

WARFARE

WAR

Big Guys against Big Guys

CRIME

Little Guys against Little Guys

PERSECUTION

Big Guys against Little Guys

TERRORISM

Little Guys against Big Guys

4 species of Polarization

Each level has its own rules
and they change

With 4th Generation Warfare
and WMD - the rules are obsolete

[as Gonzales said]

but the Bush administration's new rules don't work

Nukes

J.F. Kennedy: accident
miscalculation
madness
and surrenders

INTRODUCTION

Nov 4, 1979

This series of essays began as a project for the Institute of the Future. The subject was first brought into prominence in the U.S. by Iranians holding Americans hostage in the Embassy in Teheran from ---until January 1980. Although terrorism is not new to human societies, because of advances in technology, especially in communication, it has achieved an important role on center stage in thinking about the future. Analyses first published almost a quarter of a century ago, have proven to have 20/20 fore sight in many of the subsequent developments regarding terrorists and terrorism. The essays and notes collected here were mostly written before the events of 9, 11, 2001, but reflect the ability of detached futurism to map out trends with fair accuracy. While many of the detailed observations have been superceded, the general principles described have been repeatedly affirmed.

250MB DISK
IN TRANSFER

VARIOUS SUBJECTS

THE IRAQ WAR

WMD, AL QAIDA

WAR

There is no use belaboring the historical records of wars and lies, what is needed is to understand that people who pursue power are congenital liars. Until we wake up to the truth that Confucius recognized 2500 years ago, that "anyone who wants political office should automatically be disqualified", we will continue to have lies and wars.

LIST of Items ^{in TB SORTED} in CURRENT in 250 MB DISK: TRANSFER
but Not in Scraps and printed see page in TAXONOMY N.B

To be sorted - distributed by subject

ONWARS.WPD

August 8, 2005

WAR and LIES are essential partners. Not only are lies needed to initiate war, and to wage war, but to record the war in history.

WORLD WAR II

We can no longer excuse the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as effecting the end of the war. The facts point otherwise..

Ending the war was neither the purpose nor the result of dropping the atomic bombs.

The war ended when Hirohito learned his death and resignation would not be demanded as a condition of surrender. He then overruled his military and announced Japan's surrender.

The bomb was dropped to justify the past

Revenge for Pearl Harbor

Make a two billion dollar investment have a product

The bomb was dropped to shape the future

The USSR was not to participate in occupying Japan

The USA was to be number one and in control of what was to take place in the post war world

Why the bomb in the first place?

Fear Hitler would make one a political imperative

Ozbekian's Imperative a scientific imperative

The current thinking was the US had a monopoly on the bomb. It knew the secret of how to make one. But the only secret was that such a bomb existed. With a few years the monopoly was gone. Had this been foreseen, there might have been an entirely different set of decisions about using the bomb. (Some scientists foresaw this but were ignored)

THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

The same historical distortions remain about the American Civil War.

After the southern states seceded Lincoln said he would save the union with slavery or without slavery. The intent of the war was to preserve the union.

History now tells us that the war was fought to end slavery.

For the South, the war was to hold to the original concept of "These United States", not allowing the centralization of power implied in the concept "The United States".

The result of the war was a not preservation of union, but redefinition of union.

Abolition of slavery was an added, but very important, by product.

THE VIETNAM WAR Gulf of Tonkin

09/11/2001 + 4

It has become a cliché that everything changed on 9/11. This is likely true, but we have warped its truth by deciding what part of everything we will allow to change and what part of everything we will never allow to change. (The illusion that we have, or ever had, the power to make such decisions is definitely one thing that has not changed.) Four years have elapsed and the real lessons of 9/11 are yet to be perceived. The public outrage of the attack on the twin towers has been focused on the deaths and the damage, and on a need for revenge. But there has also been an inner outrage: Great offense that someone dared to challenge our #1 status. But then follows a silent secondary thought that maybe we aren't really the almighty Number One we believe we are. But quickly banish that thought. It is itself outrageous!

We refuse to admit that one thing that really changed with 9/11 was the meaning of being Number One. Conventional military power is useless against terrorists. *and generation 4 warfare*

Within the rules of certain cultural "games", we were and are #1,, but that game is gone and with it the shift in power that changes with new rules. i.e. We were a special case of #1

Our military and fiscal power is power only in certain games Each game is defined by its clock rate

The old game with rules has been replaced with a new game with different rules or no rules. The contest today is to define the new game. Preemption Unilateralism Military might go it alone *re write* change the UN vs a terrorism that has found ways around the power of the past.

It's weapons are using our weapons against us, randomness, no permanent organizations, dissolving and reforming structures No special locations or centers Suicide bombers and above all spontaneity. **Operating with a different clock rate**

[here the story of the intelligence officers American and German re WWII]

the power of spontaneity no course to stay, no plans, only a meta-purpose even intelligence is of no use There is no intelligence re spontaneity

plans have meaning only within a set of rules within a game spontaneity is out of the box

There was an attempt to change the rules at Nuremberg, but it has been rejected

We do have a rule, an agreement between rulers, not to assassinate one another, keep mutual assassination on the troop level.

and civilian

THE FUTURE OF TERRORISM

A lecture by Albert G. Wilson, July 1980

Since November 4th of last year when the U.S. Embassy in Teheran was taken over by student militants, there have been 10 similar seizures of embassies in both Eastern and Western hemispheres by terrorist groups of various descriptions with various causes. It appears as though a new force is emerging in global politics. A few years ago hijacks, kidnaping, seizures of hostages were viewed simply as crimes. Perhaps rather dramatic crimes with somewhat different motivations, but none the less crimes, committed by criminals and to be punished as crimes. Today this view appears to be a bit naive. We are beginning to recognize that in terrorism we are encountering a new phenomenon, and while the specific acts of terrorists may be classified as criminal, terrorism is evolving into something much more than just crime. It is becoming a force that dialogues not on the level of cops and robbers, but on the level of ambassadors, heads of state, and U.N. Commissions. And this is because terrorists create miniature de facto states. While these nations have only limited spatial and temporal sovereignty, they are none-the-less locally sovereign and therefore to be addressed nation to nation not cop to robber. Further, terrorists have found that in being in possession of the embassy of a nation, they are not only in physical possession of a building, but are also in possession of a national symbol and therefore are, in some symbolic sense, in a position of dominion over that nation--and, at the dominated end, the citizenry of the nation share this feeling. This is clearly speaking state to state.

While the lives of hostages are per se of concern and importance, it is the affront of a symbolic boot on the throat of the nation that creates much of the anger and sense of frustration connected with many terrorist inspired incidents. But on a deeper level, there is the frustration arising from a de facto powerlessness because the terrorist situation slips through the net of our military and political power structures. There is great consternation over the realization that the traditional rules of the power game are not only being violated, but are being successfully scrapped. The terrorist movement is therefore of primary importance to futurists and those who try to stay alert to the winds of change in today's world.

Just exactly what has happened to the world that a mere handful of willful persons can effectively stand off the might and power of a great nation. Herman Kahn used to say, "Reality has outstripped experience". Here we have an example of experience beginning to catch up with reality. And it's an entirely different reality out there from the one we have in our heads.

What is the nature of this new reality? There are several factors that have made it possible and worthwhile for terrorists to take the risks they do to attain their ends:

0 First, terrorists can exist only in a divided world, a world that affords safe conduct and asylum in one part for criminal acts committed in other parts. Without hostile and non-cooperating camps there would be no safe conduct to anywhere. But so long as major divisions exist, East vs. West, Arab vs. Israeli, black vs. white, etc. one side looks on a terrorist act committed against the other side as a plus item for their side and will reward the terrorists with asylum or more.

④ An interesting parallel from history goes back to the time when England, France, Holland and Spain were contending for the New World. These countries were at war off and on--mostly on--throughout a good part of the 16th century. Privateering--the granting of "legal permission" to individuals through letters of marque to attack and seize as prizes the ships of other nations --became standard practice. But privateers crossed over the thin legal line to piracy when they continued to operate during periods of peace and when they no longer were too particular about the flag of the ship they seized as a prize. But piracy could not be checked so long as the nations were hostile and competitive. England would not punish an English privateer who attacked Spanish ships even when war was officially off. And Colonial America condoned piracy both by providing havens for the pirates and markets for their loot.

0 A second feature of today's world that enables terrorists to be effective is the high level of interconnectedness in the global system. In energy, food and basic resources no part of the world is completely self-sufficient or independent in its requirements. The more intimately interconnected and complex a system becomes, the more vulnerable it is to breakdowns, component failures, and deliberate acts of terrorism. An airplane--a very complex system-- flying at 30,000ft is vulnerable to even one bullet. It is not necessary to hold the gun to the head of the pilot, pointing it anywhere will do. With high levels of interconnectedness, if sufficient amounts of redundancy have not been provided, system vulnerability destroys the option space of its decision makers and leaves them with few alternative courses of action. Hardin's Law: "You cannot do just one thing" converts every missile into a boomerang. A punitive grain embargo primarily punishes the American farmer. An attempt to save hostages ends in their deaths. To "Nuke the Ayatollah" as some bumper stickers suggest, would trigger a jahid among not only Shiites, but throughout all Islam and we should be

prepared to come up with a daily 8 million barrels of oil from another source. When measures like "Boycott the Olympics" constitutes our arsenal of political options, we are getting a good look at the new reality.

We have great military power, but if we were to use it, we would lose those things which were the reason behind building up military might in the first place--a new reality example of doublebind.

0 A third aspect of today's world that works to the advantage of terrorists is the nature of modern weapons, particularly the large amount of firepower and destructive energy that is possible at the fingertips of but a handful of men. As recently as World War II, the Germans employed a large gun on the Eastern Front that could throw a seven ton armor piercing shell through 90 feet of solid rock at a distance of 19 miles. But to effect such a strike required 4,120 men--gun crew, maintenance and security forces. Today as few as five men could transport and detonate a device that could destroy an entire city.

0 A fourth feature supportive of terrorism is an intrinsic asymmetry both in the risks and in the rules that act to deter and restrict responses of the victim but not the terrorist. The target nation frequently stands to suffer great material loss, not only aircraft, buildings and resources, but human lives, sometimes highly placed leaders and persons whose skills are irreplaceable. On the other hand, terrorists stand to lose little, having little to lose in the first place. But the rules are also different. Nations and their agents are expected to be guided by forbearance, fairness and protectiveness. They cannot kill the innocent to get at the guilty. The favor of humankind turns against those states that act by the same rules as the terrorists. The terrorists, on their part, have no reputations at stake and for their purposes even profit from records of violence and rapacity. Terrorists and criminals may shoot and bomb, but states and police must act with restraint, else the difference and the choice between terrorists and the state disappears.

W Gandhi's "They are not our leaders"
It cannot be denied that today it is felt important to maintain an appearance of morality. This has had the effect of driving underground certain shadier diplomatic activities that are none the less considered to be essential, but the advantages of the more lawful procedures are internationally recognized.

The difference between the world of 1980 and that at the beginning of this century is well illustrated by an event quite similar to the present situation in Teheran which occurred during the Boxer Uprising in Peking in 1900. A group of militants, with the covert support of the Chinese

Government attacked the foreign legations in Peking. There ensued a 55 day siege which was lifted only when an eight-power international military relief force struck the capital. There was no hesitation at that time over the employment of force. But we may question whether the difference with today lies on views on the use of military force, the fact that then there were eight nations involved instead of just one, or in possible repercussions over access to oil.

