture techniques that Headquarters later retroactively approved.

- CIA interrogators subjected one detainee, Abu Hudhaifa, to “ice water baths” and 66 hours of standing sleep deprivation, as well as forced nudity and dietary manipulation. He was later released as the CIA had mistaken his identity. According to CIA records, Hudhaifa was one of dozens of individuals whom the CIA detained who were cases of mistaken identity or otherwise did not meet the requirements for detention.
- Torture of prisoners led to serious mental harm (e.g. dementia, paranoia, insomnia, and attempts at self-harm [including suicide]).

Torture at Guantanamo


According to Wikipedia, “The Guantanamo Bay detention camp is a United States military prison located within Guantanamo Bay Naval Base,... which is on the coast of Guantánamo Bay in Cuba. Indefinite detention without trial and torture have led the operations of this camp to be considered a major breach of human rights by Amnesty International and a violation of Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth amendments of the United States Constitution.”


Below are some drawings by Abu Zubaydah, who is currently being held without charge at Guantanamo Bay. After being held in US black sites for four years, Zubaydah was transferred to the US prison at GuantÁjnamo, Cuba, where he’s been detained since but never criminally charged. Zubaydah’s attorney of 10 years, the Seton Hall law professor Mark Denbeaux, told Insider that military prosecutors “can’t find a crime to charge him with.”














6.2 Murder in the name of fighting terrorism

Collateral Murder

Here is the report, *Collateral Murder*, published by Wikileaks:¹

5th April 2010 10:44 EST WikiLeaks has released a classified US military video depicting the indiscriminate slaying of over a dozen people in the Iraqi suburb of New Baghdad – including two Reuters news staff.

Reuters has been trying to obtain the video through the Freedom of Information Act, without success since the time of the attack. The video, shot from an Apache helicopter gun-sight, clearly shows the unprovoked slaying of a wounded Reuters employee and his rescuers. Two young children involved in the rescue were also seriously wounded.

The military did not reveal how the Reuters staff were killed, and stated that they did not know how the children were injured.

After demands by Reuters, the incident was investigated and the U.S. military concluded that the actions of the soldiers were in accordance with the law of armed conflict and its own "Rules of Engagement".

Consequently, WikiLeaks has released the classified Rules of Engagement for 2006, 2007 and 2008, revealing these rules before, during, and after the killings.

WikiLeaks has released both the original 38 minutes video and a shorter version with an initial analysis. Subtitles have been added to both versions from the radio transmissions.

WikiLeaks obtained this video as well as supporting documents from a number of military whistleblowers. WikiLeaks goes to great lengths to verify the authenticity of the information it receives. We have analyzed the information about this incident from a variety of source material. We have spoken to witnesses and journalists directly involved in the incident.

WikiLeaks wants to ensure that all the leaked information it receives gets the attention it deserves. In this particular case, some of the people killed were journalists that were simply doing their jobs: putting their lives at risk in order to report on war. Iraq is a very dangerous place for journalists: from 2003- 2009, 139 journalists were killed while doing their work.

The videos can be seen by going to the Wikileaks website.

Julian Assange, A martyr to the truth

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe depositories." Thomas Jefferson, (1743-1826)

¹<https://collateralmurder.wikileaks.org/>



Figure 6.1: Wikileaks' Julian Assange removed from the Ecuador embassy.

"The jaws of power are always open to devour, and her arm is always stretched out, if possible, to destroy the freedom of thinking, speaking, and writing." John Adams, (1735-1826)

According to the Nuremberg Principles, the citizens of a country have a responsibility for the crimes that their governments commit. But to prevent these crimes, the people need to have some knowledge of what is going on. Indeed, democracy cannot function at all without this knowledge.

What are we to think when governments make every effort to keep their actions secret from their own citizens? We can only conclude that although they may call themselves democracies, such governments are in fact oligarchies or dictatorships.

At the end of World War I, it was realized that secret treaties had been responsible for its outbreak, and an effort was made to ensure that diplomacy would be more open in the future. Needless to say, these efforts did not succeed, and diplomacy has remained a realm of secrecy.

Many governments have agencies for performing undercover operations (usually very dirty ones). We can think, for example of the KGB, the CIA, M5, or Mossad. How can countries that have such agencies claim to be democracies, when the voters have no knowledge of or influence over the acts that are committed by the secret agencies of their governments?

Nuclear weapons were developed in secret. It is doubtful whether the people of the

United States would have approved of the development of such antihuman weapons, or their use against an already-defeated Japan, if they had known that these things were going to happen. The true motive for the nuclear bombings was also kept secret. In the words of General Groves, speaking confidentially to colleagues at Los Alamos, the real motive was “to control the Soviet Union”.

The true circumstances surrounding the start of the Vietnam War would never have been known if Daniel Ellsberg had not leaked the Pentagon Papers. Ellsberg thought that once the American public realized that their country’s entry into the war was based on a lie, the war would end. It did not end immediately, but undoubtedly Ellsberg’s action contributed to the end of the war.

We do not know what will happen to Julian Assange. If his captors send him to the US, and if he is executed there for the crime of publishing leaked documents (a crime that he shares with the New York Times), he will not be the first martyr to the truth.

The ageing Galileo was threatened with torture and forced to recant his heresy, that the Earth moves around the Sun. Galileo spent the remainder of his days in house arrest.

Giordano Bruno was less lucky. He was burned at the stake for maintaining that the universe is larger than it was then believed to be.

If Julian Assange becomes a martyr to the truth like Galileo or Bruno, his name will be honored in the future, and the shame of his captors will be remembered too.

Barak Obama’s kill list

During his presidency, Barak Obama greatly expanded the use of drones for killing suspects in the “War on Terror”. He began his day, each morning, by signing a list of people who were to be killed. In so doing, he was violating the UN Charter and both international and domestic laws against extrajudicial killing. Here is an article about Obama’s use of drones from the Bureau of Investigative Journalism website:²

There were ten times more air strikes in the covert war on terror during President Barak Obama’s presidency than under his predecessor, George W. Bush.

Obama embraced the US drone programme, overseeing more strikes in his first year than Bush carried out during his entire presidency. A total of 563 strikes, largely by drones, targeted Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen during Obama’s two terms, compared to 57 strikes under Bush. Between 384 and 807 civilians were killed in those countries, according to reports logged by the Bureau.

The use of drones aligned with Obama’s ambition to keep up the war against al Qaeda while extricating the US military from intractable, costly ground wars in the Middle East and Asia. But the targeted killing programme has drawn

²<https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/stories/2017-01-17/obamas-covert-drone-war-in-numbers-ten-times-more-strikes-than-bush>

much criticism.

The Obama administration has insisted that drone strikes are so “exceptionally surgical and precise” that they pluck off terror suspects while not putting “innocent men, women and children in danger”. This claim has been contested by numerous human rights groups, however, and the Bureau’s figures on civilian casualties also demonstrate that this is often not the case.

The White House released long-awaited figures last July on the number of people killed in drone strikes between January 2009 and the end of 2015, an announcement which insiders said was a direct response to pressure from the Bureau and other organizations that collect data. However the US’s estimate of the number of civilians killed - between 64 and 116 - contrasted strongly with the number recorded by the Bureau, which at 380 to 801 was six times higher.

That figure does not include deaths in active battlefields including Afghanistan - where US air attacks have shot up since Obama withdrew the majority of his troops at the end of 2014. The country has since come under frequent US bombardment, in an unreported war that saw 1,337 weapons dropped last year alone - a 40% rise on 2015.

Afghan civilian casualties have been high, with the United Nations (UN) reporting at least 85 deaths in 2016. The Bureau recorded 65 to 105 civilian deaths during this period. We did not start collecting data on Afghanistan until 2015.

Pakistan was the hub of drone operations during Obama’s first term. The pace of attacks had accelerated in the second half of 2008 at the end of Bush’s term, after four years pocked by occasional strikes. However in the year after taking office, Obama ordered more drone strikes than Bush did during his entire presidency. The 54 strikes in 2009 all took place in Pakistan. 563 Strikes in Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen during Obama’s two terms 57 Strikes in those countries under George W. Bush

Strikes in the country peaked in 2010, with 128 CIA drone attacks and at least 89 civilians killed, at the same time US troop numbers surged in Afghanistan. Pakistan strikes have since fallen with just three conducted in the country last year.

Obama also began an air campaign targeting Yemen. His first strike was a catastrophe: commanders thought they were targeting al Qaeda but instead hit a tribe with cluster munitions, killing 55 people. Twenty-one were children - 10 of them under five. Twelve were women, five of them pregnant.

Through 2010 and the first half of 2011 US strikes in Yemen continued sporadically. The air campaign then began in earnest, with the US using its drones and jets to help Yemeni ground forces oust al Qaeda forces who had taken advantage of the country’s Arab Spring to seize a swath of territory in the south of the country.

In Somalia, US Special Operations Forces and gunships had been fighting

al Qaeda and its al Shabaab allies since January 2007. The US sent drones to Djibouti in 2010 to support American operations in Yemen, but did not start striking in Somalia until 2011.

The number of civilian casualties increased alongside the rise in strikes. However reported civilian casualties began to fall as Obama's first term progressed, both in real terms and as a rate of civilians reported killed per strike.

In Yemen, where there has been a minimum of 65 civilian deaths since 2002, the Bureau recorded no instances of civilian casualties last year. There were three non-combatants reportedly killed in 2016 in Somalia, where the US Air Force has been given broader authority to target al Shabaab - in previous years there were no confirmed civilian deaths.

Strikes in Yemen, Pakistan and Somalia have always been dwarfed by the frequency of air attacks on battlefields such as Afghanistan.

December 2014 saw the end of NATO combat operations there, and the frequency of air attacks plummeted in 2015. Strikes are now increasing again, with a 40% rise in 2016, though numbers remain below the 2011 peak.

The number of countries being simultaneously bombed by the US increased to seven last year as a new front opened up in the fight against Islamic State (IS). The US has been leading a coalition of countries in the fight against IS in Iraq and Syria since August 2014, conducting a total of 13,501 strikes across both countries, according to monitoring group Airwars.

In August US warplanes started hitting the group hard in Libya. The US declared 495 strikes in the country between August 1 and December 5 as part of efforts to stop IS gaining more ground, Airwars data shows.

Making a game of killing

The mass media are an important part of our educational system. Perhaps it is time to look more closely at the values that they are transmitting. In particular, we should perhaps look at computer games designed for young boys. They often give the strongest imaginable support to a culture of violence.

For example, a game entitled "Full Spectrum Warrior" was recently reviewed in a Danish newspaper. According to the reviewer, "...An almost perfect combination of graphics, sound, band design, and gameplay makes it seem exactly like the film Black Hawk Down - with the player as the main character. This is not just a coincidence, because the game is based on an army training program... Full Spectrum Warrior is an extremely intense experience, and despite the advanced possibilities, the controls are simple enough so that young children can play it... The player is completely drawn into the screen, and remains there until the end of the mission." The reviewer gave the game six stars (the maximum).

Another genre of computer games has to do with building empires, ignoring the fact that imperialism is morally indefensible. For example, "Forge of Empires" is a browser-based strategy game. It is described as follows: "The game offers a single-player campaign for players to explore and conquer several provinces, gaining resources and new technology

as they progress.” Conquering countries for the sake of gaining their resources is an all-too-familiar feature of the modern world. In the game “Forge of Empires”, our young people are indoctrinated with the ethos of resource wars.

During his trial, the Norwegian mass-murderer Anders Behring Breivik described how he trained for his attack on young people on the Island of Utøya using the computer game “Call of Duty: Modern Warfare”. The court also heard how he took what he called a “sabbatical” for a year between the summers of 2006 and 2007. During this year, he played a game called “World of Warcraft” full-time, in the bedroom of his mother’s Oslo flat, spending up to 16 hours a day using the game to distance himself from the human and moral significance of killing.

Is this not similar to the frame of mind of drone operators, sitting in comfort in their Nevada bunkers, distanced from the reality of killing? They are playing a computer game that kills targeted individuals and their families, in remote countries, by remote control. There is no need to look into the eyes of the victims. They are just abstract symbols in a computer game.

Suggestions for further reading

1. L. Birkowitz, *Aggression: Its Causes, Consequences and Control*, McGraw-Hill, (1993).
2. Helen Pidd, *Anders Breivik ‘trained’ for shooting attacks by playing Call of Duty*, The Guardian, 19 April, (2012).
3. Media Benjamin, *Drone Warfare, Killing by Remote Control*, OR Books, (2012).

Chapter 7

THE FAR RIGHT

7.1 Alt-right

The Associated Press gives the following definition of the alt-right movement:

“The ‘alt-right’ or ‘alternative right’ is a name currently embraced by some white supremacists and white nationalists to refer to themselves and their ideology, which emphasizes preserving and protecting the white race in the United States in addition to, or over, other traditional conservative positions such as limited government, low taxes and strict law-and-order. The movement has been described as a mix of racism, white nationalism and populism ... criticizes ‘multiculturalism’ and more rights for non-whites, women, Jews, Muslims, gays, immigrants and other minorities. Its members reject the American democratic ideal that all should have equality under the law regardless of creed, gender, ethnic origin or race.”

Wikipedia states that “The alt-right, an abbreviation of alternative right, is a loosely connected far-right, white supremacist, white nationalist, white separatist, anti-immigration and sometimes antisemitic movement based in the United States. A largely online phenomenon, the alt-right originated in the U.S. during the 2010s although it has since established a presence in various other countries. The term is ill-defined, having been used in different ways by various self-described ‘alt-rightists’, media commentators, and academics.

“In 2010, the American white nationalist Richard B. Spencer launched The Alternative Right webzine to disseminate his ideas. Spencer’s ‘alternative right’ was influenced by earlier forms of American white nationalism, as well as paleoconservatism, the Dark Enlightenment, and the Nouvelle Droite. Critics charged it with being a rebranding of white supremacism. His term was shortened to “alt-right” and popularised by far-right participants of /pol/, the politics board of web forum 4chan. It came to be associated with other white nationalist websites and groups, including Andrew Anglin’s Daily Stormer, Brad Griffin’s Occidental Dissent, and Matthew Heimbach’s Traditionalist Worker Party...

“The alt-right is a white nationalist, biologically racist movement. Part of its membership supports anti-immigrationist policies to ensure a continued white majority in the



Figure 7.1: Prominent alt-rightists were instrumental in organizing the "Unite the Right" rally in Charlottesville, Virginia in August 2017. Here, rally participants carry Confederate battle flags, Gadsden flags and a Nazi flag.

United States. Others call for the breakup of the country to form a white separatist ethno-state in North America. Some alt-rightists seek to make white nationalism socially respectable in the U.S., while others - known as the '1488' scene - adopt openly white supremacist and neo-Nazi stances. Some alt-rightists are anti-semitic, promoting a conspiracy theory that there is a Jewish plot to bring about white genocide; other alt-rightists view most Jews as members of the white race. The alt-right is anti-feminist, advocates for a more patriarchal society, and intersects with the men's rights movement and other sectors of the online manosphere...

"Membership was overwhelmingly white and male, with academic and anti-fascist observers linking its growth to deteriorating living standards and prospects, anxieties about the place of white masculinity, and anger at increasingly visible left-wing forms of identity politics like the Black Lives Matter movement. Constituent groups using the "alt-right" label have been characterized as hate groups,[2][3] while alt-right material has been a contributing factor in the radicalization of young white men responsible for a range of far-right murders and terrorist attacks in the U.S. since 2014."




Figure 7.2: Heather Heyer was murdered in 2017 by a white nationalist rally participant in Charlottesville. Since then, mass shootings in Poway, Gilroy, and El Paso and elsewhere have been each linked to white nationalist beliefs.



Figure 7.3: Breitbart News amplified and popularised alt-right ideas under the editorship of “alt-lite” figure Steve Bannon.



Figure 7.4: The alt-right largely rallied behind the presidential candidacy of Donald Trump, although he later distanced himself from the movement.



Figure 7.5: A participant at the Unite the Right rally giving a Nazi salute in front of counter-protesters.



Figure 7.6: The alt-rightist was then punched in an altercation with counter-protesters.



Figure 7.7: Protestors at the 2017 Unite the Right rally, which was promoted by the alt-right. One man carries the logo of Vanguard America, and another has a t-shirt praising German Nazi leader Adolf Hitler.



Figure 7.8: An attendee at the Unite the Right rally carrying a firearm and wearing a Confederate Battle Flag T-shirt.



Figure 7.9: “Trump is Alt-Right with Us.” Anti-Trump protesters highlight what they regard as his links to the alt-right and to historical fascism by dressing as Hitler and Mussolini.

7.2 Proud Boys

Wikipedia states that “The Proud Boys is a far-right neo-fascist organization which admits only men as members and promotes political violence. It is based in the United States and has a presence in Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom. The group was started in 2016 by Vice Media co-founder and former commentator Gavin McInnes, taking its name from the song ‘Proud of Your Boy’ from the Disney film *Aladdin*. Proud Boys emerged as part of the alt-right, but in early 2017, McInnes began distancing himself from the alt-right, saying the alt-right’s focus is race while his focus is what he defines as ‘Western values’. This re-branding effort intensified after the Unite the Right Rally ¹.

“The group sees men - especially white men - and Western culture as under siege; their views have elements of white genocide conspiracy theory. While the group claims it does not support white supremacist views, its members often participate in racist rallies, events, and organizations. The organization glorifies violence, and members engage in violence at

¹Wikipedia describes this event as follows: “The Unite the Right rally was a white supremacist rally that occurred in Charlottesville, Virginia, from August 11 to 12, 2017. Protesters were members of the far-right and included self-identified members of the alt-right, neo-Confederates, neo-fascists,[13] white nationalists, neo-Nazis, Klansmen, and various right-wing militias. The marchers chanted racist and antisemitic slogans, carried semi-automatic rifles, Nazi and neo-Nazi symbols (such as the swastika, Odal rune, Black Sun, and Iron Cross), the Valknut, Confederate battle flags, Deus Vult crosses, flags and other symbols of various past and present anti-Muslim and antisemitic groups.”



Figure 7.10: Proud Boys founder Gavin McInnes.

events it attends; the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) has called it an ‘alt-right fight club’.

“The organization has been described as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center and NPR’s *The Takeaway*, and Spencer, McInnes, and the Proud Boys have been described as hipster racists by Vox and Media Matters for America. McInnes says victim mentality of women and other historically oppressed groups is unhealthy: ‘There is an incentive to be a victim. It is cool to be a victim.’ He sees white men and Western culture as ‘under siege’ and described criticism of his ideas as “victim blaming”. Their views have elements of white genocide conspiracy theory. The group is part of the ‘alt lite’ and it is ‘overtly Islamophobic’...

“The organization glorifies political violence against leftists, re-enacting political assassinations, wearing shirts that praise Augusto Pinochet’s murders of leftists, and participating directly in political violence. McInnes has said ‘I want violence, I want punching in the face. I’m disappointed in Trump supporters for not punching enough.’ He stated, ‘We don’t start fights [...] but we will finish them.’ Heidi Beirich, the Intelligence Project director for the Southern Poverty Law Center, said that this form of intentional aggression was not common among far-right groups in the past; she said: ‘We’re going to show up and we’re intending to get in fights, that’s a new thing.’ In August 2018, Twitter shut down the official account for the group, as well as McInnes’ account, under its policy prohibiting violent extremist groups; at the time, the group’s profile photo was a member punching a counter-protester.



Figure 7.11: A member of Proud Boys.

7.3 Evangelicals

Here is an excerpt from a December 31, 2018 article in the New York Times by Katherine Stewart:

The month before the 2018 midterms, a thousand theaters screened “The Trump Prophecy,” a film that tells the story of Mark Taylor, a former firefighter who claims that God told him in 2011 that Donald Trump would be elected president.

At a critical moment in the film, just after the actor representing Mr. Taylor collapses in the flashing light of an epiphany, he picks up a Bible and turns to the 45th chapter of the book of Isaiah, which describes the anointment of King Cyrus by God. In the next scene, we hear Mr. Trump being interviewed on “The 700 Club,” a popular Christian television show.

As Lance Wallnau, an evangelical author and speaker who appears in the film, once said, “I believe the 45th president is meant to be an Isaiah 45 Cyrus,” who will “restore the crumbling walls that separate us from cultural collapse.”

Cyrus, in case you’ve forgotten, was born in the sixth century B.C.E. and became the first emperor of Persia. Isaiah 45 celebrates Cyrus for freeing a population of Jews who were held captive in Babylon. Cyrus is the model for a nonbeliever appointed by God as a vessel for the purposes of the faithful.

The identification of the 45th president with an ancient Middle Eastern

potentate isn't a fringe thing. "The Trump Prophecy" was produced with the help of professors and students at Liberty University, whose president, Jerry Falwell Jr., has been instrumental in rallying evangelical support for Mr. Trump. Jeanine Pirro of Fox News has picked up on the meme, as has Ron Dermer, the Israeli ambassador to the United States, among many others.

As the Trump presidency falls under siege on multiple fronts, it has become increasingly clear that the so-called values voters will be among the last to leave the citadel. A lot of attention has been paid to the supposed paradox of evangelicals backing such an imperfect man, but the real problem is that our idea of Christian nationalism hasn't caught up with the reality. We still buy the line that the hard core of the Christian right is just an interest group working to protect its values. But what we don't get is that Mr. Trump's supposedly anti-Christian attributes and anti-democratic attributes are a vital part of his attraction.

Today's Christian nationalists talk a good game about respecting the Constitution and America's founders, but at bottom they sound as if they prefer autocrats to democrats. In fact, what they really want is a king. "It is God that raises up a king," according to Paula White, a prosperity gospel preacher who has advised Mr. Trump.

Ralph Drollinger, who has led weekly Bible study groups in the White House attended by Vice President Mike Pence and many other cabinet members, likes the word "king" so much that he frequently turns it into a verb. "Get ready to king in our future lives," he tells his followers. "Christian believers will - soon, I hope - become the consummate, perfect governing authorities!"

The great thing about kings like Cyrus, as far as today's Christian nationalists are concerned, is that they don't have to follow rules. They are the law. This makes them ideal leaders in paranoid times.



Figure 7.12: Apparently insanity rules the United States today. The Evangelical Right believes that Trump was sent by God to be King, despite the fact that, according to Glenn Kessler, author of the Washington Post’s Fact Checker column, Trump told an average of 15 lies per day in 2018, bringing the total number of documented lies since he took office in January 2017 to 7,645. But neither Trump’s lies, nor his racism and mysogeny, nor his cruel authorization of imprisonment of very young children and even babies, are his worst crimes. His most serious offense is a crime against human civilization and the biosphere: his support for coal, his climate change denial, his sabotaging of renewable energy, and his withdrawal from the Paris agreement. These actions, and support for them by Republicans, caused Noam Chomsky to call the Republican Party “the most dangerous organization in history”.




Figure 7.13: An artist's impression of Trump's National Security Advisor John Bolton.



Figure 7.14: Stars and stripes.



Figure 7.15: Anit-Mexican language used by Trump is very similar to the language used by the El Paso mass murderer. A recent article *Ex-FBI Official, FBI reluctant to probe white supremacists because Trump considers them his base*, quotes Dave Gomez as saying “There’s some reluctance among agents to bring forth an investigation that targets what the president perceives as his base.”



Figure 7.16: Family members mourning the victims of the El Paso murders.



Figure 7.17: A woman lights a candle at a makeshift memorial outside Walmart, near the scene of a mass shooting which left 22 people dead, on August 4, 2019, in El Paso, Texas.

7.4 The El Paso mass murders

On the morning of August 3, 2019, 21-year-old Patrick Wood Crusius, a Republican follower of Donald Trump, walked into a Walmart in El Paso Texas. carrying an AK-47 automatic weapon. He opened fire on the largely Latino customers, killing 22 people and seriously injuring 24 others. In a manifesto, which he published on the Internet just before the murders, he wrote “In general, I support the Christchurch shooter and his manifesto. This attack is a response to the Hispanic invasion of Texas. They are the instigators, not me. I am simply defending my country from cultural and ethnic replacement brought on by an invasion.” The language and ideas used by Crusius are similar to those of Donald Trump, who often speaks of a Mexican invasion.

The following day, there was another mass shooting, this time in Dayton, Ohio. Again an automatic attack rifle was used. Nine people were killed.

Between January and February, 2019, President Donald Trump’s Facebook page ran about 2,200 ads referring to immigration as an “invasion”.

7.5 Right-wing parties in Europe and elsewhere.

Brexit

Across the developed world, the reaction to threatened migration of refugees from climate change has been less than generous, to say the least. The recent decision of Britain to leave the European Union was motivated largely by the fear of British workers that EU laws would force their country to accept large numbers of refugees.

Swings to the right in Europe

In Germany, Angela Merkel’s generous policies towards refugees have cost her votes, while an openly racist party, the Alternative for Germany (AfD) party, has gained in strength. Frauke Petry, 40, the party’s leader, has said border guards might need to turn guns on anyone crossing a frontier illegally. The party’s policy platform says “Islam does not belong in Germany” and calls for a ban on the construction of mosques.

In September, 2017, eight people from the neo-Nazi Freital Group were put on trial in Dresden for bomb attacks on homes for asylum applicants. Hundreds of similar assaults occur in Germany every year, but they had never before been tried as terrorism in a federal court.

In the German election, which took place on Sunday, October 1, 2017, Angela Merkel won a fourth term as Chancellor, but her party won only 33% of the votes, a percentage much reduced from the 41% won in the election of 2013. Angela Merkel was paying a high price for her refugee-friendly policies.

Meanwhile the far right anti-immigration AfD party made a historic breakthrough, winning 13.5% of the vote, thus becoming the first overtly nationalist party to sit in the

Bundestag in 60 years. The Greens have already complained that “Nazis have returned to parliament”. In fact, members of the AfD party have begun to say that Germans should stop being ashamed of their country’s Nazi past.

In France, the National Front is a nationalist party that uses populist rhetoric to promote its anti-immigration and anti-European Union positions. The party favors protectionist economic policies and would clamp down on government benefits for immigrants.

Similarly, in the Netherlands, the anti-European Union, anti-Islam Party for Freedom has called for closing all Islamic schools and recording the ethnicity of all Dutch citizens. In early November, the party was leading in polls ahead of next year’s parliamentary elections.

Other far-right anti-immigrant parties in Europe include Golden Dawn (Greece), Jobbik (Hungary), Sweden Democrats (Sweden), Freedom Party (Austria), and People’s Party - Our Slovakia (Slovakia). All of these parties have gained in strength because of the widespread fear of immigration.

Populism in the United States

The election of Donald Trump, who ran for President in 2016 on an openly racist and anti-immigrant platform, can also be seen as the result of fear of immigration, especially on the part of industrial workers.

A more humane response to the refugee crisis

In the long-term future, climate change will make the refugee crisis much more severe. Heat and drought will make large regions of the world uninhabitable, and will threaten many populations with famine. The severity of the refugee crisis will depend on how quickly we reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

While making many parts of the world uninhabitable, long-term climate change will make other regions more suitable for human habitation and agriculture. For example, farming will become more possible in Siberia, Greenland, the Canadian Arctic, Alaska and Patagonia. A humane response to the refugee crisis could include the generous opening of these regions to refugees.

The global population of humans is currently increasing by almost a billion people every decade. Global population must be stabilized, and in the long run, gradually reduced. Money currently wasted (or worse than wasted) on armaments could be used instead to promote universal primary health care, and with it, universal access to the knowledge and materials needed for family planning.

Finally, reduced consumption of meat, particularly beef, would shorten the food chain thus make more food available for famine relief.

7.6 Trump copies Hitler's rhetoric

Book review: *When at Times the Mob Is Swayed*

Below are some quotations from an article by Steven Rosenfeld, published by *Common Dreams* on Friday, August 9, 2019. Rosenfeld's article is a review of a book by Bert Neuborne entitled *When at Times the Mob Is Swayed: A Citizen's Guide to Defending Our Republic*.

Neuborne doesn't make this comparison [between Trump and Hitler] lightly. His 55-year career began by challenging the constitutionality of the Vietnam War in the 1960s. He became the ACLU's national legal director in the 1980s under Ronald Reagan. He was founding legal director of the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University Law School in the 1990s. He has been part of more than 200 Supreme Court cases and Holocaust reparation litigation.

"Why does an ignorant, narcissistic buffoon like Trump trigger such anxiety? Why do so many Americans feel it existentially (not just politically) important to resist our forty-fifth president?" he writes. "Partly it's just aesthetics. Trump is such a coarse and appalling man that it's hard to stomach his presence in Abraham Lincoln's house. But that's not enough to explain the intensity of my dread. LBJ was coarse. Gerald Ford and George W. Bush were dumb as rocks. Richard Nixon was an anti-Semite. Bill Clinton's mistreatment of women dishonored his office. Ronald Reagan was a dangerous ideologue. I opposed each of them when they appeared to exceed their constitutional powers. But I never felt a sense of existential dread. I never sensed that the very existence of a tolerant democracy was in play."

A younger Trump, according to his first wife's divorce filings, kept and studied a book translating and annotating Adolf Hitler's pre-World War II speeches in a locked bedside cabinet, Neuborne noted. The English edition of *My New Order*, published in 1941, also had analyses of the speeches' impact on his era's press and politics. "Ugly and appalling as they are, those speeches are masterpieces of demagogic manipulation," Neuborne says.

"Watching Trump work his crowds, though, I see a dangerously manipulative narcissist unleashing the demagogic spells that he learned from studying Hitler's speeches - spells that he cannot control and that are capable of eroding the fabric of American democracy," Neuborne says. "You see, we've seen what these rhetorical techniques can do. Much of Trump's rhetoric - as a candidate and in office - mirrors the strategies, even the language, used by Adolf Hitler in the early 1930s to erode German democracy."

Many Americans may seize or condemn Neuborne's analysis, which has more than 20 major points of comparison. The author repeatedly says his goal is not "equating" the men - as "it trivializes Hitler's obscene crimes to compare them to Trump's often pathetic foibles."




Figure 7.18: Burt Neuborne's brilliant book on the current crisis of American democracy is a warning that we must take very seriously.



Indeed, the book has a larger frame: whether federal checks and balances - Congress, the Supreme Court, the Electoral College - can contain the havoc that Trump thrives on and the Republican Party at large has embraced. But the Trump-Hitler compilation is a stunning warning, because, as many Holocaust survivors have said, few Germans or Europeans expected what unfolded in the years after Hitler amassed power.

Here's how Neuborne introduces this section. Many recent presidents have been awful, "But then there was Donald Trump, the only president in recent American history to openly despise the twin ideals - individual dignity and fundamental equality - upon which the contemporary United States is built. When you confront the reality of a president like Trump, the state of both sets of brakes - internal [constitutional] and external [public resistance] - become hugely important because Donald Trump's political train runs on the most potent and dangerous fuel of all: a steady diet of fear, greed, loathing, lies, and envy. It's a toxic mixture that has destroyed democracies before, and can do so again.

"Give Trump credit," he continues. "He did his homework well and became the twenty-first-century master of divisive rhetoric. We're used to thinking of Hitler's Third Reich as the incomparably evil tyranny that it undoubtedly was. But Hitler didn't take power by force. He used a set of rhetorical tropes codified in Trump's bedside reading that persuaded enough Germans to welcome Hitler as a populist leader. The Nazis did not overthrow the Weimar Republic. It fell into their hands as the fruit of Hitler's satanic ability to mesmerize enough Germans to trade their birthright for a pottage of scapegoating, short-term economic gain, xenophobia, and racism. It could happen here."