0 A fourth feature, one related to the first feature of a suspicious and divided world, and one which is intimately connected with the increasing prevalence of terrorists, is the direct and indirect employment of terrorist forces and tactics by organizations under the control of the big powers. In fact, it was the big powers who first broke their own rules on the proper conduct of war and other forms of rivalry, blazing the path for independent terrorist groups. Being enemies is one thing, but breaking the established rules of enmity is another. Because of this there now exists a crack in the dike that could lead to a new type of international instability in which nobody knows "who's on first". Some brands of terrorists like credit for their deeds, but others including big power groups prefer anonymity. Many times we have no idea whom to blame for this morning's headline atrocities. CIA

Paradoxically, in the world struggle between the followers of Jefferson and those of Marx, the philosophical ideals of both lost out to those of a third contender. The draftsman who made the first design sketches for the new-reality was neither Marx nor Jefferson, It was Ivan Grozny--Ivan the Terrible, Tsar of Russia. His Oprichniki, set up in 1564, was the prototype for the modern secret police and undercover intelligence establishment. During the last 400 years Ivan's concepts were refined and perfected, primarily in Eastern countries. There is a long list in Russia alone: The Oprichniki, Okrana, the Revolution, then the Cheka, GPU, NKVD, MVD, and most recently the KGB. One important rubric concerning such organizations which the Russians early learned, but which their Western emulators have yet to appreciate is the necessity for periodically liquidating and replacing these groups, especially their chiefs. An undercover agency if left unpurged, will take you over in under 20 years time.

There is no question that such organizations afford many advantages to their employers in a divided and suspicious world. Through the decades of the 20's and 30's we suffered from the unfair competition on the world stage that the Third International forced on us with the aid of the above sequence of alphabetical agencies. Finally, after World War II we

decided we had to meet kind with kind and set up an intelligence agency authorized to perpetrate our own style of covert dirty tricks. President Truman who signed the CIA into existence, later said he felt that it might have been the greatest mistake of his life. Maybe he was right in his concern. Jefferson was put under house arrest and in less than 30 years the United States went from a highly respected and trusted nation to its present status as No. 1. hate target. A connection? It would be difficult to prove. However, the basic threat to society from either a terrorist organization or from a state sponsored covert agency lies in the existence of power without accountability. Somehow the Congress has been sold on the idea that the effectiveness of our intelligence gathering would be impaired by imposing accountability.

It must not be concluded, however, that an end to cold wars and the liquidation of CIA's and KGB's would result in the end of terrorism. The peace concluded between England and Spain in 1689 resulted in the "Golden Age of Piracy", a brief period of about 30 years duration when the privateers, their last pretexts of legitimacy removed, became purely pirates, ranging widely and preying upon whomsoever they would. When public repugnance over dirty tricks, even those against Spain, finally set in, the Royal Navy cleaned up the situation in short order, ending the "Golden Age" by about 1725.

The foregoing points: Divisiveness, global, regional and local; The vulnerability of the complex and highly interconnected systems; The large destructive power that can be wielded by relatively few, augmented by acute asymmetries in material and moral risk between terrorist groups and their targets; Covert practices of terrorism sponsored by legitimate states--should not be considered as causes of terrorism. These conditions are but the contextual climate that is supportive of terrorism. The causes and motivations of terrorism lie elsewhere.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS October 8, 1993

Thirteen years after the above was compiled most of the statements remain true. The Cold War has ended, but terrorism is still alive and well. It is still supported by divisiveness, particularly among Islamic groups, and in the isolation of countries such as Iran and Libya. Vulnerability to modern 'truck bombs' has been demonstrated from Beirut to New York City. The role (unplanned perhaps) of big power agencies in terrorism is now more clear. Those bombing the Trade Center in New York were trained by the CIA in Afghanistan. An effect, not predicted in 1980, is the trickle down of the violence of state terrorism to the violence of street gangs and psychotic individuals. We look to our governments and leaders to set the example.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS July 30, 2001

The past eight years have continued along the lines foreseen in 1980, not only with the bombing of American embassies in various countries, but with the end of the cold war we see a repetition of the privateers becoming pirates and a "Golden Age of Terrorism" ensuing. The principal unforeseen item in the original essay was the warfare between government agencies and home grown quasi-terrorist groups with consequences such as the Oklahoma City bombing. And also new is the concept of "rogue state". If a rogue state is one that excludes itself from participating in international treaties against biological warfare, land mines, cooperation with the International Court, etc, then the United States has become a rogue state.

*All of the above written before 9/11
Unchanged*

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS September 15, 2001

The second bombing of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, together with the bombing of the Pentagon, reiterated a parameter that seems important in the thinking of some terrorists. An attack must not only be against a physical target, but must also carry symbolic significance. The idols under attack were the West's financial system (WTC) and its military support base (Pentagon). Terrorist thinking seems to be deeply absorbed with a "voodoo" association between a symbol and its referent. If one destroys the symbol or ikon, the destruction of the physical system will follow. [cf the Taliban destruction of ancient Buddhist statues earlier this year] Whether we chose to believe or disbelieve this, an important clue to future strikes by terrorists may be the physical manifestations of symbols they wish to destroy.

THE FUTURE OF TERRORISM

Since November 4th of last year when the U.S. Embassy in Teheran was taken over by student militants, there have been 10 similar seizures of embassies in both Eastern and Western hemispheres by terrorist groups of various descriptions with various causes. It appears as though a new force is emerging in global politics. A few years ago hijackings, kidnappings, seizures of hostages were viewed simply as crimes. Perhaps rather dramatic crimes with somewhat different motivations, but none the less crimes, committed by criminals and to be punished as crimes.

Today this view appears to be a bit naive. We are beginning to recognize that in terrorism we are encountering a new phenomenon, and while the specific acts of terrorists may be classified as criminal, terrorism is evolving into something much more than just crime. It is becoming a force that dialogues not on the level of cops and robbers, but on the level of ambassadors, heads of state, and U.N. Commissions. And this is because terrorists create miniature de facto states. While these nations have only limited spatial and temporal sovereignty, they are none-the-less locally sovereign and therefore to be addressed nation to nation not cop to robber. Further, terrorists have found that in being in possession of the embassy of a nation, they are not only in physical possession of a building, but are also in possession of a national symbol and therefore are, in some symbolic sense, in a position of dominion over that nation--and, at the dominated end, the citizenry of the nation share this feeling. This is clearly speaking state to state.

While the lives of hostages are per se of concern and importance, it is the affront of a symbolic boot on the throat of the nation that creates much of the anger and sense of frustration connected with many terrorist inspired incidents. But on a deeper level, there is the frustration arising from a de facto powerlessness because the terrorist situation slips through the net of our military and political power structures. There is great consternation over the realization that the traditional rules of the power game are not only being violated, but are being successfully scrapped. The terrorist movement is therefore of primary importance to futurists and those who try to stay alert to the winds of change in today's world.

Just exactly what has happened to the world that a mere handful of willful persons can effectively stand off the might and power of a great nation. Herman Kahn used to say, "Reality has outstripped experience". Here we have an example of experience beginning to catch up with reality. And it's an entirely different reality out there from the one we have in our heads.

What is the nature of this new reality? There are several factors that have made it possible and worthwhile for terrorists to take the risks they do to attain their ends:

0 First, terrorists can exist only in a divided world, a world that affords safe conduct and asylum in one part for criminal acts committed in other parts. Without hostile and non-cooperating camps there would be no safe conduct to anywhere. But so long as major divisions exist, East vs. West, Arab vs. Israeli, black vs. white, etc. one side looks on a terrorist act committed against the other side as a plus item for their side and will reward the terrorists with asylum or more. An interesting parallel from history goes back to the time when England, France, Holland and Spain were contending for the New World. These countries were at war off and on--mostly on--throughout a good part of the 16th century. Privateering--the granting of "legal permission" to

individuals through letters of marque to attack and seize as prizes the ships of other nations --became standard practice. But privateers crossed over the thin legal line to piracy when they continued to operate during periods of peace and when they no longer were too particular about the flag of the ship they seized as a prize. But piracy could not be checked so long as the nations were hostile and competitive. England would not punish an English privateer who attacked Spanish ships even when war was officially off. And Colonial America condoned piracy both by providing havens for the pirates and markets for their loot.

0 A second feature of today's world that enables terrorists to be effective is the high level of interconnectedness in the global system. In energy, food and basic resources no part of the world is completely self-sufficient or independent in its requirements. The more intimately interconnected and complex a system becomes, the more vulnerable it is to breakdowns, component failures, and deliberate acts of terrorism. An airplane--a very complex system-- flying at 30,000ft is vulnerable to even one bullet. It is not necessary to hold the gun to the head of the pilot, pointing it anywhere will do. With high levels of interconnectedness, if sufficient amounts of redundancy have not been provided, system vulnerability destroys the option space of its decision makers and leaves them with few alternative courses of action. Hardin's Law: "You cannot do just one thing" converts every missile into a boomerang. A punitive grain embargo primarily punishes the American farmer. An attempt to save hostages ends in their deaths. To "Nuke the Ayatollah" as some bumper stickers suggest, would trigger a jahid among not only Shiites, but throughout all Islam and we should be prepared to come up with a daily 8 million barrels of oil from another source. When measures like "Boycott the Olympics" constitutes our arsenal of political options, we are getting a good look at the new reality.

We have great military power, but if we were to use it, we would lose those things which were the reason behind building up military might in the first place--a new reality example of doublebind.

0 A third aspect of today's world that works to the advantage of terrorists is the nature of modern weapons, particularly the large amount of firepower and destructive energy that is possible at the fingertips of but a handful of men. As recently as World War II, the Germans employed a large gun on the Eastern Front that could throw a seven ton armor piercing shell through 90 feet of solid rock at a distance of 19 miles. But to effect such a strike required 4,120 men--gun crew, maintenance and security forces. Today as few as five men could transport and detonate a device that could destroy an entire city.

0 A fourth feature supportive of terrorism is an intrinsic asymmetry both in the risks and in the rules that act to deter and restrict responses of the victim but not the terrorist. The target nation frequently stands to suffer great material loss, not only aircraft, buildings and resources, but human lives, sometimes highly placed leaders and persons whose skills are irreplaceable. On the other hand, terrorists stand to lose little, having little to lose in the first place. But the rules are also different. Nations and their agents are expected to be guided by forbearance, fairness and protectiveness. They cannot kill the innocent to get at the guilty. The favor of humankind turns against those states that act by the same rules as the terrorists. The terrorists, on their part, have no reputations at stake and for their purposes even profit from records of violence and rapacity. Terrorists and criminals may shoot and bomb, but states and police must act with restraint, else the difference and the choice between terrorists and the state disappears. It cannot be denied that today it is felt important to maintain an appearance of morality. This has had the effect of driving underground certain shadier diplomatic activities that are none the less considered to be essential,

but the advantages of the more lawful procedures are internationally recognized.

The difference between the world of 1980 and that at the beginning of this century is well illustrated by an event quite similar to the present situation in Teheran which occurred during the Boxer Uprising in Peking in 1900. A group of militants, with the covert support of the Chinese Government attacked the foreign legations in Peking. There ensued a 55 day siege which was lifted only when an eight-power international military relief force struck the capital. There was no hesitation at that time over the employment of force. But we may question whether the difference with today lies on views on the use of military force, the fact that then there were eight nations involved instead of just one, or in possible repercussions over access to oil.

0 A fourth feature, one related to the first feature of a suspicious and divided world, and one which is intimately connected with the increasing prevalence of terrorists, is the direct and indirect employment of terrorist forces and tactics by organizations under the control of the big powers. In fact, it was the big powers who first broke their own rules on the proper conduct of war and other forms of rivalry, blazing the path for independent terrorist groups. Being enemies is one thing, but breaking the established rules of enmity is another. Because of this there now exists a crack in the dike that could lead to a new type of international instability in which nobody knows "who's on first". Some brands of terrorists like credit for their deeds, but others including big power groups prefer anonymity. Many times we have no idea whom to blame for this morning's headline atrocities.

Paradoxically, in the world struggle between the followers of Jefferson and those of Marx, the philosophical ideals of both lost out to those of a third contender. The draftsman who made the first design sketches for the new-reality was neither Marx nor Jefferson, it was Ivan Grozny--Ivan the Terrible, Tsar of Russia. His Oprichniki, set up in 1564, was the prototype for the modern secret police and undercover intelligence establishment. During the last 400 years Ivan's concepts were refined and perfected, primarily in Eastern countries. There is a long list in Russia alone: The Oprichniki, Okrana, the Revolution, then the Cheka, GPU, NKVD, MVD, and most recently the KGB. One important rubric concerning such organizations which the Russians early learned, but which their Western emulators have yet to appreciate is the necessity for periodically liquidating and replacing these groups, especially their chiefs. An undercover agency if left unpurged, will take you over in under 20 years time.

There is no question that such organizations afford many advantages to their employers in a divided and suspicious world. Through the decades of the 20's and 30's we suffered from the unfair competition on the world stage that the Third International forced on us with the aid of the above sequence of alphabetical agencies. Finally, after World War II we decided we had to meet kind with kind and set up an intelligence agency authorized to perpetrate our own style of covert dirty tricks. President Truman who signed the CIA into existence, later said he felt that it might have been the greatest mistake of his life. Maybe he was right in his concern. Jefferson was put under house arrest and in less than 30 years the United States went from a highly respected and trusted nation to its present status as No. 1. hate target. A connection? It would be difficult to prove. However, the basic threat to society from either a terrorist organization or from a state sponsored covert agency lies in the existence of power without accountability. Somehow the Congress has been sold on the idea that the effectiveness of our intelligence gathering would be impaired by imposing accountability.

It must not be concluded, however, that an end to cold wars and the liquidation of CIA's and KGB's would result in the end of terrorism. The peace concluded between England and Spain in 1689 resulted in the "Golden Age of Piracy", a brief period of about 30 years duration when the privateers, their

last pretexts of legitimacy removed, became purely pirates, ranging widely and preying upon whomsoever they would. When public repugnance over dirty tricks, even those against Spain, finally set in, the Royal Navy cleaned up the situation in short order, ending the "Golden Age" by about 1725.

The foregoing points: Divisiveness, global, regional and local; The vulnerability of the complex and highly interconnected systems; The large destructive power wieldable by relatively few, augmented by acute asymmetries in material and moral risk between terrorist groups and their targets; Covert practices of terrorism sponsored by legitimate states--should not be considered as causes of terrorism. These conditions are but the contextual climate that is supportive of terrorism. The causes and motivations of terrorism lie elsewhere.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS October 8, 1993

Fifteen years after the above was compiled most of the statements remain true. The Cold War has ended, but terrorism is still alive and well. It is still supported by divisiveness, particularly among Islamic groups, and in the isolation of countries such as Iran and Libya. Vulnerability to modern 'truck bombs' has been demonstrated from Beirut to New York City. The role (unplanned perhaps) of big power agencies in terrorism is now more clear. Those bombing the Trade Center in New York were trained by the CIA in Afghanistan. An effect, not predicted in 1980, is the trickle down of the violence of state inspired and ideological terrorism to the violence of street gangs and psychotic individuals. We look to our leaders to set the example.

September 9, 1996

ON CODE BOOKS

The White House is sending a message to the Middle East encoded according to the code book of American politics, which Republicans, Democrats, and the public at large all share and all understand. But the message is received and decoded in Islamic lands by peoples having a different code-book. The message they receive is not the one the incompetents in the White House think they are sending. This is a form of egoism that has more than once been at the root of failures of American foreign policy, from the time of Woodrow Wilson to today. Assuming that our way of thinking is also how others think has cost thousands of lives of American service men in wars whose seeds were planted by our thinking locally and acting globally.

The compilers of messages proclaim, "There will be no mistaking the message we are sending", "The only thing ^{so & so} understands is force". These announcements are excuses for not taking the effort to translate what we want to say so that it can be understood in the language of cultures with different values and ^{w/ different} approaches to life. Ultimately, the usual message that gets across, one certainly not intended, is that the only thing Americans understand is force. Perhaps that message may contribute to how terrorists choose to communicate with us.

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER PART I

“At 12:18 p.m. on Friday, February 26, 1993, a bomb exploded in the World Trade Center, collapsing walls, igniting fires, and leaving 50,000 workers and visitors gasping for air and stranded in darkness in the shafts of the 110 story towers. The explosion, which carved out a 200-foot-wide, five-story-deep crater in the lower levels, knocked out the tower’s police command and central operations center, rendering the complex’s emergency evacuation system useless.”¹

“Ramzi Yousef was the mastermind of this February 1993 World Trade Center bombing which killed six people and injured more than a thousand. Ramzi Yousef & Co. were ready to use dynamite and a Ryder truck [to fulfill their objective] to spit in the face of Americanization-globalization and stomp on it, by using the system against itself.”²

“Did he want a Palestinian state in Brooklyn? Did he want an Islamic republic in New Jersey? No, He just wanted to blow up two of the tallest buildings in America. He told the Federal District Court in Manhattan that his goal was to set off an explosion that would cause one World Trade Center tower to fall onto the other and kill 250,000 civilians. Ramzi Yousef’s message was that he had no message, other than to rip up the message coming from the all-powerful America to his society”²

At his trial Ramzi Yousef said: “You keep talking about collective punishment and killing innocent people. . . You were the first one who introduced this type of terrorism to the history of mankind when you dropped an atomic bomb which killed tens of thousands of women and children in Japan and when you killed over 100,000 people, most of them civilians, in Tokyo with firebombings. You killed them by burning them to death. And you killed civilians in Vietnam with chemicals, as with the so-called Orange agent. You killed civilians and innocent people, not soldiers, in every single war you went to. You went to war more than any other country in this century, and then you have the nerve to talk about killing innocent people. And now you have invented new ways to kill innocent people, You have so-called economic embargo, which kills nobody other than children and elderly people, and which , other than Iraq, you have been placing the economic embargo on Cuba and other countries for over thirty-five years. The government in its summations and opening statement said that I was a ‘terrorist’. Yes, I am a terrorist and I am proud of it. And I support terrorism so long as it was against the United States government and against Israel, because you are more than terrorists; you are the one who invented terrorism and are using it every day. You are butchers, liars and hypocrites.”³

¹ From the book, SKYSCRAPERS, Black Dog Publishers, 1996 p 67

² From the book, THE LEXUS AND THE OLIVE TREE, Thomas L. Friedman, Anchor Books, 1999, p 402

³ ibid p 404

THOUGHTS ON OCTOBER 8, 2001

As many have said, the world changed on 9/11. And I find that my thoughts have been wondering in strange and unfamiliar places ever since. One change that 9/11 effected was to open us up to alternatives that were invisible on 9/10. This I would say is good, but only if we are prepared to risk the alternatives. However, what has happened in the intervening three weeks is that we have chosen to travel once more the road that for centuries has returned us to the same pit from which we started. We either lack the courage or imagination to risk an alternative. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that leadership, those who make the decisions for us, lack the courage and imagination to do something untried. For there seem to be thousands of plain citizens who have articulated realistic alternatives that would allow us to escape the loop of revenge and counter revenge. We are again faced with the ancient Confucian paradox that those who want and seek power are the least qualified to exercise it.

The "first war of the 21st century" is a "framing war". A fight over who will define the issue for the public's frame of mind, and thus permit other pertinent issues to be downplayed or ignored. In other words, how to simplify a complex tangle of conflicting historic trends, interests and motivations in order to seize the moral high ground for a particular agenda and thus compel God to choose sides. Or in cowboy terms, how to create a frame that makes us the good guys and them the bad guys. The Bush Administration is drafting the frame: Freedom and Peace against Terrorism. Osama bin Laden is seeking the frame: Islam and Justice against American Imperialism. A neutral, but moral, alien from Venus or Mars would agree and disagree with both frames and wonder why the avoidance of the real issues. The same aliens know that all frames are not only wrong, but obstruct and preclude understanding.

Two days after the 9/11 assault on the American homeland, President Bush established a cabinet level department of Homeland Defense. Most of us thought we already had a department of defense. But we have learned that this so called Department of Defense can do little to protect the lives of Americans either at home or abroad. The real department of defense turned out to be the fire and police departments of various communities. In these departments were the heros who gave their lives defending America. But what is this multi-trillion dollar Department of Defense that we have been supporting for decades under the illusion it could defend us? If we look at some of the weapons it has bought to defend us we find: B-52H Stratofortresses, range 8,800 nautical miles carrying cruise missiles; B-1B Lancers, range 5,600 nm with bombs, cruise missiles and cluster bomblets; B-2 Spirit stealth bombers, range 6,300 nm with cruise missiles and guided bombs. And C-17 Globemaster cargo planes, range 3,225 miles, which can carry three Apache helicopter gunships, 100 paratroopers, or a mobile 155mm howitzer. Do these ranges sound like these weapons were designed to defend the home land? Rather it appears, the bombers and globemasters were designed to command distant parts of the globe. We have been deceived. We do not have a Department of Defense. We have a Department of Colonialism.

There seem to be some things that Osama bin Laden knows that American leadership has either forgotten or not grasped.:

First, Colonialism.

History has shown that the peoples of the colonized parts of the world have overwhelmingly rejected colonialism, from the Minute Men of 1776 to the Viet Cong of 1976. The take over of foreign lands and peoples by Western powers which began with Portuguese explorers in the 15th century, reached its peak in the 19th century, but was then eroded by two great wars fought between colonial powers in the first decades of the 20th century. Following World War II global unrest and uprisings forced the colonial powers except for the Soviet Union and the United States to abandon colonialism. The United States sought indirectly to replace the French in Viet Nam and the Soviets sought to sovietize Afghanistan. Both actions were part of a struggle for global dominance, (colonialism, that is) labeled "The Cold War".¹ Both colonial wannabees were defeated, not by each other, but by indigenous peoples. Finally, in 1991 the peoples in the Soviet Empire from the Baltic to Central Asia threw off Soviet colonialism leaving only the United States to continue to play the colonial power game, specifically with the Gulf War and numerous "incidents" in such places as Granada, Panama, and Somalia. While American neo-colonialism is more economic than political, like the old colonialism, it requires military presence in far parts of the globe. But indigenous peoples resented a return to colonialism in any form and it did not require an Osama bin Laden to create the awareness that there was a new generation of exploitation at hand. The United States formed a tentative and fragile alliance with local rulers, but the peoples of the region stand ready to oppose all who represent foreign dominance and exploitation. It is this wide spread resentment that bin Laden hopes to mobilize to his own purposes by morphing it into a jihad.

Second, Random Warfare

The first war of the 21st century is not a war. Sun Tzu and Clausewitz would not recognize it. From the days of Alexander's phalanxes to America's nuclear aircraft carriers military might has resided in the concentration of force. The rules of war were for force to meet force head on to decide outcomes. But over the years there were annoying exceptions to the rules. Such as, General Braddock upset by "cowardly" Indians shooting from behind trees instead of facing off man to man. Or, German outrage in three wars at the cowardly franc-tireur, civilian snipers shooting at troops from windows and roof tops. Although guerilla groups have plagued legitimate warriors for centuries, they never were sufficiently effective as to force a change in the rules of war -until now. And what has happened to render the guerillas sufficiently effective? Technology! With modern technologies the few can now overcome the many. A "cowardly" handful with modern weapons, nuclear, chemical, biological, can destroy the multitude. And as was demonstrated on 9/11, the handful did not need to make or own the weapons, they could convert the technology of their enemies into weaponry. Box cutters converting commercial aircraft into guided missiles. But the technological dimension is not the only dimension that has scrapped the traditional rules of warfare. The chess board of traditional war has been replaced by the spin of the roulette wheel ^{and} or the random toss of dice.

¹ Soviet colonialism flew the banner of world communist revolution. American colonialism flew the banner of free markets and anti-communism.

What today we are calling cowardly is not hiding behind trees or shooting from windows but skill in exploiting the properties of randomness: Attacks at random times in random places with random weapons against random targets. The result –random and paralyzing fear, with the overriding question, ‘ What must we change in order to fight a random war?’ To fight such a war, we have to ask: Who is the enemy? Where is the enemy? What is he up to? Who is helping him? The answers are again random. He could be anybody, He could be on the plane, in the ballpark, in the supermarket He could be part of a terrorist network based in Afghanistan, agent of a drug cartel in Columbia, member of an disaffected local minority, or just plain wacko. He could be laying land mines in golf courses, launching computer viruses, spraying anthrax, fitting out a truck bomb, putting together a nuclear weapon. And who is helping him? A network of laundered transfers from difficult to trace anonymous accounts. Or he might just be acting alone on his own funds. How do we protect against the randomness of all of these possibilities? We try to create targets by saying if the enemy resides in your country then you become the enemy. This might allow us the satisfaction of employing our traditional weapons in the traditional way, but does very little in the war against randomness, except possibly to create more enemies. Military leadership is beginning to glimpse the nature of random war. The Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, now says that neither the air war nor a ground war will put a quick end to terrorism. “This war may take a long time.”² So it may turn out that the solution to terrorism is not war.