Twenty points of similarity

Neuborne lists the following points of similarity between early Hitler and Trump:

1. Neither was elected by a majority. Trump lost the popular vote by 2.9 million votes, receiving votes by 25.3 percent of all eligible American voters. "That's just a little less than the percentage of the German electorate that turned to the Nazi Party in 1932-33," Neuborne writes. "Unlike the low turnouts in the United States, turnout in Weimar Germany averaged just over 80 percent of eligible voters." He continues, "Once installed as a minority chancellor in January 1933, Hitler set about demonizing his political opponents, and no one - not the vaunted, intellectually brilliant German judiciary; not the respected, well-trained German police; not the revered, aristocratic German military; not the widely admired, efficient German government bureaucracy; not the wealthy, immensely powerful leaders of German industry; and not the powerful center-right political leaders of the Reichstag - mounted a serious effort to stop him."

2. Both found direct communication channels to their base. By 1936's Olympics, Nazi narratives dominated German cultural and political life. "How on earth did Hitler pull it off? What satanic magic did Trump find in Hitler's speeches?" Neuborne asks. He addresses Hitler's extreme rhetoric soon enough, but notes that Hitler found a direct communication pathway - the Nazi Party gave out radios with only one channel, tuned to Hitler's voice, bypassing Germany's news media. Trump has an online equivalent.

"Donald Trump's tweets, often delivered between midnight and dawn, are the twenty-first century's technological embodiment of Hitler's free plastic radios," Neuborne says. "Trump's Twitter account, like Hitler's radios, enables a charismatic leader to establish and maintain a personal, unfiltered line of communication with an adoring political base of about 30-40 percent of the population, many (but not all) of whom are only too willing, even anxious, to swallow Trump's witches' brew of falsehoods, half-truths, personal invective, threats, xenophobia, national security scares, religious bigotry, white racism, exploitation of economic insecurity, and a never ending-search for scapegoats."

3. Both blame others and divide on racial lines. As Neuborne notes, "Hitler used his single-frequency radios to wax hysterical to his adoring base about his pathological racial and religious fantasies glorifying Aryans and demonizing Jews, blaming Jews (among other racial and religious scapegoats) for German society's ills." That is comparable to "Trump's tweets and public statements, whether dealing with black-led demonstrations against police violence, white-led racist mob violence, threats posed by undocumented aliens, immigration policy generally, protests by black and white professional athletes, college admission policies, hate speech, even response to hurricane damage in Puerto Rico," he says. Again and again, Trump uses "racially tinged messages calculated to divide whites from people of color."
4. Both relentlessly demonize opponents. "Hitler's radio harangues demonized his domestic political opponents, calling them parasites, criminals, cockroaches, and various categories of leftist scum," Neuborne notes. "Trump's tweets and speeches similarly demonize his political opponents. Trump talks about the country being 'infested' with dangerous aliens of color. He fantasizes about jailing Hillary Clinton, calls Mexicans rapists, refers to 'shithole countries,' degrades anyone who disagrees with him, and dreams of uprooting thousands of allegedly disloyal bureaucrats in the State Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, the FBI, and the CIA, who he calls 'the deep state' and who, he claims, are sabotaging American greatness."

5. They unceasingly attack objective truth. “Both Trump and Hitler maintained a relentless assault on the very idea of objective truth,” he continues. “Each began the assault by seeking to delegitimize the mainstream press. Hitler quickly coined the epithet *Lügenpresse* (literally ‘lying press’) to denigrate the mainstream press. Trump uses a paraphrase of Hitler’s lying press epithet - ‘fake news’ - cribbed, no doubt, from one of Hitler’s speeches. For Trump, the mainstream press is a ‘lying press’ that publishes ‘fake news.’” Hitler attacked his opponents as spreading false information to undermine his positions, Neuborne says, just as Trump has attacked “elites” for disseminating false news, “especially his possible links to the Kremlin.”
6. They relentlessly attack mainstream media. Trump’s assaults on the media echo Hitler’s, Neuborne says, noting that he “repeatedly attacks the ‘failing New York Times,’ leads crowds in chanting ‘CNN sucks,’ [and] is personally hostile to most reporters.” He cites the White House’s refusal to fly the flag at half-mast after the murder of five journalists in Annapolis in June 2018, Trump’s efforts to punish CNN by blocking a merger of its corporate parent, and trying to revoke federal Postal Service contracts held by Amazon, which was founded by Jeff Bezos, who also owns the Washington Post.
7. Their attacks on truth include science. Neuborne notes, “Both Trump and Hitler intensified their assault on objective truth by deriding scientific experts, especially academics who question Hitler’s views on race or Trump’s views on climate change, immigration, or economics. For both Trump and Hitler, the goal is (and was) to eviscerate the very idea of objective truth, turning everything into grist for a populist jury subject to manipulation by a master puppeteer. In both Trump’s and Hitler’s worlds, public opinion ultimately defines what is true and what is false.”
8. Their lies blur reality - and supporters spread them. “Trump’s pathological penchant for repeatedly lying about his behavior can only succeed in a world where his supporters feel free to embrace Trump’s ‘alternative facts’ and treat his hyperbolic exaggerations as the gospel truth,” Neuborne says. “Once Hitler had delegitimized the mainstream media by a series of systematic attacks on its integrity, he constructed a fawning alternative mass media designed to reinforce his direct radio messages and enhance his personal power. Trump is following the same path, simultaneously launching bitter attacks on the mainstream press while embracing the so-called alt-right media, co-opting both Sinclair Broadcasting and the Rupert Murdoch-owned Fox Broadcasting Company as, essentially, a Trump Broadcasting Network.”

9. Both orchestrated mass rallies to show status. "Once Hitler had cemented his personal communications link with his base via free radios and a fawning media and had badly eroded the idea of objective truth, he reinforced his emotional bond with his base by holding a series of carefully orchestrated mass meetings dedicated to cementing his status as a charismatic leader, or Führer," Neuborne writes. "The powerful personal bonds nurtured by Trump's tweets and Fox's fawning are also systematically reinforced by periodic, carefully orchestrated mass rallies (even going so far as to co-opt a Boy Scout Jamboree in 2017), reinforcing Trump's insatiable narcissism and his status as a charismatic leader."
10. They embrace extreme nationalism. "Hitler's strident appeals to the base invoked an extreme version of German nationalism, extolling a brilliant German past and promising to restore Germany to its rightful place as a preeminent nation," Neuborne says. "Trump echoes Hitler's jingoistic appeal to ultranationalist fervor, extolling American exceptionalism right down to the slogan 'Make America Great Again,' a paraphrase of Hitler's promise to restore German greatness."
11. Both made closing borders a centerpiece. "Hitler all but closed Germany's borders, freezing non-Aryan migration into the country and rendering it impossible for Germans to escape without official permission. Like Hitler, Trump has also made closed borders a centerpiece of his administration," Neuborne continues. "Hitler barred Jews. Trump bars Muslims and seekers of sanctuary from Central America. When the lower courts blocked Trump's Muslim travel ban, he unilaterally issued executive orders replacing it with a thinly disguised substitute that ultimately narrowly won Supreme Court approval under a theory of extreme deference to the president."
12. They embraced mass detention and deportations. "Hitler promised to make Germany free from Jews and Slavs. Trump promises to slow, stop, and even reverse the flow of non-white immigrants, substituting Muslims, Africans, Mexicans, and Central Americans of color for Jews and Slavs as scapegoats for the nation's ills. Trump's efforts to cast dragnets to arrest undocumented aliens where they work, live, and worship, followed by mass deportation... echo Hitler's promise to defend Germany's racial identity," he writes, also noting that Trump has "stooped to tearing children from their parents [as Nazis in World War II would do] to punish desperate efforts by migrants to find a better life."
13. Both used borders to protect selected industries. "Like Hitler, Trump seeks to use national borders to protect his favored national interests, threatening to ignite protectionist trade wars with Europe, China, and

Japan similar to the trade wars that, in earlier incarnations, helped to ignite World War I and World War II,” Neuborne writes. “Like Hitler, Trump aggressively uses our nation’s political and economic power to favor selected American corporate interests at the expense of foreign competitors and the environment, even at the price of international conflict, massive inefficiency, and irreversible pollution [climate change].”

14. They cemented their rule by enriching elites. “Hitler’s version of fascism shifted immense power - both political and financial - to the leaders of German industry. In fact, Hitler governed Germany largely through corporate executives,” he continues. “Trump has also presided over a massive empowerment - and enrichment - of corporate America. Under Trump, large corporations exercise immense political power while receiving huge economic windfalls and freedom from regulations designed to protect consumers and the labor force. Hitler despised the German labor movement, eventually destroying it and imprisoning its leaders. Trump also detests strong unions, seeking to undermine any effort to interfere with the ‘prerogatives of management.’”
15. Both rejected international norms. “Hitler’s foreign policy rejected international cooperation in favor of military and economic coercion, culminating in the annexation of the Sudetenland, the phony Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the horrors of global war,” Neuborne notes. “Like Hitler, Trump is deeply hostile to multinational cooperation, withdrawing from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Paris Agreement on climate change, and the nuclear agreement with Iran, threatening to withdraw from the North American Free Trade Agreement, abandoning our Kurdish allies in Syria...”
16. They attack domestic democratic processes. “Hitler attacked the legitimacy of democracy itself, purging the voting rolls, challenging the integrity of the electoral process, and questioning the ability of democratic government to solve Germany’s problems,” Neuborne notes. “Trump has also attacked the democratic process, declining to agree to be bound by the outcome of the 2016 elections when he thought he might lose, supporting the massive purge of the voting rolls allegedly designed to avoid (nonexistent) fraud, championing measures that make it harder to vote, tolerating - if not fomenting - massive Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election, encouraging mob violence at rallies, darkly hinting at violence if Democrats hold power, and constantly casting doubt on the legitimacy of elections unless he wins.”
17. Both attack the judiciary and rule of law. “Hitler politicized and eventually destroyed the vaunted German justice system. Trump also seeks to

turn the American justice system into his personal playground,” Neuborne writes. “Like Hitler, Trump threatens the judicially enforced rule of law, bitterly attacking American judges who rule against him, slyly praising Andrew Jackson for defying the Supreme Court, and abusing the pardon power by pardoning an Arizona sheriff found guilty of criminal contempt of court for disobeying federal court orders to cease violating the Constitution.”

18. Both glorify the military and demand loyalty oaths. “Like Hitler, Trump glorifies the military, staffing his administration with layers of retired generals (who eventually were fired or resigned), relaxing control over the use of lethal force by the military and the police, and demanding a massive increase in military spending,” Neuborne writes. Just as Hitler “imposed an oath of personal loyalty on all German judges” and demanded courts defer to him, “Trump’s already gotten enough deference from five Republican [Supreme Court] justices to uphold a largely Muslim travel ban that is the epitome of racial and religious bigotry.” Trump has also demanded loyalty oaths. “He fired James Comey, a Republican appointed in 2013 as FBI director by President Obama, for refusing to swear an oath of personal loyalty to the president; excoriated and then sacked Jeff Sessions, his handpicked attorney general, for failing to suppress the criminal investigation into... Trump’s possible collusion with Russia in influencing the 2016 elections; repeatedly threatened to dismiss Robert Mueller, the special counsel carrying out the investigation; and called again and again for the jailing of Hillary Clinton, his 2016 opponent, leading crowds in chants of ‘lock her up.’” A new chant, “send her back,” has since emerged at Trump rallies directed at non-white Democratic congresswomen.
19. They proclaim unchecked power. “Like Hitler, Trump has intensified a disturbing trend that predated his administration of governing unilaterally, largely through executive orders or proclamations,” Neuborne says, citing the Muslim travel ban, trade tariffs, unraveling of health and environmental safety nets, ban on transgender military service, and efforts to end President Obama’s protection for Dreamers. “Like Hitler, Trump claims the power to overrule Congress and govern all by himself. In 1933, Hitler used the pretext of the Reichstag fire to declare a national emergency and seize the power to govern unilaterally. The German judiciary did nothing to stop him. German democracy never recovered. When Congress refused to give Trump funds for his border wall even after he threw a tantrum and shut down the government, Trump, like Hitler, declared a phony national emergency and claimed the power to ignore Congress,” Neuborne continues. “Don’t count on the Supreme Court to stop him. Five justices gave the game away on the President’s unilateral travel ban.

They just might do the same thing on the border wall.” It did in late July, ruling that Trump could divert congressionally appropriated funds from the Pentagon budget - undermining constitutional separation of powers.

20. Both relegate women to subordinate roles. “Finally,” writes Neuborne, “Hitler propounded a misogynistic, stereotypical view of women, valuing them exclusively as wives and mothers while excluding them from full participation in German political and economic life. Trump may be the most openly misogynist figure ever to hold high public office in the United States, crassly treating women as sexual objects, using nondisclosure agreements and violating campaign finance laws to shield his sexual misbehavior from public knowledge, attacking women who come forward to accuse men of abusive behavior, undermining reproductive freedom, and opposing efforts by women to achieve economic equality.”

Suggestions for further reading

1. Geoff Harris. *The Dark Side of Europe: The Extreme Right Today*, Edinburgh University Press; New edition, (1994).
2. Luciano Cheles, Ronnie Ferguson, and Michalina Vaughan. *The Far Right in Western and Eastern Europe*, Longman Publishing Group; 2nd edition, (1995).
3. Herbert Kitschelt. *The Radical Right in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*, University of Michigan Press; Reprint edition, (1997).
4. Martin Schain, Aristide Zolberg, and Patrick Hossay, editors. *Shadows Over Europe: The Development and Impact of the Extreme Right in Western Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan; 1st edition, (2002).
5. Robert S. Griffin. *The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds: An Up-Close Portrait of White Nationalist William Pierce*, Authorhouse, (2001).
6. Jeffrey Kaplan and Tore Bjorgo. *Nation and Race: The Developing Euro-American Racist Subculture*, Northeastern University Press, (1998).
7. Mattias Gardell. *Gods of the Blood: The Pagan Revival and White Separatism*, Duke University Press, (2003)
8. Kathleen Blee. *Inside Organized Racism: Women in the Hate Movement*. Berkeley, California; London: University of California Press, (2002).

Chapter 8

PROGRESSIVES CAN SAVE AMERICA

8.1 Progressives from the 1960's can inspire us today

It is worthwhile today to remember the passion and dedication of the progressives of the 1960's. It was an era that saw the civil rights movement, protests against the Vietnam War, and the assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr., John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy. The brave resistance of American progressives of that time can inspire us today.

8.2 Woodstock

Wikipedia states that “Woodstock was a music festival held on a dairy farm in the Catskill Mountains, northwest of New York City, between August 15-18, 1969, which attracted an audience of more than 400,000.

“Billed as ‘An Aquarian Exposition: 3 Days of Peace & Music’, it was held at Max Yasgur’s 600-acre dairy farm near White Lake in Bethel, New York, 43 miles (70 km) southwest of Woodstock.

“Over the sometimes rainy weekend, 32 acts performed outdoors. It is widely regarded as a pivotal moment in popular music history, as well as the definitive nexus for the larger counterculture generation. Rolling Stone listed it as number 19 of the 50 Moments That Changed the History of Rock and Roll.

“The event was captured in the Academy Award-winning 1970 documentary movie *Woodstock*, an accompanying soundtrack album, and Joni Mitchell’s song ‘Woodstock’, which commemorated the event and became a major hit for both Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young and Matthews Southern Comfort. Joni Mitchell said, ‘Woodstock was a spark of beauty’ where half-a-million kids ‘saw that they were part of a greater organism’. In 2017, the festival site was listed on the National Register of Historic Places...

“There was worldwide media interest in the 40th anniversary of Woodstock in 2009. A number of activities to commemorate the festival took place around the world. On August



Figure 8.1: **The Woodstock Festival, 1969: “Give peace a chance!”**. An estimated 400,000 people attended the event.

15, at the Bethel Woods Center for the Arts overlooking the original site, the largest assembly of Woodstock performing alumni since the original 1969 festival performed in an eight-hour concert in front of a sold-out crowd...