It may be that the first war of the 21st century will not be a religious war as bin Laden hopes, but will be the war that finally puts an end to colonialism. A war demonstrating that history cannot be defied and that is not in the interest of any nation, even a “super–power”, to dictate unilaterally to the world. I do not wish to conclude that Osama bin Laden will have two powerful allies on his side—the power of randomness and history itself. But if we do not understand these factors he might coopt them to his advantage. We should remember,

“Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power.”

² If it turns into a religious war, a jihad, as bin Laden wishes, it could take a very long time. We should recall that the last religious war lasted 30 years [1618-1648] and some of those before that [e.g. the Crusades] lasted for centuries.

SOME DECEMBER THOUGHTS

Today we are celebrating the attack on Pearl Harbor which occurred 60 years ago this date. I wonder why we celebrate the beginning of a war instead of its ending. Everyone knows December 7, few know the date the war ended. Once there was a brief exception, We celebrated Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, the end of World War I. But that did not last long. We changed the celebration of that date from the ending of a war to the honoring of veterans. It is fitting we honor those who make sacrifices, but I find it a paradox for a nation that proclaims to hate war to celebrate the start of wars instead of their termination.

I also find it paradoxical, when we are repeatedly told that everything changed on 9/11, that it has become politically incorrect to question why politicians and the military are doing everything the same old way. Why hasn't their thinking changed? They are trying to force unprecedented situations into obsolete molds. The random nature of terrorism cannot be forced into opposing lines of trenches or besieged cities just so the traditional practice of warfare can be employed. Instead of facing up to the new nature of the challenge and designing a way to oppose it, current leadership has put its energies into an attempt to bend the new challenge to fit old solutions. And it is not working. Furthermore, removal of Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, Arafat, and their successors will not put an end to terrorism. The genie is out of the bottle and CVN's, F16's, gun ships, tanks, or troops cannot put him back in. The department of defense is not constituted to protect America against this kind of threat. Yes, many things have changed since 9/11, but not our way of thinking.

While reviewing the happenings of the past few weeks, four points about the nature of terrorism should be made:

- 1) Technology has disrupted traditional power balance. Now a handful can successfully take on an entire nation.
- 2) The random nature of terrorism has rendered the traditional force-against-force type of warfare ineffective in opposing it.
- 3) Terrorists are not motivated by greed, aspiration to power, or "winning". They are motivated by hatred. This leads to irrational and unconventional attacks.
- 4) Since terrorists are suicidal, they have little to lose physically against what they can destroy physically. And they have little to lose morally against what those who combat them can lose.

The imbalances noted in points 1) and 4) have made traditional security and stability procedures obsolete. Pretending we are in a conventional war, rather than confronting this new and different species of threat with the innovative thinking and action it requires, is inviting disaster. Those leaders and institutions that were made obsolete on 2001-9-11 are the ones who are in a war. They are waging a war against having to change, a war to preserve obsolete thinking and business as usual. But the price for the survival of ^{JAELR}inflexibility is not one humanity can be expected to pay.

One pundit has put it:

The U.S. is a Scrooge nation [re per capita as per GNP
giving]

But the US is not a nation of scrooges.

Scrooge is the Capitalist System and
the international corporations that have
sold it.

If the terrorist could get it straight.

America is not the enemy, it
is the international corporate state
that is the enemy - globalization
the new colonialism, and imperialism

Terrorists have in common with all extremists the inability to cope with complexity. They must simplify all issues into black and white, them and us. They have lumped all Americans into the same package of being exploitive, arrogant, imperialists. They ignore the reality of millions of Americans who are compassionate sharing people dedicated to world justice and peace and the fact that we contribute billions of dollars each year to other countries to raise their standards of living. But for their agenda to work, the world must be polarized. The jihad must be all of us against all of them. No neutrals, no non-combatants, no innocents.

To counter the terrorists' attempt to polarize the world into a them and us, we have responded by attempting to polarize the world into a ^{us} them and ^{them} us. The result has been a cooperative effort in polarization. In order to fit terrorism into the traditional patterns of conventional warfare, where force directly encounters force, U.S. leadership had to lump entire nation states and terrorists into the same package. In order to supply targets for our global weaponry systems (CVN's, 8800 mile range B-52H Stratofortress bombers etc.), and give them a role to play, sovereign states such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, etc. were equated to terrorist cults, ignoring the fact that a country that may contain a dozen terrorist cells also contains several million individuals who have nothing to do with terrorism. The logic behind this is as irrational as is the fanaticism of the terrorists. In fact, our us/them policy coincides exactly with their policy of a global jihad against the United States.

It is well known that in order for conflict even to be possible there must first be some agreements, agreements on the rules of war so to speak. The agreement that has been reached by both sides in this terrorism war is that there is to be global polarization in order to exclude any alternative solutions. Both sides have agendas that would be thwarted by alternative options. So you are either with us or against us, you are not allowed to be neutral and if you choose to criticize the polarization you will automatically be classified as one of them.

This has been the ultimate triumph of logic based on the law of the excluded middle.

With the masks removed and the contenders unveiled, the world is now in a war between the supporters of the madness of arrogance and the supporters of the insanity of hatred. The rest of us are not allowed to be neutral. Our role is to be collateral damage.

*The type of leadership that has created the present world crisis,
is not the type that can solve it.*

TAKE OVER vs TAKE DOWN

Two distinct wars are being fought, neither with a chance of winning. The terrorist's Jihad, and the Imperialists "war against terrorism". Neither of these wars do significant damage to their supposed enemy. Both primarily kill and destroy the innocent non participants.

It is shaping into a war between those who want to "take over" and those who want to "take down". Imperialists vs Terrorists. Sane people cannot support either group. But the millions of lemmings on earth keep both groups viable.

Most of us have nothing to gain by supporting either side. Not all of us will likely be victims of WMD, but we all seem already to be victims of WMM,, weapons of mass manipulation. And it appears that the WMM are as hitech and dangerous as the WMD (WMM have gone way beyond Orwell's time). In fact the most effective use of WMD is as WMM, [through fear that is.]

WMM convert free men into lemmings. Those who have full information and access to all the contexts cannot be manipulated into fearful lemmings. But the psychological napalms of WMM turn citizens into lemmings that will let anything be done in their name.

The principal weapons of WMM are secrecy, distortion, distraction, repetition, fear, uncertainty, mood swings, big lies such as the inevitability of such and such making it inevitable.

There is a paradox: The Imps cannot use WMD against the Ters. But the Ters could readily use WMD against the Imps. However, only the Imps possess WMD. The Ters only hope to acquire them.

The Imps must fight a traditional chess or geometric war of position and movement, supply lines etc

The Ters fight a dice or random war, anywhere, anywhen and they cannot be deterred as can nation states.

The important difference is group and state. Weapons designed for state vs state wars are not effective against the groups that wage random war against states. Refusing to accept this fact, and wanting to continue to build state vs state military machines, the war against the terrorist groups was translated into state vs state war on the premise that some states might contain terrorist groups. This translated the war against terrorism into pseudo imperialism. [There is also evidence that other agendas entered into the picture e.g. oil, which strikes the adjective pseudo from imperialism]

A military establishment built to fight geometric war is all but useless for random war. [else why home defense] esp WMD

It is an illusion to fight random war by a geometric war taking on country after country

The Imps replace an element [a terrorist group] with a set [a country]

Imps invade an entire country of innocents to kill a few terrorists.

While terrorists terrify an entire country by killing a few innocents.

The real battlefield in the war between the "take overs" and the "take downs" is not physical. It is the endurance of people to live with terror and violence.

The bottom line is that to win is impossible for either side. First, the terrorists are not concerned with winning anything only with taking down, destroying, but the Imps in their illusion that they are in a war that can be won are only replacing existing terrorists with new recruits. Their take over war does not stop terrorism it only strengthens it.

The fallacy of security from sovereignty. Security will come only from planet wide participation.

A MORPHOLOGY OF WAR

PARAMETER I. CONTESTANTS

- A. Balanced: *state w state*
family vs family; group vs group; tribe vs tribe; city vs city; nation vs nation
- B. Unbalanced:
religion vs religion; alliances; guerillas; terrorists

PARAMETER II. PHYSICAL STRATEGIES

- A. {Battles} armed force vs armed force Discontinuous Destruction
- B. Siege and Trench warfare Continuous Attrition
- C. War of movement Continuous Envelopment
- D. Random war Discontinuous Disruption, *P.R.*

PARAMETER III. PSYCHOLOGICAL STRATEGIES

- A. Shock and Awe; Fear; Propaganda and Spin; Deterrence

PARAMETER IV. WEAPONS

- A. Rocks, swords, catapults, cannons, machine guns, bombs, gas, germs, nukes
- B. Delivery Systems
personnel (suicide bombers), cavalry, tanks, aircraft, missiles, *money*

PARAMETER V. TARGETS

Armed forces, factories and farms, cities and civilians, infrastructure, cyber space

PARAMETER VI. GOALS

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CONVENTIONAL: TAKE OVER | TERRORISTS: TAKE DOWN |
| A. Control of territory and key points | A. Destruction and disruption |
| B. Control of resources and population | B. Kung Fu weaponry |
| C. Control of the record, "Sealing" <i>and P.R.</i> | C. Symbolic messages |
| D. Security and Order | D. Death and Paradise |

PARAMETER VII. CONTESTANT RATIOS

- A. Strength and population (The bully ratios)
- B. Intelligence and technology
- C. Resources and Production *death / live*

William S. Lind's Four Generations of Warfare:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| I. Prior to 20 th Century: | State armies using line and column tactics |
| II. World War I | War of attrition body count (French) |
| III. World War II | War of speed Blitz Krieg (German) |
| IV Terrorists | Random War Take Down (al Qaeda) |

trigger self-defeat

Definitions of Victory, Winston

Aikin

re Vietnam

Declare Victory and come home

THE SPECIES OF WAR

LAND WARFARE

1) **Slug Match:** Opposing lines and columns
 Probably the oldest form of warfare. Alexander's phalanxes, Caesar's legions
 The major form of warfare up until the American Civil War
 "Get there fustest with the mostest"

2) **Attrition:** Siege and trench warfare
 Siege of cities, starvation
 World War I, the trenches, outlast the enemy
 Body count warfare

Insurgents - out last forces

3) **Envelopment:** Maneuver and speed
 Rapid movement of cavalry or tanks
 By pass strong points
 Mongol general: Subutai, 4 contingents
 WWI Otto Hutier; WW II Rommel, Guderian, Patton

Targets
 1) Militar
 2) Captive Cities
 3) Economic
 4) Army Down
 Fear

4) **Random:** Guerillas and terrorists
 Irregulars, American Indian warfare
 Partisans, franc-tireur, snipers, "insurgents" freedom fighters, militias
 Suicide bombers

Cold War Economic Deterrence

*DEFENSE: EXPANDING "GREEN ZONES"
OFFENSE INTELLIGENCE & SWAT SQUADS*

Disable don't destroy

keeps enemy from changing

NAVAL WARFARE

1) **Boarding**
 Ship vs ship, Lepanto, piracy

2) **Parallel lines**
 Trafalgar, Jutland *slug it out*

*Submarine
Convoys and Wolfpacks*

3) **Manuever**
 Crossing the "T", Tsushima

raiders

4) **Carriers**
 WW II Pearl Harbor, Midway

ON ARMS RACES

(Sun Tzu updated)

There are two principal dimensions to an arms race: First, the competition for the most power within a fixed technological milieu, that is, to be stronger or bigger than the opponent in current weaponry. And second, competition in the development and enhancement of new and innovative weapon systems. This includes innovative tactics and strategies as well as innovative technology. [This second race is usually structured around the dialectics of offense vs. defense.] In other words, 1) competition in size and 2) competition in smart. Over centuries the second competitive dimension has become increasingly more significant than the first. Until today the innovative dimension destabilizes within a few decades any power position built on fixed concepts and fixed weapon systems. Military power is no longer to be measured by weapon and man power inventories and their ability to be replaced, but by the ability to innovate and by the speed with which innovative concepts can be put into practice. It follows that the military advantage of the future will reside with the most scientifically and technically educated population. [Perhaps the highest priority for the future security of the United States is an educated and intelligent administration]

THE OFFENSE/DEFENSE DIALECTIC

Which came first offense or defense? The chicken or the egg, the phenotype or genotype?

usually a defense is developed in response to an offense

first the sword (offense), then the shield (defense)

first raiders (offense), then the city wall (defense)

the battleship (offense) then coast artillery (defense)

tanks(offense) then Maginot line (defense)

missiles (offense) then Mutually Assured Destruction (defense)

But defense always invited an offense response

The city wall then the trebuchet, catapult, cannon

aircraft, then anti-aircraft

But now the anomaly of ABM, a defense coming before the offense.

Field of Dreams. Build the ball park, the players will come

Build the ABM, the missiles will come.

*It takes only one to
create a fight - Eowyn
start*

But it takes two to make peace

W U.S.A.

2 to start fight

Congress + President

1 to stop fight

President

Technological Races

battleships dreadnoughts Carriers missile submarines

Germ Warfare :blankets with small pox infection

Defensive anthrax: In trying to develop offensive and defensive germs we forget germs have no political allegiances and have no respect for political borders.

machine gun tank Aircraft Anti aircraft

equilibrium stability Treaties Washington London 1972 biological warfare
gas Nuclear testing Mutually assured destruction Preemptive strikes [Ozbekian's Law]
If we have stability, why destabilize "If it ain't broke don't try to fix it"

Arms another arena in which to play a competitive game

Go back to soccer since nowadays war can have no winners

Power without war By having the mostest But this is not either defense or security

We have used a military build up, not to provide security, but to project power. The ABM is an after thought for security, but it is predicated on defending the front gate, but ignoring the more probable paths of threat.

The masters of threats to security are also highly innovative. Novel threats appear every year.

Security:

Coast artillery designed against battleships in the age of the aircraft carrier.

Maginot lines designed against guns and infantry in the age of tanks and rockets

ABM designed against missiles in the age of truck bombs and germ warfare

Mutually assured destruction in the age of nuclear missiles

Rogue states and terrorists

I can circumvent your mostest very easily -Osama bin Laden

Missiles are not my weapon of choice They are too expensive

German General Otto Hutier in WW I attack the links ignore the nodes *envelop*

destroy the will to fight was important before a handful had weapons that could annihilate millions The ratio of the power of a weapon to the number of persons required to use it.

Meta War

A TWO LEVEL WAR

While planners in the Pentagon have long worked on plans for the United States to be able to fight a war in two parts of the world at the same time. [an upgrade of a two front war], they have never contemplated fighting a *two level* war. And that is what we now face, on one level a war against **terrorists** and on another level a war against **terrorism**. These are two distinct wars and thinking of them as one and the same will lead to defeat. Further, neither of these wars fits the patterns of traditional war. The war against terrorists is a *random* war. Unlike past warfare, and even different from guerilla warfare, the nature of the war that terrorists wage consists of random strikes at random targets with random weapons at random times. Nothing is predictable. No longer does being there firstest with the mostest have meaning. You cannot mass superior forces if you do not know where or when to mass them. There is no conventional or traditional defense against this type of warfare except intelligence, and a new and superior form of intelligence is called for. But even if the war against current terrorists is won, it would not be a victory, since for every terrorist killed or captured, so long as the underlying causes of terrorism remain, dozens more are ready to take their place. Hence the second level of the war, the war against terrorism is a war to abolish the conditions that create terrorists. The precedent for this type of war is the Marshall Plan, a non violent war against the causes of war that followed WWII. While our invasion of Afghanistan and Israel's invasion of the west bank may have succeeded in eliminating current terrorists, without there being a follow up "Marshall Plan", there will be no victory over terrorism.

The challenge is to shift from level one to level two. If there is too much momentum on the part of terrorists, it becomes impossible to initiate a Marshall Plan. So a goal of a level one war, the war against current terrorists, is to check the activities of terrorists for a sufficient time for the a Marshall Plan to be initiated and for its benefits to kick in. Once a populace has recognized the benefits of the aid being supplied and acknowledges it source, that populace itself will place the checks on would be terrorists. Indeed, the only group that can effectively place a check on terrorists is their own community. If it is made clear that resumption of terrorist activity will result in terminating the plan, those in the community will have additional incentive to curtail any terrorist activity.

Specifically, what should be the steps in a Marshall Plan to combat the causes of terrorism? First, people must already have had sufficient experience that the violence reduces their day by day lives. Second, since it is those with nothing to lose who are the most likely terrorist recruits, people must be given something to lose.* Third, people must perceive that the vector toward peace is daily improving their lot. When this stage is reached political and economic grievances can be put on the negotiating table. In the absence of violence, reasonable people can prevail and the road to justice taken.

* They do have their lives - but suicide bomber philosophy has altered this

However there is a second innovation as radical
as random war replacing up-front war.

This is a psychological spin on the fear of death.

Basically fear of death is an ingredient that makes
human societies viable [possibly even ecologies]
when this is replaced by a lust for death

- the renown of martyrdom, the promise of Paradise,
all other rules go by the board.

When an unwitting death wish is transformed into
a compelling death wish and used as a weapon
its power is boundless.

The real path to peace is working
on a project together. e.g. Water, Health Care, ...
Disarmament

"Our zeal for death is greater than your zeal for life." → Aphorism

Chechen Terrorist

Moscow Threaten

Two distinct wars are being fought, neither with a chance of winning. The terrorist's Jihad, and the Imperialists "war against terrorism". Neither of these wars do significant damage to their supposed enemy. Both primarily kill and destroy the innocent non participants.

It is shaping into a war between those who want to "take over" and those who want to "take down". Imperialists vs Terrorists. Sane people cannot support either group. But the millions of lemmings on earth keep both groups viable.

Most of us have nothing to gain by supporting either side. Not all of us will likely be victims of WMD, but we all seem already to be victims of WMM,, weapons of mass manipulation. And it appears that the WMM are as hitech and dangerous as the WMD (WMM have gone way beyond Orwell's time).

In fact the most effective use of WMD is as WMM, [through fear that is.]

WMM convert free men into lemmings. Those who have full information and access to all the contexts cannot be manipulated into fearful lemmings. But the psychological napalms of WMM turn citizens into lemmings that will let anything be done in their name.

The principal weapons of WMM are secrecy, distortion, distraction, repetition, fear, uncertainty, mood swings, big lies such as the inevitability of such and such making it inevitable.

There is a paradox: The Imps cannot use WMD against the Ters. But the Ters could readily use WMD against the Imps. However, only the Imps possess WMD. The Ters only hope to acquire them.

The Imps must fight a traditional chess or geometric war of position and movement, supply lines etc

The Ters fight a dice or random war, anywhere, anywhen and they cannot be deterred as can nation states.

The important difference is group and state. Weapons designed for state vs state wars are not effective against the groups that wage random war against states. Refusing to accept this fact, and wanting to continue to build state vs state military machines, the war against the terrorist groups was translated into state vs state war on the premise that some states might contain terrorist groups. This translated the war against terrorism into pseudo imperialism. [There is also evidence that other agendas entered into the picture e.g. oil, which strikes the adjective pseudo from imperialism]

A military establishment built to fight geometric war is all but useless for random war. [else why home defense] esp WMD

It is an illusion to fight random war by a geometric war taking on country after country

The Imps replace an element [a terrorist group] with a set [a country]

Imps invade an entire country of innocents to kill a few terrorists.

While terrorists terrify an entire country by killing a few innocents.

The real battlefield in the war between the "take overs" and the "take downs" is not physical. It is the endurance of people to live with terror and violence.

The bottom line is that to win is impossible for either side. First, the terrorists are not concerned with winning anything only with taking down, destroying, but the Imps in their illusion that they are in a war that can be won are only replacing existing terrorists with new recruits. Their take over war does not stop terrorism it only strengthens it.

The fallacy of security from sovereignty. Security will come only from planet wide participation.

*lemmings who support terrorism for vengeance
and lemmings who support imperialism for security
are both deluded - It is their support in both
cases that enables this insanity and which will continue
to result in the destruction of lives and standard of living*

Terrorism is not a war, it is a weapon

- Sen Ernest F. Hollings D S.C.

Terrorism is a tactic It is not itself our enemy

- Robert B. Reich

AUGUST 6, 2005
THE FEAST OF THE TRANSFIGURATION
SIXTY YEARS FROM HIROSHIMA

The event of sixty years ago this day, unlike most events, defies being written into the history of the past. This is because, although located in the past, this event has not passed. It continues to exist in the present and appears on every menu of the future. Our intellects have analyzed it but our psyches cannot internalize it. Its implications write too large for mankind's future. The intersect of our imbedded natures with our new capabilities infers something we prefer not to look at: The clear potential for suicide by the species homo sapiens sapiens.

There are several competing "official" histories of this event and arguments wage between their supporters. Here are some of the facts:

- July 16, 1945, 5:30 a.m.: An atomic bomb, was successfully exploded in the desert near Alamogordo, New Mexico, Code Name: TRINITY. ¹
- U.S. intelligence had decoded that the Japanese were willing to negotiate surrender.
- August 6, 1945, 8:16 a.m.: An atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima killing over 70,000
- August 8, 1945: The USSR entered the war against Japan.
- August 9, 1945, 11:02 a.m.: An atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Nagasaki killing over 40,000
- August 14, 1945: The Japanese Emperor announces the decision to surrender.
- September 2, 1945: Formal Japanese surrender on the Battleship Missouri.

The arguments for dropping the bombs included:

- Military necessity. The Japanese needed to be forced to surrender. There would be hundreds of thousands of deaths on both sides in an invasion of the Japanese islands.
- The Soviet Union needed to be reminded that it would not participate in an occupation of Japan.
- The assertion that the USA was to be number one in the post war world.
- The two billion dollars spent on the Manhattan Project must not appear to have been spent for nothing.
- A politically required act of revenge for Pearl Harbor.
- Ozbekian's Imperative: If we can do it, we must do it.

The arguments against dropping the bombs included:

- Why would not a demonstration of the bomb give Japan ample face saving to surrender
- Hiroshima was not a top military target. Nor its location one suitable for invasion.
- Granting the military necessity arguments, why was the second bomb necessary?
- After Trinity, most of the scientists who created the bomb opposed its use.

Conclusion:

Ending the war was neither the purpose nor the result of the atomic bombings.

¹As the mushroom cloud rose, Robert Oppenheimer quoted the Bhagavad-Gita, "I am become death, the shatterer of worlds"

After receiving news of Trinity, Winston Churchill said, "Now they have given matches to the children"

GOANIVRE, WPD

2005#34

AUGUST 6, 2005
THE FEAST OF THE TRANSFIGURATION
SIXTY YEARS FROM HIROSHIMA

The event of sixty years ago this day still defies being written into any "official history". Arguments still wage between the supporters of foresight and those of hindsight. Between those whose view of history is a summary of synchronic events and those whose view of history is the diachronic implication of those events. Which version will be in our future history books?