“Another event occurred in Hawkhurst, Kent (UK), at a Summer of Love party, with acts including two of the participants at the original Woodstock, Barry Melton of Country Joe and the Fish and Robin Williamson of The Incredible String Band, plus Santana and Grateful Dead cover bands. On August 14 and 15, 2009, a 40th anniversary tribute concert was held in Woodstock, Illinois, and was the only festival to receive the official blessing of the ‘Father of Woodstock’, Artie Kornfeld. Kornfeld later made an appearance in Woodstock with the event’s promoters.

“Also in 2009, Michael Lang and Holly George-Warren published *The Road to Woodstock*, which describes Lang’s involvement in the creation of the Woodstock Music & Arts Festival, and includes personal stories and quotes from central figures involved in the event...

“Reports in late 2018 confirmed the plans for a 50th Anniversary event on the original site to be operated by the Bethel Woods Centre for the Arts. The scheduled date for the *Bethel Woods Music and Culture Festival: Celebrating the golden anniversary at the historic site of the 1969 Woodstock festival* was August 16-18 2019. Partners in the event are Live Nation and INVNT. Bethel Woods described the festival as a ‘pan-generational music, culture and community event’.”




Figure 8.2: The Woodstock logo.



Figure 8.3: **Yes!.**



Figure 8.4: **The 50th anniversary event.**

8.3 Joan Baez

Joan Baez is an American folk-singer and activist who has been highly influential since her breakthrough 60 years ago. Her father was a Mexican-American physicist who is credited with inventing the X-ray microscope. While her father was working at MIT, Joan Baez gave her first concert in 1958 at Club 47 in Cambridge. In 1959, Bob Gibson invited Baez to perform at the Newport Folk Festival, where her astonishingly clear and expressive voice produced a sensation. Joan Baez promoted the career of Bob Dylan, at a time when she was a star while he was unknown, by inviting him to join her on the stage for duets. Wholeheartedly engaged in many anti-war, human rights and environmental causes, including opposition to the Viet Nam and Iraq wars, she regards her activism as more important than her singing. In 2011, Amnesty International introduced the yearly Joan Baez Award for outstanding service to human rights, giving the first award to Baez herself.

A few things that Joan Baez said

I would say that I'm a nonviolent soldier. In place of weapons of violence, you have to use your mind, your heart, your sense of humor, every faculty available to you...because no one has the right to take the life of another human being.

Action is the antidote to despair.

You don't get to choose how you're going to die, or when. You can only decide how you're going to live. Now.

I went to jail for 11 days for disturbing the peace; I was trying to disturb the war.

I think music has the power to transform people, and in doing so, it has the power to transform situations - some large and some small.

To sing is to love and affirm, to fly and to soar, to coast into the hearts of the people who listen to tell them that life is to live, that love is there, that nothing is a promise, but that beauty exists, and must be hunted for and found.

The easiest kind of relationship for me is with ten thousand people. The hardest is with one.

I have hope in people, in individuals. Because you don't know what's going to rise from the ruins.

As long as one keeps searching, the answers will come.

Only you and I can help the sun rise each coming morning. If we don't, it may drench itself out in sorrow.

All of us are survivors, but how many of us transcend survival?

If you don't have music, you have silence. There is power in both.

To sing is to praise God and the daffodils, and to praise God is to thank Him, in every note within my small range, and every color in the tones of my voice, with every look into the eyes of my audience, to thank Him. Thank you, God, for letting me be born, for giving me eyes to see the daffodils lean in the wind, all my brothers, all my sisters, for giving me ears to hear crying, legs to come running, hands to smooth damp hair, a voice to laugh with and to sing with...to sing to you and the daffodils.

The point on nonviolence is to build a floor, a strong new floor, beneath which we can no longer sink.

There's a consensus out that it's OK to kill when your government decides who to kill. If you kill inside the country you get in trouble. If you kill outside the country, right time, right season, latest enemy, you get a medal.

If you're going to sing meaningful songs, you have to be committed to living a life that backs that up.

Instead of getting hard ourselves and trying to compete, women should try and give their best qualities to men - bring them softness, teach them how to cry.

We're not really pacifists, we're nonviolent soldiers.

If it's natural to kill, how come men have to go into training to learn how?

If people have to put labels on me, I'd prefer the first label to be human being, the second label to be pacifist, and the third to be folk singer.

You may not know it, but at the far end of despair, there is a white clearing where one is almost happy.

I don't think of myself as a symbol of the sixties, but I do think of myself as a symbol of following through on your beliefs.



Figure 8.5: Joan Baez (born 1941) on the 1962 cover of Time Magazine.



What have they done to the rain?

Just a little rain falling all around
The grass lifts its head to the heavenly sound
Just a little rain, just a little rain
What have they done to the rain
Just a little boy standing in the rain
The gentle rain that falls for years
And the grass is gone, the boy disappears
And rain keeps falling like helpless tears
And what have they done to the rain
Just a little breeze out of the sky
The leaves nod their head as the breeze blows by
Just a little breeze with some smoke in its eye
What have they done to the rain

Just a little boy standing in the rain
The gentle rain that falls for years
And the grass is gone, the boy disappears
And rain keeps falling like helpless tears
And what have they done to the rain
What have they done to the rain

We shall overcome

We shall overcome,
We shall overcome,
We shall overcome, some day.

Oh, deep in my heart,
I do believe
We shall overcome, some day.

We'll walk hand in hand,
We'll walk hand in hand,
We'll walk hand in hand, some day.

Oh, deep in my heart,
I do believe
We'll walk hand in hand, some day.

We shall live in peace,

We shall live in peace,
We shall live in peace, some day.

Oh, deep in my heart,
I do believe
We shall live in peace, some day.

We shall all be free,
We shall all be free,
We shall all be free, some day.

Oh, deep in my heart,
I do believe
We shall all be free, some day.

We are not afraid,
We are not afraid,
We are not afraid, today.

Oh, deep in my heart,
I do believe
We are not afraid, today.

We shall overcome,
We shall overcome,
We shall overcome, some day.

Oh, deep in my heart,
I do believe
We shall overcome, some day.

8.4 Bob Dylan

An outstanding influence on music, poetry and the anti-war movement over six decades, Bob Dylan was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2016.

Bob Dylan was born in 1941 into a Jewish immigrant family named Zimmerman. He later changed his name to Dylan because of his admiration for the Welsh poet, Dylan Thomas. As a highschool student Bob Dylan initially formed a rock and roll band, but later realized that folk music was much more meaningful. Explaining this change, he said “The thing about rock’n’roll is that for me anyway it wasn’t enough... There were great catch-phrases and driving pulse rhythms... but the songs weren’t serious or didn’t reflect

life in a realistic way. I knew that when I got into folk music, it was more of a serious type of thing. The songs are filled with more despair, more sadness, more triumph, more faith in the supernatural, much deeper feelings.”

Bob Dylan greatly admired folk singer Woodie Guthrie. Describing Guthrie’s influence, he wrote: “The songs themselves had the infinite sweep of humanity in them... [He] was the true voice of the American spirit. I said to myself I was going to be Guthrie’s greatest disciple.”

Wikipedia states that “Many early songs reached the public through more palatable versions by other performers, such as Joan Baez, who became Dylan’s advocate as well as his lover. Baez was influential in bringing Dylan to prominence by recording several of his early songs and inviting him on stage during her concerts. ‘It didn’t take long before people got it, that he was pretty damned special,’ says Baez.”

Here are a few things that Bob Dylan said:

Behind every beautiful thing, there’s some kind of pain.

I accept chaos, I’m not sure whether it accepts me.

Don’t criticize what you can’t understand.

Sometimes it’s not enough to know what things mean, sometimes you have to know what things don’t mean.

I think women rule the world and that no man has ever done anything that a woman either hasn’t allowed him to do or encouraged him to do.

People seldom do what they believe in. They do what is convenient, then repent.

Gonna change my way of thinking, make myself a different set of rules. Gonna put my good foot forward and stop being influenced by fools.

When you’ve got nothing, you’ve got nothing to lose.

You can never be wise and be in love at the same time.

When you feel in your gut what you are and then dynamically pursue it - don’t back down and don’t give up - then you’re going to mystify a lot of folks.

It frightens me, the awful truth, of how sweet life can be...

Blowin' in the wind

How many roads must a man walk down
Before you call him a man?
How many seas must a white dove sail
Before she sleeps in the sand?
Yes, and how many times must the cannonballs fly
Before they're forever banned?

The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind
The answer is blowin' in the wind

Yes, and how many years can a mountain exist
Before it's washed to the sea?
Yes, and how many years can some people exist
Before they're allowed to be free?
Yes, and how many times can a man turn his head
And pretend that he just doesn't see?

The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind
The answer is blowin' in the wind

Yes, and how many times must a man look up
Before he can see the sky?
Yes, and how many ears must one man have
Before he can hear people cry?
Yes, and how many deaths will it take 'til he knows
That too many people have died?

The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind
The answer is blowin' in the wind



Figure 8.6: One of Bob Dylan's paintings



Figure 8.7: Another Dylan painting. His work has been exhibited by major museums.

8.5 Pete Seeger

Here are a few things that Pete Seeger said:

Do you know the difference between education and experience? Education is when you read the fine print; experience is what you get when you don't.

Any darn fool can make something complex; it takes a genius to make something simple.

If it can't be reduced, reused, repaired, rebuilt, refurbished, refinished, resold, recycled or composted, then it should be restricted, redesigned or removed from production.

Participation - that's what's gonna save the human race.

Well, normally I'm against big things. I think the world is going to be saved by millions of small things. Too many things can go wrong when they get big.

Once upon a time, wasn't singing a part of everyday life as much as talking, physical exercise, and religion? Our distant ancestors, wherever they were in this world, sang while pounding grain, paddling canoes, or walking long journeys. Can we begin to make our lives once more all of a piece? Finding the right songs and singing them over and over is a way to start. And when one person taps out a beat, while another leads into the melody, or when three people discover a harmony they never knew existed, or a crowd joins in on a chorus as though to raise the ceiling a few feet higher, then they also know there is hope for the world.

I've never sung anywhere without giving the people listening to me a chance to join in - as a kid, as a lefty, as a man touring the U.S.A. and the world, as an oldster. I guess it's kind of a religion with me. Participation. That's what's going to save the human race.

It's a very important thing to learn to talk to people you disagree with.

This banjo surrounds hate and forces it to surrender.

Singing with children in the schools has been the most rewarding experience of my life.

The key to the future of the world, is finding the optimistic stories and letting them be known.

The nice thing about poetry is that you're always stretching the definitions of words. Lawyers and scientists and scholars of one sort or another try to restrict the definitions, hoping that they can prevent people from fooling each other. But that doesn't stop people from lying.

Cezanne painted a red barn by painting it ten shades of color: purple to yellow. And he got a red barn. Similarly, a poet will describe things many different ways, circling around it, to get to the truth.

My father also had a nice little simile. He said, "The truth is a rabbit in a bramble patch. And you can't lay your hand on it. All you do is circle around and point, and say, 'It's in there somewhere'."

Keep your sense of humor. There is a 50-50 chance the world can be saved. You - yes you - might be the grain of sand that tips the scales the right way.

The world is like a seesaw out of balance: on one side is a box of big rocks, tilting it its way. On the other side is a box, and a bunch of us with teaspoons, adding a little sand at a time. One day, all of our teaspoons will add up, and the whole thing will tip, and people will say, 'How did it happen so fast?'

Our technology and our economic system seem to produce the present bad situation: millions of people feel themselves poor and powerless; millions feel that music is something to be made only by experts.

It all boils down to what I would most like to do as a musician. Put songs on people's lips instead of just in their ears.

Where have all the flowers gone?

Where have all the flowers men gone,
Long time passing,
Where have all the flowers men gone,
Long time ago,
Where have all the flowers men gone,
Young girls picked them every one,
When will they ever learn?
When will they ever learn?

Where have all the young girls gone,
Long time passing,
Where have all the young girls gone,
Long time ago,

Where have all the young girls gone,
Gone to husbands every one,
When will they ever learn?
When will they ever learn?

Where have all the young men gone,
Long time passing,
Where have all the young men gone,
Long time ago,
Where have all the young men gone,
Gone to soldiers every one,
When will they ever learn?
When will they ever learn?

Where have all the soldiers gone,
Long time passing,
Where have all the soldiers gone,
Long time ago,
Where have all the soldiers gone,
They've gone to graveyards every one,
When will they ever learn?
When will they ever learn?

Where have all the graveyards gone,
Long time passing,
Where have all the graveyards gone,
Long time ago,
Where have all the graveyards gone,
Gone to flowers every one,
When will we ever learn?
When will we ever learn?

What did you learn in school today?

What did you learn in school today,
Dear little boy of mine?
What did you learn in school today,
Dear little boy of mine?

I learned that Washington never told a lie.
I learned that soldiers seldom die.
I learned that everybody's free,

And that's what the teacher said to me.

I learned our Government must be strong;
It's always right and never wrong;
Our leaders are the finest men
And we elect them again and again.

I learned that war is not so bad;
I learned about the great ones we have had;
We fought in Germany and in France
And someday I might get my chance.

That's what I learned in school today,
That's what I learned in school.

Die gedanken sind frei

Die gedanken sind frei
My thoughts freely flower
Die gedanken sind frei
My thoughts give me power
No scholar can map them
No hunter can trap them
No man can deny
Die gedanken sind frei

I think as I please
And this gives me pleasure
My conscience decrees
This right I must treasure
My thoughts will not cater
To duke or dictator
No man can deny
Die gedanken sind frei

Tyrants can take me
And throw me in prison
My thoughts will burst forth
Like blossoms in season
Foundations may crumble
And structures may tumble
But free men shall cry



Figure 8.8: Pete Seeger entertaining Eleanor Roosevelt (center), honored guest at a racially integrated Valentine's Day party marking the opening of a Canteen of the United Federal Labor, CIO, in then-segregated Washington, D.C., 1944.

Die gedanken sind frei

We will love, or we will perish

We will love or we will perish

We will learn the rainbow to cherish

Dare to struggle, dare to danger

Dare to touch the hand of a stranger



Figure 8.9: Pete Seeger in 1979.



Figure 8.10: Pete Seeger at the Ckewwater Festival in June, 2007.



Figure 8.11: Seeger at 86 on the cover of Sing Out! (Summer 2005), a magazine he helped found in 1950.

8.6 Protests against the Vietnam War

An excerpt from Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Riverside Church speech

This I believe to be the privilege and the burden of all of us who deem ourselves bound by allegiances and loyalties which are broader and deeper than nationalism and which go beyond our nation's self-defined goals and positions. We are called to speak for the weak, for the voiceless, for the victims of our nation and for those it calls "enemy," for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our brothers.

And as I ponder the madness of Vietnam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond in compassion, my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the ideologies of the Liberation Front, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them, too, because it is clear to me that there will be no meaningful solution there until some attempt is made to know them and hear their broken cries.

They must see Americans as strange liberators. The Vietnamese people proclaimed their own independence in 1954 – in 1945 rather – after a combined French and Japanese occupation and before the communist revolution in China. They were led by Ho Chi Minh. Even though they quoted the American Declaration of Independence in their own document of freedom, we refused to recognize them. Instead, we decided to support France in its reconquest of her former colony. Our government felt then that the Vietnamese people were not ready for independence, and we again fell victim to the deadly Western arrogance that has poisoned the international atmosphere for so long. With that tragic decision we rejected a revolutionary government seeking self-determination and a government that had been established not by China – for whom the Vietnamese have no great love – but by clearly indigenous forces that included some communists. For the peasants this new government meant real land reform, one of the most important needs in their lives.

For nine years following 1945 we denied the people of Vietnam the right of independence. For nine years we vigorously supported the French in their abortive effort to recolonize Vietnam. Before the end of the war we were meeting eighty percent of the French war costs. Even before the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu, they began to despair of their reckless action, but we did not. We encouraged them with our huge financial and military supplies to continue the war even after they had lost the will. Soon we would be paying almost the full costs of this tragic attempt at recolonization.