Some facts:

- July 16, 1945, 5:30 a.m.: An atomic bomb, was successfully exploded in the desert near Alamogordo, New Mexico, Code Name: TRINITY.
- U.S. intelligence had confirmation that the Japanese were willing to negotiate surrender.
- August 6, 1945: An atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima killing 70,000 ^{8:16 AM.}
- August 8, 1945: The USSR entered the war against Japan.
- August 9, 1945: An atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Nagasaki. ^{Target Kokura}
- August 14, 1945: The Japanese Emperor announces the decision to surrender. ^{11:02 A.M. smoke cloud}
- September 2, 1945: Formal Japanese surrender on the Battleship Missouri. ^{> 40,000}

The synchronic (contemporary) arguments for dropping the bombs include:

- Military necessity. The Japanese needed to be forced to surrender. There would be hundreds of thousands of deaths on both sides in an invasion of the Japanese islands.
- The Soviet Union needed to be reminded that it would not participate in an occupation of Japan.
- A global notice that the USA was to be number one in the post war world.
- The over two billion dollars spent on the Manhattan Project must not appear to have been spent for nothing.
- A politically required act of revenge for Pearl Harbor.
- Ozbekian's Imperative: If we can do it, we must do it.

The Diachronic (hindsight) arguments include:

- Hiroshima was not a military target. Nor its location ~~a~~ suitable ~~one~~ for ~~any~~ invasion.
- Granting the synchronic arguments, why was the second bombing of Nagasaki required?
- The creation of the atomic bomb was a schismatic event in human history. Why were there only three weeks between its testing and its use? Was the use of this weapon given sufficient deliberation considering it might become the precedent for future wars?
- Most of the scientists who created the bomb quickly opposed its use.
- The atomic bomb is not a weapon of defense and its radiation endures for decades.

"I am become death, the shatterer of worlds" –Bhagavad-Gita Quoted by Robert Oppenheimer

"Now they have given matches to the children" Winston Churchill on receiving news of Trinity:

"All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" Math 26:52

GO ANIV. WPD

Why the bomb in the first place?

[ot. why voting machines]

The origin of the bomb was the result of two imperatives.

The knowledge imperative
experiment \Rightarrow chain reaction

The political imperative: Power
Hitler might be building a bomb

If mankind is to survive

The knowledge imperative must be
completely free of political imperatives

Conclusion: "Ending the war was neither the purpose
nor the result of the atomic bombings"
- Kevin O'Connor

{ Saving the Emperor factor [H12]
and Hirohito's decision }

WAR AND PEACE

The law of the excluded middle no longer seems to apply to the conditions traditionally termed war and peace. We can no longer say that we are at war or we are at peace. The current relations between various states and the nature of modern weapons force upon us conditions beyond the two-fold Aristotelean W or P. We now have in addition to W and P, also W + P, and neither W nor P.

An early twentieth century example of this is when WWI ended 1917 on the Eastern front with the peace treaty of Brest Litovsk. Although the Germans signed the treaty they continued to invade further into Russia. The Red government was at a loss, they wanted peace, but had to resist. Trotsky solved the problem by declaring that a condition of both war and peace existed.

WWII was clearly war and clearly stopped when surrenders and peace treaties were signed. But the so called Cold War between the Soviets and the West was not a war, nor was it peace, it was better termed, neither war nor peace. There was no violence, but violence could occur at a moments notice. The situation was that of mutual deterrence. And it may be useful to label deterrence as neither war nor peace.

If we consider violent action without a formal declaration of war as a condition to be called both war and peace, then Israel and Palestine have co-existed in a state of both war and peace for decades.

The 2002 preemptive invasion of Iraq by the US was an officially declared war which supposedly ended after three months with a proclamation of "mission accomplished". But "shock and awe" did not accomplish the mission, instead it converted a war into both war and peace. So it was quickly announced that we were at a war which might go on for decades with mission never to be accomplished. And that is a good definition of both war and peace. And that is exactly the conflict situation adopted by the terrorists with their attack on 9/11.

William Lind has called the war against terrorist "fourth generation war". It is random on and off strikes at random targets with random weapons. So perhaps the best definition of fourth generation war is both war and peace

War in the 20th and 21st centuries has taken us beyond the law of the excluded middle. We no longer have just the states war or peace, we now have a total of four states: war (eg WWII), peace (?)¹, neither war nor peace (the cold war) and both war and peace (terrorism).

¹ It is difficult to find an example. Maybe the world was close to peace in part of the year 1926.

WAR AND PEACE

The law of the excluded middle no longer seems to apply to the conditions traditionally termed war and peace. We can no longer say that we are at war or we are at peace. The current relations between various states and the nature of modern weapons force upon us conditions beyond the two-fold Aristotelean W or P. We now have in addition to W and P, also W + P, and neither W nor P.

An early twentieth century example of this is when WWI ended in 1917 on the Eastern front with the peace treaty of Brest Litovsk. Although the Germans signed the treaty they continued to invade further into Russia. The Red government was at a loss, they wanted peace, but had to resist. Trotsky solved the problem by declaring that a condition of both war and peace existed.

WWII was clearly war and clearly stopped when surrenders and peace treaties were signed. But the so called Cold War between the Soviets and the West was not a war, nor was it peace, it was better termed, neither war nor peace. There was no violence, but violence could occur at a moments notice. The situation was that of mutual deterrence. And it may be useful to label deterrence as neither war nor peace.

If we consider violent action without a formal declaration of war as a condition to be called both war and peace, then Israel and Palestine have co-existed in a state of both war and peace for decades.

The 2002 preemptive invasion of Iraq by the US was an officially declared war which supposedly ended after three months with a proclamation of "mission accomplished". But "shock and awe" did not accomplish the mission, instead it converted a war into both war and peace. So it was quickly announced that we were at a war which might last for decades with mission never to be accomplished. And that is a good definition of both war and peace. And that is exactly the conflict situation adopted by the terrorists with their attack on 9/11.

William Lind has called the war against terrorists "fourth generation warfare". It is random on and off strikes at random targets with random weapons. So perhaps the best definition of fourth generation war is both war and peace

We conclude that war in the 20th and 21st centuries has taken us beyond the law of the excluded middle. We no longer have just the states war or peace, we now have a total of four states: war (eg WWII), peace (?), neither war nor peace (the cold war) and both war and peace (terrorism).

¹ It is difficult to find an example. Maybe the world was close to peace during part of the year 1926.

June 10, 1940

FDR: USA from neutrality to non-belligerency
P neither P nor W

June 10, 1940

Mussolini declares war on France, Britain ?

THE FUTURE OF TERRORISM
Albert Wilson

Since November 4th of last year when the U.S. Embassy in Teheran was taken over by student militants, there have been 10 similar seizures of embassies in both Eastern and Western hemispheres by terrorist groups of various descriptions with various causes. It appears as though a new force is emerging in global politics. A few years ago hijackings, kidnappings, seizures of hostages were viewed simply as crimes. Perhaps rather dramatic crimes with somewhat different motivations, but none the less crimes, committed by criminals and to be punished as crimes. Today this view appears to be a bit naive. We are beginning to recognize that in terrorism we are encountering a new phenomenon, and while the specific acts of terrorists may be classified as criminal, terrorism is evolving into something much more than just crime. It is becoming a force that dialogues not on the level of cops and robbers, but on the level of ambassadors, heads of state, and U.N. Commissions. And this is because terrorists create miniature de facto states. While these nations have only limited spatial and temporal sovereignty, they are none-the-less locally sovereign and therefore to be addressed nation to nation not cop to robber. Further, terrorists have found that in being in possession of the embassy of a nation, they are not only in physical possession of a building, but are also in possession of a national symbol and therefore are, in some symbolic sense, in a position of dominion over that nation--and, at the dominated end, the citizenry of the nation share this feeling. This is clearly speaking state to state.

While the lives of hostages are per se of concern and importance, it is the affront of a symbolic boot on the throat of the nation that creates much of the anger and sense of frustration connected with many terrorist inspired incidents. But on a deeper level, there is the frustration arising from a de facto powerlessness because the terrorist situation slips through the net of our military and political power structures. There is great consternation over the realization that the traditional rules of the power game are not only being violated, but are being successfully scrapped. The terrorist movement is therefore of primary importance to futurists and those who try to stay alert to the winds of change in today's world.

Just exactly what has happened to the world that a mere handful of willful persons can effectively stand off the might and power of a great nation. Herman Kahn used to say, "Reality has outstripped experience". Here we have an example of experience beginning to catch up with reality. And it's an entirely different reality out there from the one we have in our heads.

What is the nature of this new reality? There are several factors that have made it possible and worthwhile for terrorists to take the risks they do to attain their ends:

- 0 First, terrorists can exist only in a divided world, a world that affords safe conduct and asylum in one part for criminal acts committed in other parts. Without hostile and non-cooperating camps there would be no safe conduct to anywhere. But so long as major divisions exist, East vs. West, Arab vs. Israeli, black vs. white, etc. one side looks on a terrorist act committed against the other side as a plus item for their side and will reward the terrorists with asylum or more. An interesting parallel from history goes back to the time when England, France, Holland and Spain were contending for the New World. These countries were at war off and on--mostly on--throughout a good part of the 16th century. Privateering--the granting of "legal permission" to individuals through letters of marque to attack and seize as prizes the ships of other nations --became standard practice. But privateers crossed over the thin legal line to piracy when they continued to operate during periods of peace and when they no longer were too particular about the flag of the ship they seized as a prize. But piracy could not be checked so long as the nations were hostile and competitive. England would not punish an English privateer who attacked Spanish ships even when war was officially off. And Colonial America condoned piracy both by providing havens for the pirates and markets for their loot.
- 0 A second feature of today's world that enables terrorists to be effective is the high level of interconnectedness in the global system. In energy, food and basic resources no part of the world is completely self-sufficient or independent in its requirements. The more intimately interconnected and complex a system becomes, the more vulnerable it is to breakdowns, component failures, and deliberate acts of terrorism. An airplane--a very complex system-- flying at 30,000ft is vulnerable to even one bullet. It is not necessary to hold the gun to the head of the pilot, pointing it anywhere will do. With high levels of interconnectedness, if sufficient amounts of redundancy have not been provided, system vulnerability destroys the option space of its decision makers and leaves them with few alternative courses of action. Hardin's Law: "You cannot do just one thing" converts every missile into a boomerang. A punitive grain embargo primarily punishes the American farmer. An attempt to save hostages ends in their deaths. To "Nuke the Ayatollah" as some bumper stickers suggest, would trigger a jahid among not only Shiites, but throughout all Islam and we should be

prepared to come up with a daily 8 million barrels of oil from another source. When measures like "Boycott the Olympics" constitutes our arsenal of political options, we are getting a good look at the new reality.

We have great military power, but if we were to use it, we would lose those things which were the reason behind building up military might in the first place--a new reality example of doublebind.

0 A third aspect of today's world that works to the advantage of terrorists is the nature of modern weapons, particularly the large amount of firepower and destructive energy that is possible at the fingertips of but a handful of men. As recently as World War II, the Germans employed a large gun on the Eastern Front that could throw a seven ton armor piercing shell through 90 feet of solid rock at a distance of 19 miles. But to effect such a strike required 4,120 men--gun crew, maintenance and security forces. Today as few as five men could transport and detonate a device that could destroy an entire city.

0 A fourth feature supportive of terrorism is an intrinsic asymmetry both in the risks and in the rules that act to deter and restrict responses of the victim but not the terrorist. The target nation frequently stands to suffer great material loss, not only aircraft, buildings and resources, but human lives, sometimes highly placed leaders and persons whose skills are irreplaceable. On the other hand, terrorists stand to lose little, having little to lose in the first place. But the rules are also different. Nations and their agents are expected to be guided by forbearance, fairness and protectiveness. They cannot kill the innocent to get at the guilty. The favor of humankind turns against those states that act by the same rules as the terrorists. The terrorists, on their part, have no reputations at stake and for their purposes even profit from records of violence and rapacity. Terrorists and criminals may shoot and bomb, but states and police must act with restraint, else the difference and the choice between terrorists and the state disappears.

It cannot be denied that today it is felt important to maintain an appearance of morality. This has had the effect of driving underground certain shadier diplomatic activities that are none the less considered to be essential, but the advantages of the more lawful procedures are internationally recognized.