After the French were defeated, it looked as if independence and land reform would come again through the Geneva Agreement. But instead there

came the United States, determined that Ho should not unify the temporarily divided nation, and the peasants watched again as we supported one of the most vicious modern dictators, our chosen man, Premier Diem. The peasants watched and cringed as Diem ruthlessly rooted out all opposition, supported their extortionist landlords, and refused even to discuss reunification with the North. The peasants watched as all this was presided over by United States' influence and then by increasing numbers of United States troops who came to help quell the insurgency that Diem's methods had aroused. When Diem was overthrown they may have been happy, but the long line of military dictators seemed to offer no real change, especially in terms of their need for land and peace.

The only change came from America, as we increased our troop commitments in support of governments which were singularly corrupt, inept, and without popular support. All the while the people read our leaflets and received the regular promises of peace and democracy and land reform. Now they languish under our bombs and consider us, not their fellow Vietnamese, the real enemy. They move sadly and apathetically as we herd them off the land of their fathers into concentration camps where minimal social needs are rarely met. They know they must move on or be destroyed by our bombs.

So they go, primarily women and children and the aged. They watch as we poison their water, as we kill a million acres of their crops. They must weep as the bulldozers roar through their areas preparing to destroy the precious trees. They wander into the hospitals with at least twenty casualties from American firepower for one Vietcong-inflicted injury. So far we may have killed a million of them, mostly children. They wander into the towns and see thousands of the children, homeless, without clothes, running in packs on the streets like animals. They see the children degraded by our soldiers as they beg for food. They see the children selling their sisters to our soldiers, soliciting for their mothers.

What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Vietnam we claim to be building? Is it among these voiceless ones?

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in the crushing – in the crushing of the nation's only non-Communist revolutionary political force, the unified Buddhist Church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men.

Now there is little left to build on, save bitterness. Soon, the only solid – solid physical foundations remaining will be found at our military bases and

in the concrete of the concentration camps we call "fortified hamlets." The peasants may well wonder if we plan to build our new Vietnam on such grounds as these. Could we blame them for such thoughts? We must speak for them and raise the questions they cannot raise. These, too, are our brothers.

Perhaps a more difficult but no less necessary task is to speak for those who have been designated as our enemies. What of the National Liberation Front, that strangely anonymous group we call "VC" or "communists"? What must they think of the United States of America when they realize that we permitted the repression and cruelty of Diem, which helped to bring them into being as a resistance group in the South? What do they think of our condoning the violence which led to their own taking up of arms? How can they believe in our integrity when now we speak of "aggression from the North" as if there were nothing more essential to the war? How can they trust us when now we charge them with violence after the murderous reign of Diem and charge them with violence while we pour every new weapon of death into their land? Surely we must understand their feelings, even if we do not condone their actions. Surely we must see that the men we supported pressed them to their violence. Surely we must see that our own computerized plans of destruction simply dwarf their greatest acts.

How do they judge us when our officials know that their membership is less than twenty-five percent communist, and yet insist on giving them the blanket name? What must they be thinking when they know that we are aware of their control of major sections of Vietnam, and yet we appear ready to allow national elections in which this highly organized political parallel government will not have a part? They ask how we can speak of free elections when the Saigon press is censored and controlled by the military junta. And they are surely right to wonder what kind of new government we plan to help form without them, the only party in real touch with the peasants. They question our political goals and they deny the reality of a peace settlement from which they will be excluded. Their questions are frighteningly relevant. Is our nation planning to build on political myth again, and then shore it up upon the power of new violence?

Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and nonviolence, when it helps us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see the basic weaknesses of our own condition, and if we are mature, we may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition.

So, too, with Hanoi. In the North, where our bombs now pummel the land, and our mines endanger the waterways, we are met by a deep but understandable mistrust. To speak for them is to explain this lack of confidence in Western words, and especially their distrust of American intentions now. In Hanoi are the men who led the nation to independence against the Japanese and the French, the men who sought membership in the French Commonwealth

and were betrayed by the weakness of Paris and the willfulness of the colonial armies. It was they who led a second struggle against French domination at tremendous costs, and then were persuaded to give up the land they controlled between the thirteenth and seventeenth parallel as a temporary measure at Geneva. After 1954 they watched us conspire with Diem to prevent elections which could have surely brought Ho Chi Minh to power over a united Vietnam, and they realized they had been betrayed again. When we ask why they do not leap to negotiate, these things must be remembered.

Also, it must be clear that the leaders of Hanoi considered the presence of American troops in support of the Diem regime to have been the initial military breach of the Geneva Agreement concerning foreign troops. They remind us that they did not begin to send troops in large numbers and even supplies into the South until American forces had moved into the tens of thousands.

Hanoi remembers how our leaders refused to tell us the truth about the earlier North Vietnamese overtures for peace, how the president claimed that none existed when they had clearly been made. Ho Chi Minh has watched as America has spoken of peace and built up its forces, and now he has surely heard the increasing international rumors of American plans for an invasion of the North. He knows the bombing and shelling and mining we are doing are part of traditional pre-invasion strategy. Perhaps only his sense of humor and of irony can save him when he hears the most powerful nation of the world speaking of aggression as it drops thousands of bombs on a poor, weak nation more than eight hundred – rather, eight thousand miles away from its shores.

At this point I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless in Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called "enemy," I am as deeply concerned about our own troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved. Before long they must know that their government has sent them into a struggle among Vietnamese, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy, and the secure, while we create a hell for the poor.

Somehow this madness must cease. We must stop now. I speak as a child of God and brother to the suffering poor of Vietnam. I speak for those whose land is being laid waste, whose homes are being destroyed, whose culture is being subverted. I speak of the – for the poor of America who are paying the double price of smashed hopes at home, and death and corruption in Vietnam. I speak as a citizen of the world, for the world as it stands aghast at the path we have taken. I speak as one who loves America, to the leaders of our own nation: The great initiative in this war is ours; the initiative to stop it must be ours.

This is the message of the great Buddhist leaders of Vietnam. Recently one of them wrote these words, and I quote: "Each day the war goes on the hatred increases in the heart of the Vietnamese and in the hearts of those of humanitarian instinct. The Americans are forcing even their friends into becoming their enemies. It is curious that the Americans, who calculate so carefully on the possibilities of military victory, do not realize that in the process they are incurring deep psychological and political defeat. The image of America will never again be the image of revolution, freedom, and democracy, but the image of violence and militarism".

If we continue, there will be no doubt in my mind and in the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. If we do not stop our war against the people of Vietnam immediately, the world will be left with no other alternative than to see this as some horrible, clumsy, and deadly game we have decided to play. The world now demands a maturity of America that we may not be able to achieve. It demands that we admit that we have been wrong from the beginning of our adventure in Vietnam, that we have been detrimental to the life of the Vietnamese people. The situation is one in which we must be ready to turn sharply from our present ways. In order to atone for our sins and errors in Vietnam, we should take the initiative in bringing a halt to this tragic war.

I would like to suggest five concrete things that our government should do [immediately] to begin the long and difficult process of extricating ourselves from this nightmarish conflict:

Number one: End all bombing in North and South Vietnam.

Number two: Declare a unilateral cease-fire in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiation.

Three: Take immediate steps to prevent other battlegrounds in Southeast Asia by curtailing our military buildup in Thailand and our interference in Laos.

Four: Realistically accept the fact that the National Liberation Front has substantial support in South Vietnam and must thereby play a role in any meaningful negotiations and any future Vietnam government.

Five: Set a date that we will remove all foreign troops from Vietnam in accordance with the 1954 Geneva Agreement...

In 1957, a sensitive American official overseas said that it seemed to him that our nation was on the wrong side of a world revolution. During the past ten years, we have seen emerge a pattern of suppression which has now justified the presence of U.S. military advisors in Venezuela. This need to maintain social stability for our investments accounts for the counterrevolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Cambodia and why American napalm and Green Beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru.

It is with such activity in mind that the words of the late John F. Kennedy

come back to haunt us. Five years ago he said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." Increasingly, by choice or by accident, this is the role our nation has taken, the role of those who make peaceful revolution impossible by refusing to give up the privileges and the pleasures that come from the immense profits of overseas investments. I am convinced that if we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin...we must rapidly begin the shift from a thing-oriented society to a person-oriented society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights, are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, extreme materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

A true revolution of values will soon cause us to question the fairness and justice of many of our past and present policies. On the one hand, we are called to play the Good Samaritan on life's roadside, but that will be only an initial act. One day we must come to see that the whole Jericho Road must be transformed so that men and women will not be constantly beaten and robbed as they make their journey on life's highway. True compassion is more than flinging a coin to a beggar. It comes to see that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring.

A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa, and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the countries, and say, "This is not just." It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of South America and say, "This is not just." The Western arrogance of feeling that it has everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just.

A true revolution of values will lay hand on the world order and say of war, "This way of settling differences is not just." This business of burning human beings with napalm, of filling our nation's homes with orphans and widows, of injecting poisonous drugs of hate into the veins of peoples normally humane, of sending men home from dark and bloody battlefields physically handicapped and psychologically deranged, cannot be reconciled with wisdom, justice, and love. A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.



Figure 8.12: Protests against the Vietnam War in Washington, D.C., on October 21, 1967.



Figure 8.13: U.S. Marshals dragging away a Vietnam War protester in Washington, D.C., 1967.



Figure 8.14: John Filo's Pulitzer Prize-winning photograph of Mary Ann Vecchio kneeling over the body of Jeffrey Miller minutes after he was fatally shot by the Ohio National Guard.



Figure 8.15: Berkeley anti-war protests.



Figure 8.16: Photo taken by United States Army photographer Ronald L. Haeberle on March 16, 1968, in the aftermath of the My Lai Massacre showing mostly women and children dead on a road.



Figure 8.17: Frightened children fleeing from bombs in Vietnam.

8.7 Progressive Democrats versus the DNC and Nancy Pelosi

One aspect in the bitter split in public opinion in the United States is the split in the Democratic Party between progressives, such as Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren or Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, and what might be called Corporate Democrats, such as Nancy Pelosi, Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden, as well as the Democratic National Committee.

In the 2016 presidential election, the immensely popular Senator Bernie Sanders would have easily defeated Donald Trump. However, the DNC actively sabotaged his campaign, and the slavish corporate-controlled mass media did the same. The result was that the Democratic Party ran Hillary Clinton as their presidential candidate, to the outrage and disgust of young progressive voters. Hillary Clinton was seen by the progressives as having blood on her hands from her participation as Secretary of State in immoral and illegal US wars. She was also seen as having close ties with both Wall Street and the Israel Lobby. The result was that the progressives stayed away from the polls in disillusion and disgust, and Donald Trump won narrowly, losing the popular vote, but winning the electoral vote.

The Democratic Party bosses seem about to repeat this mistake in 2020, sabotaging Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren, and pushing for the nomination of Joe Biden, a candidate closely analogous to Hillary Clinton. Biden, too, has blood on his hands. Although he now denies it, records show that he supported the Iraq War. Thus, dishonesty must be added to his other faults. Biden, too, has close connections with both Wall Street and the Israel Lobby. Corporations love him. Progressives hate him. Biden would be better than Trump, if elected, but that is faint praise indeed, since almost anyone would be better than Trump. The Democrats risk repeating the 2016 election disaster, if Biden is their candidate. Only progressives can win.

Here is a quotation from a recent article by Chris Hedges¹:

The oligarchs, who spent \$1 billion in 2016 to deny Sanders the Democratic Party nomination and try to put Hillary Clinton in the White House, learned nothing from the debacle. If they can't shove Joe Biden down our throats, how about Pete Buttigieg or Michael Bloomberg? And should Warren or Sanders miraculously become the Democratic candidate, which the oligarchs are working hard to prevent, they will reluctantly back Trump. Trump may be vulgar, corrupt and inept, he may have turned the United States into an international pariah, but he slavishly serves the financial interests of the oligarchs.

And here is a quotation from a recent article by Eion Higgins and John Queally²

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez will endorse Sen. Bernie Sanders for president, The Washington Post reported Tuesday night, a political coup for the Vermont senator as he looks to increase his standing in the polls for the 2020

¹<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/52525.htm>

²<https://truthout.org/articles/ocasio-cortez-to-endorse-bernie-sanders-for-president/>

Democratic presidential nomination...

Her backing was a sought-after prize in the Democratic primary, and it was widely assumed that she would endorse either Sanders or Warren, the most liberal figures in the contest...

Reps. Ilhan Omar (D-Minn.) and Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.) will also endorse Sanders, reported CNN's Greg Krieg.

"Bernie is leading a working class movement to defeat Donald Trump that transcends generation, ethnicity and geography," Omar said in a statement, adding, "it's why I believe Bernie Sanders is the best candidate to take on Donald Trump in 2020."

"Ilhan is a leader of strength and courage," said Sanders. "She will not back down from a fight with billionaires and the world's most powerful corporations to transform our country so it works for all of us. I'm proud of what we've done in Congress, and together we will build a multiracial working class coalition to win the White House."

8.8 Elizabeth Warren

Some things that Elizabeth Warren has said

[On climate change] I don't accept the Republicans' argument that boldly addressing climate change and having the world's strongest economy are incompatible. I believe that the exact opposite of that is true. Tackling our climate challenges will provide us with the opportunity to grow our economy, protect public health, and propel the United States to become the world leader in green innovation in the 21st century. We can address climate change and strengthen our economy by making major upgrades to our crumbling infrastructure, building more resiliency along our coasts and rivers, constructing more renewable energy, and promoting policies that will spur new, innovative research. These investments will protect our planet and create good jobs, with living wages, strong benefits, and safe working conditions.

[On cutting the Pentagon budget] Let's cut our bloated defense budget. The United States will spend more than \$700 billion on defense this year alone. That is more than President Ronald Reagan spent during the Cold War. It's more than the federal government spends on education, medical research, border security, housing, the FBI, disaster relief, the State Department, foreign aid—everything else in the discretionary budget put together. This is unsustainable. If more money for the Pentagon could solve our security challenges, we would have solved them by now.

Big corporations have money and power to make sure every rule breaks their way; people have voices and votes to push back.




Figure 8.18: **Senator Elizabeth Warren**

There is nobody in this country who got rich on his own. Nobody. ... You moved your goods to market on the roads the rest of us paid for; you hired workers the rest of us paid to educate; you were safe in your factory because of police forces and fire forces that the rest of us paid for. You didn't have to worry that marauding bands would come and seize everything at your factory, and hire someone to protect against this, because of the work the rest of us did. Now look, you built a factory and it turned into something terrific, or a great idea. God bless. Keep a big hunk of it. But part of the underlying social contract is, you take a hunk of that and pay forward for the next kid who comes along.

Rising student-loan debt is an economic emergency... We got into this crisis because state governments and the federal government decided that instead of treating higher education like our public school system - free and accessible to all Americans - they'd rather cut taxes for billionaires and giant corporations and offload the cost of higher education onto students and their families. The student debt crisis is the direct result of this failed experiment. [...] That's why I'm calling for something truly transformational - the cancellation of up to \$50,000 in student loan debt for 42 million Americans

[On Donald Trump] Donald Trump identifies a real problem in America, and that is a lot of folks are hurting. And then he takes a turn and says, "it's the fault of those people, people who don't look like you, people who don't sound like you, people who don't worship like you, people who are not the same color, who didn't speak the same language." What he wants to do is set working people against working people, black working people against white working people.

You can't predict it all. People will tell you to plan things out as best you can. They will tell you to focus. They will tell you to follow your dreams. They will all be right.

America had been a boom-and-bust economy going into the Great Depression - just over and over and over, fortunes were wiped out, ordinary families were crushed under it.

How do you think we build a future? I think we build it by investing in our kids and investing in education.

Americans are fighters. We're tough, resourceful and creative, and if we have the chance to fight on a level playing field, where everyone pays a fair share and everyone has a real shot, then no one - no one can stop us.

The word's out: I'm a woman, and I'm going to have trouble backing off on that. I am what I am. I'll go out and talk to people about what's happening to their families, and when I do that, I'm a mother. I'm a grandmother.

In the 1960s, a minimum wage job would keep a family of three afloat.

What I've learned is that real change is very, very hard. But I've also learned that change is possible - if you fight for it.

A good education is a foundation for a better future.

8.9 Bernie Sanders

Some quotations from Bernie Sanders' *Our Revolution*

As President Franklin Delano Roosevelt reminded us: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have little".

This campaign was never just about electing a president of the United States - as enormously important as that was. This campaign was about transforming America. It was about the understanding that real change never takes place from the top on down. It always takes place from the bottom on up. It takes place when ordinary people, by the millions, are prepared to stand up and fight for justice.

Republicans have cultivated, into a fine art, the ability to divide people up by race, gender, nationality, or sexual orientation. That's what they do. That is the essence of their politics. They get one group to fight another group while their wealthy friends and campaign contributors get richer and laugh all the way to the bank.

You can't have it all. You can't get huge tax breaks while children in this country go hungry. You can't continue sending our jobs to China while millions are looking for work. You can't hide your profits in the Cayman Islands and other tax havens while there are massive unmet needs on every corner of this nation. Your greed has got to end. You cannot take advantage of all the benefits of America if you refuse to accept your responsibilities.

Democracy is about one person, one vote. It's about all of us coming together to determine the future of our country. It is not about a handful of billionaires buying elections, or governors suppressing the vote by denying poor people or



Figure 8.19: **Senator Bernie Sanders in 2019.**

people of color the right to vote. Our job is to stand together to defeat the drift toward oligarchy and create a vibrant democracy.

Bill McKibben named his climate change advocacy group 350.org, because 350 ppm of atmospheric carbon dioxide is what Dr. James Hansen, former head of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies and one of the most respected climatologists in the world, says is the maximum level to “preserve a planet similar to that on which civilization developed and to which life on Earth is adapted.” Tragically, we have now exceeded 400 ppm.

If we are going to create a financial system that works for all Americans, we have got to stop financial institutions from ripping off the American people by charging sky-high interest rates and outrageous fees. In my view, it is unacceptable that Americans are paying a \$4 or \$5 fee each time they go to the ATM. It is unacceptable that millions of Americans are paying credit card interest rates of 20 or 30 percent. The Bible has a term for this practice. It’s called usury. And in *The Divine Comedy*, Dante reserved a special place in the Seventh Circle of Hell for those who charged people usurious interest rates. Today, we don’t need the hellfire and the pitch forks, we don’t need the rivers of boiling blood, but we do need a national usury law.

WHO OWNS THE MEDIA? Most Americans have very little understanding of the degree to which media ownership in America - what we see, hear, and read - is concentrated in the hands of a few giant corporations. In fact, I suspect that when people look at the hundreds of channels they receive on their cable system, or the many hundreds of magazines they can choose from in a good bookstore, they assume that there is a wide diversity of ownership. Unfortunately, that’s not the case. In 1983 the largest fifty corporations controlled 90 percent of the media. That’s a high level of concentration. Today, as a result of massive mergers and takeovers, six corporations control 90 percent of what we see, hear, and read. This is outrageous, and a real threat to our democracy. Those six corporations are Comcast, News Corp, Disney, Viacom, Time Warner, and CBS. In 2010, the total revenue of these six corporations was \$275 billion. In a recent article in *Forbes* magazine discussing media ownership, the headline appropriately read: “These 15 Billionaires Own America’s News Media Companies.” Exploding technology is transforming the media world, and mergers and takeovers are changing the nature of ownership. *Freepress.net* is one of the best media watchdog organizations in the country, and has been opposed to the kind of media consolidation that we have seen in recent years. It has put together a very powerful description of what media concentration means.

We, proudly, were the only campaign not to have a super PAC. In a manner

unprecedented in American history, we received some 8 million individual campaign contributions. The average contribution was \$27. These donations came from 2.5 million Americans, the vast majority of whom were low- or moderate-income people.

There is no justice, and I want you to hear this clearly, when the top one-tenth of 1 percent - not 1 percent, the top one-tenth of 1 percent - today in America owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent.

They are rightfully tired of turning on the television and seeing videos of unarmed blacks being shot and killed by police officers. They want criminal justice reform. They want police department reform.

Bernie also said:

I am who I am, and what I believe in and what my spirituality is about is that we're all in this together. That I think it is not a good thing to believe as human beings we can turn our backs on the suffering of other people ... and this is not Judaism, this is what Pope Francis is talking about, that we can't just worship billionaires and the making of more and more money. Life is more than that.

The history of American democracy, to say the least, has been checkered. Our nation was founded at a time when people of African descent were held in bondage. After slavery was abolished, they were forced to endure legal discrimination for another 100 years.

Let us wage a moral and political war against the billionaires and corporate leaders, on Wall Street and elsewhere, whose policies and greed are destroying the middle class of America.

Unemployment insurance, abolishing child labor, the 40-hour work week, collective bargaining, strong banking regulations, deposit insurance, and job programs that put millions of people to work were all described, in one way or another, as 'socialist.' Yet, these programs have become the fabric of our nation and the foundation of the middle class.

Yes, we become stronger when men and women, young and old, gay and straight, native-born and immigrant fight together to create the kind of country we all know we can become.

Democratic socialism means that we must create an economy that works for all, not just the very wealthy.




Figure 8.20: 28-year-old Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (born in 1989) won a stunning victory in the Democratic Party primary election of June 26, 2018. Although outspent by a factor of 18 to 1 by her opponent (Democratic Caucus Chair, Joseph Crowley), she won the primary by 57% to 42%. Her campaign contributions came from small individual donors, while his came in large blocks, from corporations. Ocasio-Cortez calls for the United States to transition by 2035 to an electrical grid running on 100% renewable-energy production and end the use of fossil fuels. She calls healthcare “a human right”, and says: “Almost every other developed nation in the world has universal healthcare. It’s time the United States catch up to the rest of the world in ensuring all people have real healthcare coverage that doesn’t break the bank”. The Guardian called her victory “one of the biggest upsets in recent American political history”, and Senator Bernie Sanders commented “She took on the entire local Democratic establishment in her district and won a very strong victory. She demonstrated once again what progressive grassroots politics can do”. The lesson that the US Democratic Party must learn from this is that in order to overthrow Donald Trump’s openly racist Republican Party in the 2020 elections, they must free themselves from the domination of corporate oligarchs, and instead stand for honest government and progressive values. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is facing criticism from climate activists for failing to back a Green New Deal. Last week Pelosi announced the formation of a new Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, headed by long-standing Florida Congressman Kathy Castor. But the committee is far weaker than what backers of a Green New Deal had envisioned. The committee will not have subpoena power or the power to draft legislation. According to a January 24 2019 article by Robert R. Raymond, “When polled, 92 percent of registered Democratic voters say they support the Green New Deal. But perhaps more importantly, a full 81 percent of all registered voters support it - a number that includes both Republicans and Democrats.”

Suggestions for further reading

1. Anderson, Terry H. (1995). *The Movement and the Sixties*. Oxford University Press.
2. Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society, 1962
3. Stephens, Elizabeth, *Free Speech Movement Chronology*. Bancroft.berkeley.edu. Retrieved June 9, 2009.
4. Skrentny, John (2002). *The Minority Rights Revolution*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.
5. Editors of the New York Times (December 11, 1994). *In Praise of the Counterculture*. nytimes.com
6. Edward Macan (November 11, 1996). *Rocking the Classics: English Progressive Rock and the Counterculture*. Oxford University Press.
7. Kifner, John (April 28, 2008). *Columbia's Radicals of 1968 Hold a Bittersweet Reunion*. www.nytimes.com. New York Times Company.
8. Kent State University, *The May 4 Shootings at Kent State University: The Search for Historical Accuracy*. www.kent.edu.
9. Miles, Barry (January 30, 2011). *Spirit of the underground: the 60s rebel*. the-guardian.com. Guardian News and Media Limited
10. Marcuse, Herbert ,(October 14, 2004). *The New Left and the 1960s: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse*. Routledge.
11. Seeger, Peggy (2002) *The Peggy Seeger Songbook: Forty Years of Songmaking*, Oak Publications
12. Freedman, Jean R., (2017) *Peggy Seeger: A Life of Music, Love and Politics* University of Illinois Press.
13. Seeger, Peggy, (2017), *First Time Ever: A Memoir*, Faber & Faber

Index

- A broken man, 220
- A martyr to the truth, 228
- A United Nations television channel?, 129
- Abducted, tortured and murdered, 193
- Abraham, Spencer, 175
- Abuse of prisoners, 218
- Academic freedom, 150
- Academy Award-winning documentary, 261
- Acceleration of cultural change, 32
- Accents, 36
- Accident waiting to happen, 57
- Accidental nuclear war, 57, 67
- Accidents, 63
- Act of Valor, 76
- Admiral von Tirpitz, 42
- Admiration of excessive consumption, 136
- Adolf Hitler, 45
- Advertising department of Coca-Cola, 134
- Afghan civilian casualties, 231
- Afghanistan, 152, 163, 179, 180, 185, 232
- Afghanistan and oil, 180
- Africa, 69
- Aggression, 28, 30
- Agreed-upon lies, 10
- Agriculture, 59, 61
- Airbus, 72
- Al-Qaeda, 66, 68, 179, 180
- Alaska, 32, 250
- Albania, 162–164
- Already-defeated Japan, 210
- Alt-right, 235
- Alt-right fight club, 242
- Alt-right supported Donald Trump, 236
- Alternative for Germany party, 249
- Alternative Right webzine, 235
- Altruism, 30
- American Empire?, 182, 186, 187
- American foreign policy, 181, 185
- American military colony, 189
- American Sniper, 76
- Americium, 67
- Amnesty International, 186, 266
- Ancestor worship, 36
- Andrew Anglin's Daily Stormer, 235
- Angela Merkel's telephone, 98, 203
- Annan, Kofi, 60, 67
- Anthropocene, 76
- Anthropogenic climate change, 67
- Anti-Christian and anti-democratic, 244
- Anti-war activist, 266
- Anticommunist alternative, 47
- Antisemitism defined as criticism of Israel?, 123
- Appalling consequences, 152
- Arab nationalism and Islam, 36
- Arab-Arab conflicts, 177
- Arc of instability, 189
- Argentina, 193
- Armaments race, 42, 44
- Arms control agreements, 76
- Arms manufacturers, 44
- Arms race, 42
- Art objects, 32
- Article VI, 57
- Asia, 63
- Assange, Julian, 228
- Assassination attempts, 66
- Assassinations, 152, 189, 199, 200
- Asteroids, 57
- Atom bomb, 29

- Atrocities, 28
Attacks on Iran, actual and threatened, 106
Attempted coups, 203
Attempts to overthrow governments, 154
Auschwitz, 45
Australia, 186
Austria-Hungary, 42

Ba'ath Party, 176
BAE Systems, 72
Baez, Joan, 265, 266, 270
Baker, James A., 177
Barak Obama's kill list, 230
Barnaby, Frank, 66
Base Structure Report, 185
Battleships, 44
BearingPoint Corporation, 184
Bechtel Corporation, 184
Bedjaoui, Muhammad, 56
Behind Enemy Lines, 76
Belarus, 63
Bering Strait, 32
Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali, 66
Bias, 187
Big Brother, 203
Big event needed, 21, 202
Bin Ladin, Osama, 179, 180
Biological weapons, 176
Biology of War and Peace, 33
Birth control, 250
Bitterness of conflicts, 202
Black Hawk Down, 76
Black sites, 221
Blair, Bruce G., 57
Blair, Tony, 180, 181
Blowin' in the Wind, 271
Blum, William, 152
Bob Dylan's paintings, 271
Boeing, 72
Bohr, Niels, 64
Bohr-Wheeler theory, 64
Bolivia, 155, 193
Bolton, John, 244

Bombs, 244
Bosnia, 159
Brazil, 193
Bread and circuses, 130
Breitbart News popularized alt-right, 236
Brexit, 76
Brexit and refugees, 249
Britain, 42, 183, 186
British Empire, 182, 187
British-American coup of 1953, 106
Brose Eric, 42
Bruno, Gordiano, 230
Brutalization of values, 44
Bryzinski, Zbigniew, 179
Burial customs, 36
Burkana Faso, 155
Bush administration, 207
Bush and bin Laden families, 179
Bush family and Hitler, 45
Bush political dynasty, 46
Bush, George W., 11, 45, 180, 181, 185, 230
Bush, Prescott, 45
Bush/Nazi connection, 46

Caldecott, Helen, 47
Call of Duty: Modern Warfare, 233
Calogero, Francesco, 58
Cambodia, 152, 162
Can't find a crime, 221
Canada, 186
Canadian Arctic, 250
Cancer, 178, 187
Caravan of Death, 189
Caste markings, 36
Catastrophic climate change, 171
Catastrophic global war, 44
Catastrophic mistake, 57
Catastrophic nuclear war, 60, 61
Catholic Church, 181
Censorship of the news, 100, 208
Central Intelligence Agency, 216
Ceremonies, 36
Chad, 70

- Chadors, 36
- Chain-reacting pile, 64
- Chance of survival, 60
- Changes of diet, 250
- Charlottesville rally, August 2017, 236
- Chemical properties, 64
- Chemical weapon precursors, 176
- Cheney Report, 175
- Cheney, Dick, 181, 186
- Chernobyl disaster, 63
- Children killed by wars, 55
- Chile, 193
- China, 70
- China, oil use, 173
- Chomsky, Noam, 132, 244
- Christian Aid, 186
- Christian nationalism, 244
- Chuckman, John, 99, 203
- Churchill, Winston, 176
- CIA, 96, 199, 200
- CIA and Mujaheddin, 179
- CIA and Saddam, 176
- CIA black sites, 220
- CIA in Afghanistan, 179
- CIA insider Susan Lindauer, 21, 202
- CIA killed Rahman during interrogation, 219
- CIA torture, 217
- CIA torture report, 209
- Circumcision, 36
- Civil liberties, attacks on, 186
- Civil society, 60
- Civil war, 69
- Civil wars, 70
- Civilian victims of war, 55
- Civilians as targets, 60
- Clark, General Wesley, 68
- Clark, Ramsey, 178
- Clarke, Richard, 180
- Climate and environment, 76
- Climate change, 63, 67
- Climate change denial, 244
- Climate crisis, 298
- Climate emergency, 171
- Clinton, Hillary, 114
- CNN, 129
- Coal, 67
- Coal and steel, 46
- Coal resources, 171
- Coercive diplomacy, 186
- Cold War, 57, 69, 100, 183, 200, 201, 209
- Collateral Murder, 228
- Colonialism, 183
- Colonialism and World War I, 44
- Colonies, 183
- Communal aggression, 28
- Communal defense response, 28, 29
- Communications of millions, 207
- Communist Party, 47
- Competition, 33
- Competition of all against all, 134
- Computer games, 233
- Confessions of Economic Hit-Man, 215
- Congo, 162
- Congressional Research Services Report, 156
- Consolidated Silesian Steel, 46
- Container ships, 67
- Contributions of Islamic culture, 107
- Control government policy, 199, 200
- Control of the planet's resources, 215
- Control over oilfields, 175
- Cooperation, 30
- Corbyn, Jeremy, 122
- Core aspirations, 211
- Core meltdown, 63
- Corporate oligarchs, 199, 201
- Corporate oligarchy, 103
- Corporations, 209
- Corporations resist change, 133
- Corrupt governments, 101
- Cost of war, 44
- Cote d'Ivoire, 170
- Counterculture, 261
- Coup in Bolivia in 2019, 155
- Coup in Venezuela in 2018, 155
- Coup overthrowing Mosaddegh, 105
- Coups, 208