The difference between the world of 1980 and that at the beginning of this century is well illustrated by an event quite similar to the present situation in Teheran which occurred during the Boxer Uprising in Peking in 1900. A group of militants, with the covert support of the Chinese

Government attacked the foreign legations in Peking. There ensued a 55 day siege which was lifted only when an eight-power international military relief force struck the capital. There was no hesitation at that time over the employment of force. But we may question whether the difference with today lies on views on the use of military force, the fact that then there were eight nations involved instead of just one, or in possible repercussions over access to oil.

0 A fourth feature, one related to the first feature of a suspicious and divided world, and one which is intimately connected with the increasing prevalence of terrorists, is the direct and indirect employment of terrorist forces and tactics by organizations under the control of the big powers. In fact, it was the big powers who first broke their own rules on the proper conduct of war and other forms of rivalry, blazing the path for independent terrorist groups. Being enemies is one thing, but breaking the established rules of enmity is another. Because of this there now exists a crack in the dike that could lead to a new type of international instability in which nobody knows "who's on first". Some brands of terrorists like credit for their deeds, but others including big power groups prefer anonymity. Many times we have no idea whom to blame for this morning's headline atrocities.

Paradoxically, in the world struggle between the followers of Jefferson and those of Marx, the philosophical ideals of both lost out to those of a third contender. The draftsman who made the first design sketches for the new-reality was neither Marx nor Jefferson, It was Ivan Grozny--Ivan the Terrible, Tsar of Russia. His Oprichniki, set up in 1564, was the prototype for the modern secret police and undercover intelligence establishment. During the last 400 years Ivan's concepts were refined and perfected, primarily in Eastern countries. There is a long list in Russia alone: The Oprichniki, Okrana, the Revolution, then the Cheka, GPU, NKVD, MVD, and most recently the KGB. One important rubric concerning such organizations which the Russians early learned, but which their Western emulators have yet to appreciate is the necessity for periodically liquidating and replacing these groups, especially their chiefs. An undercover agency if left unpurged, will take you over in under 20 years time.

There is no question that such organizations afford many advantages to their employers in a divided and suspicious world. Through the decades of the 20's and 30's we suffered from the unfair competition on the world stage that the Third International forced on us with the aid of the above sequence of alphabetical agencies. Finally, after World War II we

decided we had to meet kind with kind and set up an intelligence agency authorized to perpetrate our own style of covert dirty tricks. President Truman who signed the CIA into existence, later said he felt that it might have been the greatest mistake of his life. Maybe he was right in his concern. Jefferson was put under house arrest and in less than 30 years the United States went from a highly respected and trusted nation to its present status as No. 1. hate target. A connection? It would be difficult to prove. However, the basic threat to society from either a terrorist organization or from a state sponsored covert agency lies in the existence of power without accountability. Somehow the Congress has been sold on the idea that the effectiveness of our intelligence gathering would be impaired by imposing accountability.

It must not be concluded, however, that an end to cold wars and the liquidation of CIA's and KGB's would result in the end of terrorism. The peace concluded between England and Spain in 1689 resulted in the "Golden Age of Piracy", a brief period of about 30 years duration when the privateers, their last pretexts of legitimacy removed, became purely pirates, ranging widely and preying upon whomsoever they would. When public repugnance over dirty tricks, even those against Spain, finally set in, the Royal Navy cleaned up the situation in short order, ending the "Golden Age" by about 1725.

The foregoing points: Divisiveness, global, regional and local; The vulnerability of the complex and highly interconnected systems; The large destructive power wieldable by relatively few, augmented by acute asymmetries in material and moral risk between terrorist groups and their targets; Covert practices of terrorism sponsored by legitimate states--should not be considered as causes of terrorism. These conditions are but the contextual climate that is supportive of terrorism. The causes and motivations of terrorism lie elsewhere.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS October 8, 1993

Fifteen years after the above was compiled most of the statements remain true. The Cold War has ended, but terrorism is still alive and well. It is still supported by divisiveness, particularly among Islamic groups, and in the isolation of countries such as Iran and Libya. Vulnerability to modern 'truck bombs' has been demonstrated from Beirut to New York City. The role (unplanned perhaps) of big power agencies in terrorism is now more clear. Those bombing the Trade Center in New York were trained by the CIA in Afghanistan. An effect, not predicted in 1980, is the trickle down of the violence of state inspired and ideological terrorism to the violence of street gangs and psychotic individuals. Our leaders have set the agenda.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS July 30, 2001

The past eight years have continued along the lines foreseen in 1980, not only with the bombing of American embassies in various countries, but with the end of the cold war we see a repetition of the privateers becoming pirates and a "Golden Age of Terrorism" ensuing. The principal unforeseen item in the original essay was the warfare between government agencies and home grown quasi-terrorist groups with consequences such as the Oklahoma City bombing. And also new is the concept of "rogue state". If a rogue state is one that excludes itself from participating in international treaties against biological warfare, land mines, cooperation with the International Court, etc, then the United States has become a rogue state.

THE FUTURE OF TERRORISM

Since November 4th of last year when the U.S. Embassy in Teheran was taken over by student militants, there have been 10 similar seizures of embassies in both Eastern and Western hemispheres by terrorist groups of various descriptions with various causes. It appears as though a new force is emerging in global politics. A few years ago hijackings, kidnappings, seizures of hostages were viewed simply as crimes. Perhaps rather dramatic crimes with somewhat different motivations, but none the less crimes, committed by criminals and to be punished as crimes. Today this view appears to be a bit naive. We are beginning to recognize that in terrorism we are encountering a new phenomenon, and while the specific acts of terrorists may be classified as criminal, terrorism is evolving into something much more than just crime. It is becoming a force that dialogues not on the level of cops and robbers, but on the level of ambassadors, heads of state, and U.N. Commissions. And this is because terrorists create miniature de facto states. While these nations have only limited spatial and temporal sovereignty, they are none-the-less locally sovereign and therefore to be addressed nation to nation not cop to robber. Further, terrorists have found that in being in possession of the embassy of a nation, they are not only in physical possession of a building, but are also in possession of a national symbol and therefore are, in some symbolic sense, in a position of dominion over that nation--and, at the dominated end, the citizenry of the nation share this feeling. This is clearly speaking state to state.

While the lives of hostages are per se of concern and importance, it is the affront of a symbolic boot on the throat of the nation that creates much of the anger and sense of frustration connected with many terrorist inspired incidents. But on a deeper level, there is the frustration arising from a de facto powerlessness because the terrorist situation slips through the net of our military and political power structures. There is great consternation over the realization that the traditional rules of the power game are not only being violated, but are being successfully scrapped. The terrorist movement is therefore of primary importance to futurists and those who try to stay alert to the winds of change in today's world.

Just exactly what has happened to the world that a mere handful of willful persons can effectively stand off the might and power of a great nation. Herman Kahn used to say, "Reality has outstripped experience". Here we have an example of experience beginning to catch up with reality. And it's an entirely different reality out there from the one we have in our heads.

What is the nature of this new reality? There are several factors that have made it possible and worthwhile for terrorists to take the risks they do to attain their ends:

2

- 0 First, terrorists can exist only in a divided world, a world that affords safe conduct and asylum in one part for criminal acts committed in other parts. Without hostile and non-cooperating camps there would be no safe conduct to anywhere. But so long as major divisions exist, East vs. West, Arab vs. Israeli, black vs. white, etc. one side looks on a terrorist act committed against the other side as a plus item for their side and will reward the terrorists with asylum or more. An interesting parallel from history goes back to the time when England, France, Holland and Spain were contending for the New World. These countries were at war off and on--mostly on--throughout a good part of the 16th century. Privateering--the granting of "legal permission" to individuals through letters of marque to attack and seize as prizes the ships of other nations --became standard practice. But privateers crossed over the thin legal line to piracy when they continued to operate during periods of peace and when they no longer were too particular about the flag of the ship they seized as a prize. But piracy could not be checked so long as the nations were hostile⁺competitive. England would not punish an English privateer who attacked Spanish ships even when war was officially off. And Colonial America condoned piracy both by providing havens for the pirates and markets for their loot.
- 0 A second feature of today's world that enables terrorists to be effective is the high level of interconnectedness in the global system. In energy, food and basic resources no part of the world is completely self-sufficient or independent in its requirements. The more intimately interconnected and complex a system becomes, the more vulnerable it is to breakdowns, component failures, and deliberate acts of terrorism. An airplane--a very complex system-- flying at 30,000ft is vulnerable to even one bullet. It is not necessary to hold the gun to the head of the pilot, pointing it anywhere will do. With high levels of interconnectedness, if sufficient amounts of redundancy have not been provided, system vulnerability destroys the option space of its decision makers and leaves them with few alternative courses of action. Hardin's Law: "You cannot do just one thing" converts every missile into a boomerang. A punitive grain embargo primarily punishes the American farmer. An attempt to save hostages ends in their deaths. To "Nuke the Ayatollah" as some bumper stickers suggest, would trigger a jahid among not only Shiites, but throughout all Islam and we should be prepared to come up with a daily 8 million barrels of oil from another source. When measures like "Boycott the Olympics" constitutes our arsenal of political options, we are getting a good look at the new reality.

We have great military power, but if we were to use it, we would lose those things which were the reason behind

building up military might in the first place--a new reality example of doublebind.

0 A third aspect of today's world that works to the advantage of terrorists is the nature of modern weapons, particularly the large amount of firepower and destructive energy that is possible at the fingertips of but a handful of men. As recently as World War II, the Germans employed a large gun on the Eastern Front that could throw a seven ton armor piercing shell through 90 feet of solid rock at a distance of 19 miles. But to effect such a strike required 4,120 men--gun crew, maintenance and security forces. Today as few as five men could transport and detonate a device that could destroy an entire city.

0 A fourth feature supportive of terrorism is an intrinsic asymmetry both in the risks and in the rules that act to deter and restrict responses of the victim but not the terrorist. The target nation frequently stands to suffer great material loss, not only aircraft, buildings and resources, but human lives, sometimes highly placed leaders and persons whose skills are irreplaceable. On the other hand, terrorists stand to lose little, having little to lose in the first place. But the rules are also different. Nations and their agents are expected to be guided by forbearance, fairness and protectiveness. They cannot kill the innocent to get at the guilty. The favor of humankind turns against those states that act by the same rules as the terrorists. The terrorists, on their part, have no reputations at stake and for their purposes even profit from records of violence and rapacity. Terrorists and criminals may shoot and bomb, but states and police must act with restraint, else the difference and the choice between terrorists and the state disappears.

It cannot be denied that today it is felt important to maintain an appearance of morality. This has had the effect of driving underground certain shadier diplomatic activities that are none the less considered to be essential, but the advantages of the more lawful procedures are internationally recognized.

The difference between the world of 1980 and that at the beginning of this century is well illustrated by an event quite similar to the present situation in Teheran which occurred during the Boxer Uprising in Peking in 1900. A group of militants, with the covert support of the Chinese Government attacked the foreign legations in Peking. There ensued a 55 day siege which was lifted only when an eight-power international military relief force struck the capital. There was no hesitation at that time over the employment of force. But we may question whether the difference with today lies on views on the use of military force, the fact that then there were eight nations involved instead of just one, or in possible repercussions over access to oil.

0 A fourth feature, one related to the first feature of a suspicious and divided world, and one which is intimately connected with the increasing prevalence of terrorists, is the direct and indirect employment of terrorist forces and tactics by organizations under the control of the big powers. In fact, it was the big powers who first broke their own rules on the proper conduct of war and other forms of rivalry, blazing the path for independent terrorist groups. Being enemies is one thing, but breaking the established rules of enmity is another. Because of this there now exists a crack in the dike that could lead to a new type of international instability in which nobody knows "who's on first". Some brands of terrorists like credit for their deeds, but others including big power groups prefer anonymity. Many times we have no idea whom to blame for this morning's headline atrocities.