- Coups by US-trained fighters, 155
Coups, torture, and illegal killing, 100
Courage, 29
Covert intervention, 184
Covert war on terror, 230
Crime against human civilization, 244
Crisis, 37
Critical mass, 64, 66
Cruelty by children, 36
Crusade Against Communism, 183
Crusades, 36
Cuban Missile Crisis, 47
Cultural barriers to marriage, 33
Cultural evolution, 32, 33
Culture of violence, 69, 76, 232
Cumulative risk, 60
Curzon, Lord, 175
- Dances and songs, 36
Dangers of nuclear power, 63
Dark government, 96, 99, 203
Darwin, Charles, 25, 36
David Swanson's list, 152
Decay of democracy, 53
Deep state, 199, 200
Dementia, 221
Democracy, 187
Democracy Now, 117, 298
Democratic Republic of Congo, 70
Denbeaux, Mark, 221
Dependable source of income, 210
Depleted uranium shells, 178
Depleted uranium tank shells, 188
Destruction of rainforests, 209
Deteriorating living standards, 236
Deterrence, flaws in concept, 55
Developing countries, 210
Devil's Dynamo, 53
Devotion, 29, 30
Dialects, 36
Dictatorships, 175
Diction, 36
Die gedanken sind frei, 276
- Diet, 36
Dietary changes, 250
Directly used fuels, 67
Dirty business of ISIS, 203
Dirty wars, 199, 200
Disarmament, 55
Disease, 70
Disempowered TV viewers, 130
Diverse populations, 32
Dominance, full spectrum, 185
Dreadnought-class ships, 42
Drone air force, 203
Drones, 232
Drug addiction, 47
Dylan Thomas, 270
Dylan, Bob, 265, 266, 269
- East Asia, 70
East Timor, 165
Eastern Europe, 63
Eavesdropping, 186
ECHELON, 186
Ecological catastrophes, 130
Ecological conscience, 210
Economic hit men, 215
Economic influence, 53
Economic interests, 184
Ecstasy, 29
Edward Snowden, 199, 200
Egypt, 155
Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Irenäus, 33, 37
Einstein, Albert, 128
Eisenhower's farewell address, 53
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 187
ElBaradei, Mohamed, 58, 67
Electrical plants targeted, 178
Electricity generation, 65, 67
Electronic surveillance, 186
Elephant in the room, 112
Eliminating democracy, 199, 200
Ellsberg, Daniel, 230
Embrace of spying, 207
Emotions, 25

- Empire, 182, 187
- Empire of Bases, 187
- Endemic conflict, 70
- Energy crisis, 63
- Energy supply crisis, 175
- Energy use, 173
- Engineering firms, 216
- Enhanced interrogation techniques, 218
- Enormous dark branches, 211
- Enrichment, 58
- Environmental activist, 266
- Environmental reforms, 209
- Ecuador, 193
- Equity, 65
- Eradication of communist ideas, 189
- Eritiria, 70
- Escalatory cycles of violence, 55
- Eternal war, 185
- Ethical principles, 37, 55
- Ethiopia, 70
- Ethnic diversity, 32
- Ethnic identity, 33
- Ethnicity, 33
- Ethnicity and nationalism, 136
- Ethnicity and religion, 36
- Ethology, 25
- Europe needs to be independent, 96
- Europe's right-wing parties, 249
- European colonial conquests, 36
- Evangelicals, 243
- Evidence-based research, 150
- Examples of torture, 218
- Exceptionalism, 104
- Expanded German navy, 42
- Exposure of mistakes, 203
- Expression of emotions, 25
- Extortion, 67, 215
- Extra-judicial killings, 203
- Extrajudicial killing, 209
- Fahrenheit 11/9, 117
- Falk, Richard, 186
- Fallout, 56
- Falluja 2, 176
- False charge of antisemitism, 122
- Family planning, 250
- Famine, 59, 173
- Fanaticism, 29
- Far-right neo-fascist organization, 241
- Fast breeder reactors, 65
- Fast neutrons, 65
- Fatal accident, 58
- FBI, 96
- Fear of communism, 47
- Ferguson, Niall, 187
- Fermi, Enrico, 64
- Fertility of mixed marriages, 33
- Fertilizers, 171
- Ficsher, R.A., 30
- Filed teeth, 36
- Films that glorify war, 76
- Financial architects of Nazism, 45
- Finland, 63
- Fire storms, 61
- Firearm and Confederate T-shirt, 236
- Firebombing of Dresden, 55
- Fission of uranium, 64
- Fissionable isotopes, 58, 64
- Fissionable materials, 67
- Flags, 29
- Folk music, 270
- Food costs, 173
- Forced labor, 209
- Forge of Empires, 233
- Former Soviet Union, 70
- Fossil fuel corporations, 297
- Fossil fuel depletion, 171
- Fossil fuel industry, 133
- Fossil fuel reserves, 173
- Fourth Amendment trashed, 199, 200
- Fourth Estate, 207
- France, 42, 70
- Fraudulent financial reports, 215
- Free speech, 150
- Freedom from fear, 102, 211
- Freedom of Information Act, 228

- Freedom Party (Austria), 250
- Friedrich Krupp AG, 44
- Frightened children, 285
- Frisch, Karl von, 25
- Frontline's documentary, 207
- Full spectrum dominance, 185
- Full Spectrum Warrior, 232
- Full torture report remains classified, 217
- Fusion energy, 68
- Future generations, 139
- Gabon, 162
- Galileo, 230
- Gambia, 155
- GATT, 209
- General Dynamics, 72
- Genes, 30
- Genetic change, 32
- Genetically homogeneous tribes, 32
- Geneva Conventions, 176, 184
- Genocide, 37, 55
- Genocide against Jews, 37
- George H.W. Bush, 45
- George W. Bush, 45
- German nationalism, 36
- German naval buildup, 42
- Germany, 42
- Germany's armament industry, 45
- Gibson, Bob, 266
- Glaring contradiction, 199, 200
- Global economic interdependence, 210
- Global energy use, 173
- Global ethic, 128
- Global hegemony, 70, 187
- Global hegemony by means of military force, 97
- Global Policy Forum, 175
- Global power, 70
- Global warming, 63, 67
- Global weather forecast, 129
- Globalization, 215
- Globe-girdling Baseworld, 187
- Golden Dawn party (Greece), 250
- Goldsmith, Lord, 184
- Goodman, Amy, 68, 117, 298
- Government spying, 208
- Governmental secrecy, 202
- Graphite moderator, 64
- Grave implications, 53
- Great-power competition, 70
- Greece, 42
- Green Berets, 76
- Green New Deal, 297
- Green Party, 115
- Greenhouse gas emissions, 250
- Greenland, 63, 250
- Grey, Colin S., 57
- Gross, wholesale spying, 199, 200
- Group identity, 32
- Group selection, 30
- Guilt, 55
- Guinea-Bissau, 162
- Gulf War, 177, 178
- Gun-type bomb, 66
- Guns, 44
- Guns in schools?, 76
- Guthrie, Woodie, 270
- Habias Corpus trashed, 199, 200
- Hague Regulations, 184
- Hair standing on end, 28
- Hair-trigger alert, 57
- Haiti, 155, 160
- Halabja, 176
- Haldane, J.B.S., 30
- Haliburton Corporation, 184, 185
- Hall, Anthony James, 150
- Hamilton, W.D., 30
- Harold Pinter's Nobel Lecture, 141
- Hearst, William Randolph, 125
- Heather Heyer murdered, 236
- Hegemony, 187
- Heiliger Schauer, 29
- Hero face, 28
- Heroic behavior, 30
- Heroin from Afghanistan, 180

- Heroism, 28
- HEU, 65
- Hidden military costs, 185
- Higgs, Robert, 185
- Highly enriched uranium, 58, 65
- Highly-enriched uranium, 60
- Hiroshima, 30, 63, 64, 128, 210
- History, 36
- Hitler as Chancellor, 47
- Hitler Youth, 29
- Hitler's rise to power, 44, 46, 47
- Hitler, Adolf, 125, 236, 251
- Hitler-Trump parallels, 251
- HMS Dreadnought, 42
- Holy shiver, 28
- Homeland Security, 96
- Hondurs, 155
- Hoodbhoy, Pervez, 66
- Hope for the future, 32
- Horton, Scott, 203
- Hospitality, 36
- Howitzers, 44
- Hubbert peak, 171
- Hubbert, Dr. M. King, 171
- Hubris, 99
- Human failings, 57
- Human hands used as currency, 104
- Human nature, 36
- Human rights, 266
- Human rights activist, 266
- Human rights trashed, 199, 200
- Humane response to refugees, 250
- Humanitarian law, 55, 57
- Humanitarian reforms, 209
- Humanitarian tragedies, 75
- Humanity betrayed by the mass media, 130
- Hunter-gatherers, 32
- Huntington Ingals, 72
- Hussein, Saddam, 181, 186
- Hydrological cycle, 61
- I'll supply the war, 125
- IAEA, 67
- Iceland's financial crisis was brief, 103
- Illegal collection of private data, 98
- Illegal killings, 208
- Illegal we do at once, 199, 200
- Illegality of nuclear weapons, 55
- Imperial aspirations, 187
- Imprinting, 28
- Incendiary bombings, 61
- Incendiary bombs, 176
- Increased arms trading, 75
- India, 60, 70
- India's nuclear weapons, 65
- India, oil use, 173
- Indian army, 176
- Indiscriminate mass slaughter, 55
- Indiscriminate slaying, 228
- Industrial Revolution, 42, 182
- Information accumulation, 32
- Insomnia, 221
- Instinctive behavior, 33
- Instincts, 25
- Institution of war, 60
- Institutional and cultural inertia, 132
- Interference in foreign elections, 152
- International control, 58, 65
- International cooperation, 76
- International law, 181, 184, 186
- Internet corporations, 203
- Interservices Intelligence Agency, 179
- Intertribal aggression, 30
- Intertribal massacres, 37
- Intervention, 183
- Intervention, covert, 184
- Intervention, military, 184
- Intragroup aggression, 28
- Invasion of Transvaal, 42
- Iran, 60, 69, 70, 176
- Iran nuclear deal, 75
- Iran's oil and gas resources, 105
- Iraq, 69, 152, 158, 163, 176, 185, 186
- Iraq and colonialism, 175
- Iraq, economic colonization of, 184
- Iraq, invasion of, 180, 181

- Iraq-Iran War, 176
- Iraqi oilfields, 176
- Iron and steel company, 44
- Isaiah 45 = 45th President, 243
- ISIS, 99
- Islamic fundamentalism, 180
- Islamic fundamentalists, 179
- Islamic militants and CIA, 179
- Islamic superstate, 180
- Islamic world, 187
- Isolationism, 183
- Isotopes, 64, 65
- Isotopes of uranium, 64
- Israel, 70, 185, 187
- Israel's genocide against Palestinians, 123
- Israel's nuclear weapons, 65
- Israel, US support for, 179
- Italy, 42
- Ituri Province of Congo, 37

- Japan, 42
- Jaws of power, 229
- Jefferson, Thomas, 228
- Jewish employees, 47
- Jewish plot for white genocide, 236
- Joan Baez Award, 266
- Jobbic party (Hungary), 250
- John Perkins, 215
- Johnson, Chalmers, 187
- Joint Vision for 2020, 185
- Jonsdottir, Birgitta, 102

- Kaiser Wilhelm II, 42
- Kavanaugh, Brett, 117
- Kellogg, Brown and Root, 185
- Kent State Massacre, 285
- Kenya, 163, 164
- Kept awake for over one week, 220
- Kermit Roosevelt, 215
- Khan, A.Q., 66
- Kim Jong-un, 72
- Kindness, 30
- King's Riverside Church speech, 280
- King, Martin Luther, 47
- Kissinger, Henry, 186, 199, 200
- Klein, Naomi, 184
- Koestler, Arthur, 29
- Korean Peoples Army, 72
- Kosovo, 37, 164, 185
- Krauthammer, Charles, 186
- Kristallnacht, 47
- Krupp family business, 44
- Kuqait, 159
- Kurdish civilians gassed, 37
- Kurds, betrayal of, 178
- Kuwait, invasion by Iraq, 177
- Kuwait, 176, 185
- Kyrgyzistan, 185

- L-3 Communications, 72
- Language and ethnic identity, 36
- Languages, 33
- Laos, 152
- Lapps, 32
- Largest company in Europe, 44
- Laws binding on individuals, 210
- League of Nations, 183
- Lebanese civil war, 37
- Lebanon, 69
- LeMay, General Curtis E., 57
- Leonardo-Finmeccanica, 72
- LEU, 65
- Liberia, 158, 163
- Libya, 69, 152, 158
- Light weapons, 69
- Literature, 36
- Living from war, 53
- Local communities, 36
- Lockheed Martin, 72
- Lord Curzon, 175
- Lorenz, Konrad, 25, 28, 30, 33
- Loss of profits, 209
- Low enriched uranium, 65
- Loyalty, 29, 30
- Loyalty to humanity, 128
- Lubrication, 171

- Ludendorff, 47
- Macedonia, 160
- Machiavelli, 186
- Machine Gun, 182
- Madrasa schools, 180
- Mafia, 66
- Magna Carta trashed, 199, 200
- Magnetic bottles, 68
- Mainstream media, 199, 201
- Making a game of killing, 232
- Malnutrition, 187
- Manufactured goods, 182
- Manufacturing Consent, 132
- Mariachi Reyna de Los Angeles, 299
- Markets, 182, 183
- Marriage, 30
- Marriage across ethnic boundaries, 37
- Marshall Plan, 96
- Martin Luther King, 280
- Mass illegal spying, 211
- Mass media have betrayed us, 125
- Massacres, 37
- Massive nuclear retaliation, 55
- Massive retaliation, 137
- Massive spying, 200, 201
- Mattas, James, 70
- McInnes, Gavin, 241
- Media are a battleground, 125
- Media neglect of climate change, 130
- Media part of our educational system, 126
- Media sabotage progressive politics, 95
- Media withhold information, 208
- Merkel, Angela, 249
- Mesopotamia, 175
- Meyer, Sir Christopher, 180
- Middle East, 187
- Middle East conflicts, 75, 171
- Migration, political reactions, 249
- Migrations, 32
- Militant enthusiasm, 28, 29
- Militarism in North Korea, 70
- Militarism, growth of, 187
- Militarization of foreign policy, 185
- Militarization of government, 175
- Military aid to dictatorships, 152
- Military budget, US, 185
- Military establishments, 185
- Military Expenditure Database, 72
- Military intervention, 184, 187
- Military power, 183
- Military spending, 150
- Military technology, 75
- Military tyranny, 187
- Military-colonial methods, 176
- Military-industrial complex, 44, 53, 96
- Miscalculation, 57
- Misplaced power, 53
- Missile defense system, 60
- Missile Envy, 47
- Mistaken for a missile strike, 57
- Mock executions, 219
- Modernism, 60
- Modernization of Iran, 105
- Money-controlled media, 126
- Moore, Michael, 117
- Moral significance of killing, 233
- More military spending, 75
- More violent conflicts, 75
- Mossadegh, 215
- Most dangerous organization in history, 244
- Mosul, 175
- Movement of refugees, 75
- Mujaheddin, 179, 180
- Multinational network, 46
- Murder, 215
- Murdos Armistice, 175
- Musharraf, Pervez, 66
- Mustard gas, 176
- My Lai Massacre, 285
- Nagasaki, 30, 63, 64, 128, 210
- National Energy Policy, 175
- National Energy Summit, 175
- National Front party, 250
- National pride, 60

- National Rifle Association, 76
National Security, 150
National Security Agency, 96, 208, 215
Nationalism, 29
Nationalism and religion, 36
Nationalism, nuclear, 66
Nations bombed by the United States, 155
NATO against Russia, 203
NATO now violates the UN Charter, 97
Natural gas resources, 171
Natural resources, 183
Natural selection, 30
Naval arms race, 42, 47
Naval bombardments, 182
Naval supremacy, 42
Nazi and neo.Nazi symbols, 241
Nazi Germany, 45
Nazi Party, 36, 45, 47
Nazi salute, 236
Neocolonialism, 183
Neoliberal economic policies, 189
Neptunium, 67
Nerve gas, 176
Network Knowledge, 207
Neuborne, Burt, 251
Neutral countries, 55
Neutrons, 64
New Agenda Resolution, 57
New York Times, 207
New Zealand, 186
Newport Folk Festival of 1959, 266
Newspapers and war, 125
Nineteen Eighty-Four, 199, 201
No President can resist, 203
No-first-use of nuclear weapons, 98
Nobel Prize in Literature, 141, 269
Non-discrimination principle, 209
Non-dollar trading, 98
Non-Proliferation Treaty, 65
Nonrenewable resources, 171
Nonvoters, 117
North Korea, 60, 70
North Korea's nuclear weapons, 65
Northrop Grumman, 72
Norwegian mass murderer Breivik, 233
NPT, 65
NPT, threatened failure of, 66
NSA Headquarters, 203
NSA Power Points, 203
Nuclear arms race, 47
Nuclear black market, 58
Nuclear darkness, 59
Nuclear deterrence, flaws, 58
Nuclear disarmament, 211
Nuclear environmental catastrophe, 61
Nuclear fusion, 68
Nuclear nationalism, 66
Nuclear power dangers, 63
Nuclear power generation, 47, 63
Nuclear proliferation, 58, 63, 65, 66
Nuclear reactor, 64
Nuclear reactors, 58
Nuclear terrorism, 58, 60, 66
Nuclear war by accident, 67
Nuclear warhead stockpiles, 72
Nuclear weapons, 47, 152
Nuclear weapons developed in secret, 230
Nuclear winter, 61
Nucleon number, 64
Nuremberg Principles, 229

Obama's decision to continue, 207
Obama, Barak, 96
Obsession with secrecy, 203
Ocasio-Cortez, Alexandria, 297
Occupy Wall Street, 95
Oil and Afghanistan, 180
Oil and agriculture, 173
Oil and conflicts, 171
Oil and Middle East conflicts, 171
Oil and military presence, 175
Oil and Turkmenistan, 180
Oil consumption, 171, 173
Oil prices, 171, 173, 177
Oil production, 171
Oil reserves, 177

- Oil resources, 171
- Oil, US domestic production, 175
- Oil-based fuel, 175
- Oil-hungry military, 175
- Oil-producing countries, 175
- Oil-rich regions, 21, 200, 201
- Okinawa, 189
- Oligarchs own the government, 199, 201
- Operation Condor, 189
- Opposition to birth control, 136
- Opposition to Viet Nam and Iraq wars, 266
- Organized criminals, 66
- Orgy of external cruelty, 104
- Orwell's dystopian prophesy, 200, 201
- Orwell, George, 182, 185, 199, 201
- Orwellian name, 21, 202
- Osama and the CIA, 179
- Ottoman Empire, 42, 175
- Overthrowing foreign governments, 154
- Ozone layer, 59, 62

- Package of broadcasts, 130
- Paints, 171
- Pakistan, 60, 70, 152, 155, 179, 180, 231
- Pakistan's nuclear weapons, 66
- Panama, 156
- Paraguay, 193
- Paranoia, 221
- Paranoid times, 244
- Paris Climate Agreement, 75
- Party for Freedom, 250
- Patagonia, 250
- Patriot Act, 21, 186, 202
- Patriotism, 29
- Paul Ehrlich, 62
- Paul, James A., 175
- Pax Americana, 187
- Payoffs, 215
- Peace in Colombia, 75
- Peaceful resolution of conflicts, 210
- Pearl Harbor, 76
- Peasant leaders, priests and nuns, 193
- Pelosi, Nancy, 298

- Pentagon, 185
- Pentagon Papers, 230
- People themselves, 228
- People's Party-Our Slovakia, 250
- Permanent arms industry, 53
- Persecution of Christians, 47
- Persian Gulf, 156, 186
- Peru, 193
- Petroleum and war, 175
- Petroleum prices, 171
- Pharmaceuticals, 171
- Physical properties, 64
- Pinochet, Augusto, 189
- Pinter, Harold, 141
- Plague cultures, 176
- Plans for blockade, 42
- Plastics, 171
- Plutonium, 58, 64, 65
- Poetry, 36
- Poison gas, 37, 176
- Poison gas and Kurds, 176
- Poison gas, use by British, 176
- Poland, 179
- Polite conversation, 134
- Political influence, 53
- Political instability, 75
- Political language, 141
- Pop culture is addictive, 127
- Popular music history, 261
- Population and food supply, 173
- Population genetics, 30
- Population of Norway, 203
- Populism in the US, 250
- Potentially illegal spying, 207
- Poverty, 182, 187
- Power reactors, 65
- Powerholders, 208
- Prakash, Varshini, 297
- Preemptive war, 181
- Preparation for war, 47
- Prescott Bush, 45
- President claims right to kill, 199, 200
- Preventable disease, 187

- Preventive war, 181
PRISM, 203
Prisoners told that they would be killed, 219
Private consulting companies, 216
Project for a New American Century, 97
Proliferation risks, 65, 66
Proliferation, nuclear, 63, 65
Promotes political violence, 241
Propaganda, 125
Propaganda and entertainment, 130
Prosperity gospel preacher, 244
Protecting whistleblowers, 211
Protection of whistleblowers, 102
Protectorates, 183
Protests against the Vietnam War, 280
Protons, 64
Proud Boys, 241
Prussian army officers, 33
Pseudospeciation, 33
Pu-239, 64–66
Public opinion, 63

Qasim, Abd al-Karim, 176
Qatar, 185

Racial cleansing, 37
Racism, colonialism and exceptionalism, 103
Radar, 57
Radioactive fallout, 63
Radioactive graphite, 63
Radioactive grass, 63
Radioactive uranium, 63
Radioactive waste disposal, 63
Rank-determining fights, 28, 30
Raw materials, 182, 183
Raytheon, 72
Reagan Administration, 176
Rearmament, 47
Red Dawn, 76
Reduced consumption of meat, 250
Regional Defense Strategy, 70
Reichstag election, 1933, 47
Religion and culture, 36
Religion and ethnicity, 36
Religious conservatism, 136
Renewable energy, 297
Report on CIA torture, 217
Reprocessing, 58
Reprocessing fuel rods, 65
Republican Party, 244
Reserves of fossil fuels, 173
Reserves of uranium, 65
Resolution 678, 177
Resource wars, 233
Resource-motivated war, 181
Restless chase after excitement, 136
Restoring democracy, 95
Reuters, 228
Revenge and counter-revenge, 55
Reza Shah, 105
Riegel Report, 176
Rigged elections, 215
Right-wing parties, 47
Righteousness, 28
Rise like lions, 21, 200, 202
Rising oil prices, 171
Ritual scarification, 33
Rituals, 36
River of money, 53
Robock, A., 59
Roman Catholic Church, 47
Roman Empire, 182, 186, 187
Roosevelt, Eleanor, 277
Rosenfeld, Steven, 251
Rotblat, Sir Joseph, 211
Rumsfeld and Saddam, 176
Rumsfeld, Donald, 176, 186
Russia, 42, 58, 63, 70
Rwanda, 160

Sabotaging Jeremy Corbyn, 122
Sacred duty, 28
Sadam Hussein, 68
Saddam and April Galspie, 177
Saddam and Rumsfeld, 176
Saddam Hussein, 176, 177, 181

- Saddam Hussein and CIA, 176
- Saddam Hussein's atrocities, 37
- Sakharov, Andrei, 203
- Sanctions, 187
- Sanctions, effect of, 178
- Sanders, Senator Bernie, 112, 297
- Sarin, 176
- Saudi Arabia, 158, 177, 179
- Schweitzer, Albert, 137
- Secrecy and democracy are incompatible, 229
- Secrecy and democracy incompatible, 99
- Secrecy and nuclear weapons, 211
- Secrecy versus democracy, 199, 200
- Secrecy, democracy and nuclear weapons, 101
- Secret diplomacy, 202
- Secret land purchases in Africa, 101
- Secret trade agreements, 98
- Secret trade deals, 209
- Secretive Shadow Government, 203
- Secure jobs, 210
- Security Council, 69, 178, 181
- Security Council and Kuwait, 177
- Seeger at the Clearwater Festival, 277
- Seeger, Peggy, 299
- Seeger, Pete, 273
- Self-congratulatory mood, 104
- Self-destruction, 29
- Self-fulfillment is your birthright, 134
- Self-sacrificing courage, 29
- Selfish motives, 29, 30
- Semi-automatic rifles, 241
- September 11, 2001, 179, 186, 187
- Serious mental harm, 221
- Several hundred million deaths, 55
- Severe droughts, 62
- Sex, 215
- Sexually abused female family members, 219
- Shah of Iran, 215
- Shamanism, 32
- Shelley, 21, 200, 202
- Shi'ites, 176
- Shi'ites, betrayal of, 178
- Shiver, 28
- Shooting Santa Claus, 134
- Shortened food chain, 250
- Shot by the Ohio National Guard, 285
- Shrouded in secrecy, 209
- Siberia, 32, 250
- Sierra Leone, 159, 162
- Silicon Valley, 208
- SIPRI, 72
- SIPRI Yearbook, 2017, 75
- Slave laborers, 45
- Sleep deprivation, 219
- Small arms, 69, 70
- Small arms, 639 million, 70
- Smith, Dan, 75
- Smith, Martin, 208
- Snowden's revelations, 199, 201
- Snowden, Edward, 99, 199, 200, 203, 207, 208
- Social conscience, 210
- Social Democrats, 47
- Societal verification, 211
- Softening ethnic boundaries, 37
- Somalia, 69, 70, 159, 232
- South Africa's nuclear weapons, 65
- South America, 199, 200
- Southwest Asia, 70
- Soviet Union, 179
- Soviet-style revolution, 47
- Spanish-American War, 125
- Special forces, 152
- Species, 33
- Spemcer, Richard B., 235
- Spiritual influence, 53
- Stabilization of population, 250
- Stars and stripes, 244
- Starvation, 70
- Stein, Jill, 114, 115
- Stohl, Michael, 186
- Strategic competition, 76
- Students and teachers murdered, 193
- Suadi Arabia, 176
- Submission, 28
- Subnational organizations, 66

- Sudan, 69, 163, 180
- Suicide, 221
- Sunrise Movement, 297
- Superpower status, 70
- Suppress opposition movements, 189
- Survival, 30
- Swanson. David, 152
- Sweden, 63
- Sweden Democrats party, 250
- Swings to the right in Europe, 249
- Sykes-Picot Agreement, 175, 202
- Sykes-Picot agreement, 99
- Syria, 69, 152
- Szent-Györgyi, Albert, 10
- Tabun, 176
- Taliban, 179, 180
- Tanks, 44
- Tanzania, 163
- Tattoos, 36
- Team-spirit, 30
- Technical defects, 57
- Technology, 182
- Temperature inversion, 61
- Terrorism, 70, 181, 186
- Terrorism threat, 170
- Terrorism, nuclear, 58
- Thales Group, 72
- The 2016 US presidential election, 111
- Thermonuclear bombs, 65
- Thermonuclear reactions, 68
- Thermonuclear weapons, 30
- Thirty Years' War, 44
- Thyroid cancer, 63
- Thyssen family, 44
- Thyssen, August, 44
- Thyssen, Fritz, 44, 46, 47
- Thyssen-controlled bank, 46
- Time Magazine, 266
- Tinbergen, Nikolaas, 25
- Tokyo, firebombing, 55
- Tom Cruse, 76
- Toon, O., 59
- Top Gun, 76
- Torture, 208
- Torture and Murder, 217
- Torture at Guantanamo, 221
- Torture, murder and genocide, 103
- Tortured for months, 220
- Tortured while pregnant, 189
- Total global supremacy, 70
- Trade unions, 47
- Trading with the enemy, 45
- Trans Pacific Partnership, 209
- Trans-Pacific Partnership, 101
- Treaty of Versailles, 47
- Trench warfare, 30
- Tribal markings, 32, 33
- Tribalism, 11, 29, 30
- Triple Alliance, 42
- Triple Entente, 42
- Troops on foreign soil, 184
- Trump is Alt-Right with us, 236
- Trump sent by God to be King, 243
- Trump, Donald, 76, 117, 243, 244, 250, 251, 297
- Truth about 9/11, 10
- Truth, t identity?, 10
- TTAPS Study, 61
- TTIP, 209
- TTIP fast-tracked, 101
- Turco, R., 59
- Turkmenistan oil, 180
- Turner, Ted, 129
- Two billion risk starvation, 63
- U-235, 64
- U-238, 64, 65
- U-boats, 44
- Ukraine, 63
- Ultracentrifuges, 65, 66
- UN General Assembly, 55, 57
- UN Security Council, 70
- UN's Agenda 2030, 75
- Unauthorized act, 58
- UNICEF, 178

- Unilateralism unacceptable, 181
- Unite the Right rally, 236
- United Kingdom, 42, 70
- United Nations, 210
- United Nations Charter, 181, 183
- United States, 42, 58, 70, 183, 187
- United States of Secrets, 207
- United Technologies, 72
- Universal healthcare, 297
- Universal human brotherhood, 37
- Universality of religion, 36
- University of Lethbridge, 150
- Unwarranted influence, 53
- Uranium, 64
- Uranium enrichment, 66
- Uranium reserves, 65
- Uruguay, 193
- US bias favoring Israel, 187
- US Democratic Party, 297
- US Evangelicals, 243
- US foreign bases, 185
- US imports of oil, 175
- US military presence, 175, 184
- US nuclear weapons in Europe, 98
- US soldiers take aim, 156
- US support for Israel, 179
- US wars, interventions and coups, 152
- US-led invasion of Iraq, 181
- US-led invasions, 152
- Use of fossil fuels must stop, 132
- USS Cole, 180
- Uzbekistan, 185

- Value systems, 36
- Value-creation, 126
- Vanguard America, 236
- Variety, 207
- Vast proportions, 53
- Vatican Council, 181
- Veils, 36
- Venezuela, 155
- Vicious circle, 47
- Vietnam, 152, 179
- Vietnam War, 230
- Violation of democracy, 209
- Violation of democratic principles, 209
- Violation of the UN Charter, 97
- Violence on television, 29
- Violence, ethos of, 186
- Violence, used by great powers, 186
- Violent computer games, 127
- Violent team sports, 29
- Von Sponeck, Hans Christian, 97

- Wahhab, Abdul, 180
- Wahhabi sect, 180
- Wales, 63
- Wall Street, 210
- War, 69, 70, 244, 266
- War and petroleum, 175
- War as an institution, 53
- War on Drugs, 158
- War on Terror, 132, 150, 152, 183, 230
- Wars of religion, 36
- Washington Naval Treaty, 42
- Water purification facilities, 178
- Waterboarding, 219
- We are many, 21, 200, 202
- We could get your mother in here, 219
- We shall overcome, 268
- We want to protect you, 200, 201, 211
- We Were Soldiers, 76
- Wealthy families, 215
- Weapons of mass destruction, 29, 181
- Weapons-usable materials, 65, 67
- Weapons-usable Pu-239, 65
- West Point speech by Bush, 181, 185
- Western Europe, 70
- Western hegemony, 21, 200, 201
- What did you learn in school today?, 275
- What have they done to the rain?, 268
- What is the truth about 9/11, 10
- Wheeler, John A., 64
- When at Times the Mob is Swayed, 251
- Where have all the flowers gone?, 274
- Whistleblowers, 199, 200

White nationalists, 236
White Revolution, 106
White supremacists, 236
Wholesale electronic spying, 199, 200
Wikileaks, 228
Wilson, E.O., 30
Without knowledge or consent, 203
Wolfowitz Doctrine, 70
Wolfowitz, Paul, 186
Women in Afghanistan, 180
Woodstock, 261
World domination through military force, 187
World of Warcraft, 233
World Trade Center, 11, 21, 202
World Trade Center attacks, 150
World Trade Center, 1993, 180
World Trade Center, 2001, 60
World War I, 42, 44, 47, 202
World War II, 44, 61, 183
WSEC/PBS Springfield, 207

X-ray microscopy, 266

Yasgur, Max, 261
Yemen, 152, 232
Yongbion Research Center, 72
Yugoslavia, 164

Zaire, 159
Zimbabwe, 70
Zionism, 36
Zubadah, Abu, 221