Paradoxically, in the world struggle between the followers of Jefferson and those of Marx, the philosophical ideals of both lost out to those of a third contender. The draftsman who made the first design sketches for the new-reality was neither Marx nor Jefferson, It was Ivan Grozny--Ivan the Terrible, Tsar of Russia. His Oprichniki, set up in 1564, was the prototype for the modern secret police and undercover intelligence establishment. During the last 400 years Ivan's concepts were refined and perfected, primarily in Eastern countries. There is a long list in Russia alone: The Oprichniki, Okrana, the Revolution, then the Cheka, GPU, NKVD, MVD, and most recently the KGB. One important rubric concerning such organizations which the Russians early learned, but which their Western emulators have yet to appreciate is the necessity for periodically liquidating and replacing these groups, especially their chiefs. An undercover agency if left unpurged, will take you over in under 20 years time.

There is no question that such organizations afford many advantages to their employers in a divided and suspicious world. Through the decades of the 20's and 30's we suffered from the unfair competition on the world stage that the Third International forced on us with the aid of the above sequence of alphabetical agencies. Finally, after World War II we decided we had to meet kind with kind and set up an intelligence agency authorized to perpetrate our own style of covert dirty tricks. President Truman who signed the CIA into existence, later said he felt that it might have been the greatest mistake of his life. Maybe he was right in his concern. Jefferson was put under house arrest and in less than 30 years the United States went from a highly respected and trusted nation to its present status as No. 1: hate target. A connection? It would be difficult to prove. However, the basic threat to society from either a terrorist organization or from a state sponsored covert agency lies in the existence of power without accountability. Somehow the

5

~~organization or from a state sponsored covert agency lies in the existence of power without accountability. Somehow the Congress has been sold on the idea that the effectiveness of our intelligence gathering would be impaired by imposing accountability.~~

It must not be concluded, however, that an end to cold wars and the liquidation of CIA's and KGB's would result in the end of terrorism. The peace concluded between England and Spain in 1689 resulted in the "Golden Age of Piracy", a brief period of about 30 years duration when the privateers, their last pretexts of legitimacy removed, became purely pirates, ranging widely and preying upon whomsoever they would. When public repugnance over dirty tricks, even those against Spain, finally set in, the Royal Navy cleaned up the situation in short order, ending the "Golden Age" by about 1725.

The foregoing points: Divisiveness, global, regional and local; The vulnerability of the complex and highly interconnected systems; The large destructive power wieldable by relatively few, augmented by acute asymmetries in material and moral risk between terrorist groups and their targets; Covert practices of terrorism sponsored by legitimate states--should not be considered as causes of terrorism. These conditions are but the contextual climate that is supportive of terrorism. The causes and motivations of terrorism lie elsewhere.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS October 8, 1993

Fifteen years after the above was compiled most of the statements remain true. The Cold War has ended, but terrorism is still alive and well. It is still supported by divisiveness, particularly among Islamic groups, and in the isolation of countries such as Iran and Libya. Vulnerability to modern 'truck bombs' has been demonstrated from Beirut to New York City. The role (unplanned perhaps) of big power agencies in terrorism is now more clear. Those bombing the Trade Center in New York were trained by the CIA in Afghanistan. An effect, not predicted in 1980, is the trickle down of the violence of state inspired and ideological terrorism to the violence of street gangs and psychotic individuals. ~~We look to~~ Our leaders ~~to~~ set the example.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS July 30, 2001

The past eight years have continued along the lines foreseen in 1980, not only with the bombing of American embassies in various countries, but with the end of the cold war we see a repetition of the privateers becoming pirates and a "Golden Age of Terrorism" ensuing. The principal unforeseen item in the original essay was the warfare between government agencies and home grown quasi-terrorist groups with consequences such as the Oklahoma City bombing. And also new is the concept of "rogue state". If a rogue state is one that excludes itself from participating in international treaties against biological warfare, land mines, cooperation with the International Court, etc, then the United States has become a rogue state.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS September 15, 2001

The second bombing of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, together with the bombing of the Pentagon, reiterated a parameter that seems important in the thinking of some terrorists. An attack must not only be against a physical target, but must also carry symbolic significance. The idols under attack were the West's financial system (WTC) and its military support base (Pentagon). Terrorist thinking seems to be deeply absorbed with a "voodoo" association between a symbol and its referent. If one destroys the symbol or ikon, the destruction of the physical system will follow. [cf the Taliban destruction of ancient Buddhist statues earlier this year] Whether we chose to believe or disbelieve this, an important clue to future strikes by terrorists may be the physical manifestations of symbols they wish to destroy.

A JUXTAPOSITION

A primary use of juxtaposition is in the disclosure of commonalities. Many are superficial and meaningless, others are tautological, still others are subtle and reveal connections or principles that have escaped notice. The following juxtapositions are of interest in that they suggests certain isomorphisms that may deserve further exploration.

| | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|
| <u>TERRORISTS</u> | <u>SHAMANS</u> | <u>LIFE</u> | <u>CONSCIOUSNESS</u> |
| INTERNATIONAL LAW | NATURE | COSMIC LAW | BRAHMAN |

Aspects these ratios have in common:

- 1) Each denominator through some inconsistency or incompleteness in its rules allows the emergence of the numerator.
- 2) Each numerator violates the rules set by the denominator.
- 3) Each numerator creates a local and ephemeral domain of control subject to rules of its own design. [which rules may or may not parallel those of the denominator]

Terrorists flourish because of conflicts between established states, or the refusal of some states [rogue states] to subscribe to international law. KGB-CIA state terrorism became "guerilla terrorism" at the conclusion of the cold war. [In Afghanistan the CIA trained counter Soviet terrorists who later blew up American embassies.] [cf privateers becoming pirates in the 18th century at the conclusion of peace between England and Spain] Terrorists set up a base that is either hidden or located in a rogue country from which to commit acts of violence, OR hijack planes, ships, busses, buildings and seize hostages. In both cases the terrorists in effect temporarily establish a local "mini-state" in which they have complete control, making the rules, and which can be used either for state-to-state negotiations or guerilla warfare.

Shamans are able to effect occurrences that appear to violate the known laws of nature. They ritualistically construct models [e.g. Navajo or Tibetan sand paintings] that somehow ephemerally and locally bend underlying probabilities to desired ends. The shaman is able to make the rules that govern what is happening in his "mini-reality". What quantum incompleteness that allows this to happen is not understood.

Life, as has long been noted, violates such basic cosmic laws as the second law of thermodynamics. From some "loop hole" in physical laws the sub-system of life with its own domain and its own laws emerges. It is probable that bio-life is but one of many sub-systems in the cosmos that have emerged and created their own domains and rules. Is it possible for them to recognize one another?

Consciousness involves a basic bifurcation It requires two levels to exist, knower and known or meta-knower and knower. Is consciousness another cosmic sub-set like bio-life?

NUCLEAR DECISION MAKING

The traditional purpose of war is to effect a decision. The victor is entitled to decide the fate of the vanquished. However, there has been a considerable blurring of this motivation for hostilities in the past few decades. Focus has been centering on the concept of win and winning, without due consideration of what one would be deciding afterwards. Whether this is attributable to an overworked analogy between war and sports, where winning is the bottom line and there are no decisions to be made concerning the fate of the loser beyond their rating on the sports page, or whether it is attributable to the realization that in nuclear war one would neither be in a position to make decisions regarding what to do with the late enemy or would be so occupied with domestic realities as to care less about what was happening to the enemy. In any event nuclear war as an extension of politics raises questions even in the minds of those whose profession is politics and its military extensions.

In order to restore meaning to nuclear war and somehow justify and retrieve some sense out of the present arms race, the schools of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war have been conjured up. War is like a game, it has always been fought according to certain rules generally--and sometimes officially--agreed upon by participants. These rules are usually dictated by the nature of the weapons involved. Strategies are largely designed within these general rules. During time of war whenever new weapons are introduced there is usually an outcry of foul followed shortly by emulation of the innovations, (e.g. German introduction of poison gas in World War I). And during war whenever new strategies are introduced, there is also a cry of foul followed shortly by escalation of the innovations, (e.g. mass bombing of urban centers in World War II). In peace time great effort is expended on secrecy concerning the development and effectiveness of new weapon systems, but agreement is sought regarding the rules and strategies for the use of reciprocally known existing weapon systems. It is this last point that holds the key to the thinking of those who would establish rules for limited and protracted nuclear war.

The new rules would be for war to consist of a bomb for bomb exchange followed by a pause for assessing whether to continue or throw in the towel. With such rules the concept of winning can be resuscitated. The winner will be the one who is willing and able to continue the exchange the longer. For the game to make sense the choice of targets should focus on the maximization of the hurt. This would not be against the enemy's weapons but against his cities. This game allows the players i.e. the military, relative immunity from hurt and freedom to continue and decide what sacrifices the civilian population should make. Considering the game as a form of chicken, with the egos of the militaries at stake, the only way the exchange could be halted

would be through revolt by that part of the civilian population as yet unhit and no longer able to sustain the snipping of the threads that hold their respective cities' sword of Damocles. So the rules reduce to the winner is the side that forces the civilian population of the other side first to revolt.

But is revolt possible? Is there any effective civilian tactic to halt the players of this game after it starts? In the novel "Catch 22" the enemy is defined as anyone on either side who is increasing my chance of being killed. This cross-contestant slice of who the real enemy is in the nuclear arms race and in the redefinition of nuclear war most urgently needs be brought to everyone's consciousness. The enemy of both the United States and the Soviet Union are those whose egos require the subjugation of their counterparts whether they are in the Kremlin or in the Pentagon. The only answer to this situation is for Americans and Russians to stop thinking of the nuclear dichotomy in terms of the USA vs the USSR, but to recognize the real dichotomy is between those human beings who just want to raise their families, make a living, and join others in improving the human lot, and those so fascinated with power and its pursuit that they have replaced the great ongoing game of Life, which all on this planet play, with a terminal game of death played only by a maniacal ego-elite who have deluded themselves into seeing it as something they can win.

1st GULF
WAR

12-1

THOUGHTS.191

DISK ECON-HIST

01/23/91

THOUGHTS JANUARY 1991

FIRST GULF ON THE WAR

- The shadow that hangs over us all seems to be the shadow of another war. But it is really the shadow of what we will think of ourselves when this is over. --Press Democrat

- It is wrong to say that the United States has no energy policy. Since January 16, the energy policy has become manifest to all through the war activities in the Persian Gulf. Conservation, intensified research for alternatives, and phasing in of renewable sources (e.g. gasohol) were abandoned in the early years of the Reagan Administration. Instead there was preparation for desert military operations. The end of the cold war allowed Desert Storm to take place. Saddam Hussein was the convenient detonator urged on by official U.S. energy policy.

- The debate over continued dependence on the sanction policy vs. prompt use of force devolved into another example of the necessary trade-off between time and energy. This trade-off pops up at all system levels. It is even expressed on the quantum level by the alternate formulation of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle,

$$\text{TIME} \times \text{ENERGY} > h$$

If the time allowed is decreased the energy allotted must be increased. If energy is limited, increased time is required. Time efficiency must always be paid for by loss of energy efficiency. The criteria for deciding between time and energy include the availabilities of time and of energy and the price of each. It is clear that Iraq is opting for a long time low energy mode while the U.S. is opting for a short time high energy mode. The unknowns, not covered by the inequality, are the relations between time and various psychological factors and between the quantity of energy employed and the cost in human life. Few political decision makers seem to be aware of the bottom line physical bounds on their games.

ON THE WAR

- President Bush has claimed to have taken the moral high ground by outlawing the invasion of the turf of one people by the forces of another. Has he subscribed to a moral principle or to a political principle? If to a moral principle, then there can be no selective application of the principle, for moral principles are global not local. Politically, but not morally, invasion is wrong in Kuwait but right in Granada and Panama. Oppression is wrong in Lithuania but right in South Africa and Palestine. While President Bush may be enunciating only a presently convenient political principle, President Eisenhower at the time of the 1956 Middle East War proclaimed a true moral principle when he said, "We cannot have one set of rules for ourselves and our friends and another set for our enemies and adversaries."

- There are many things that must be earned. Plato said, one must earn the right to praise great men. Today in philanthropy, one must earn the right to give. In science, one must earn the right to discover. The Soviet poet Yevtushenko has said, "If we are soon to have free speech, then I am concerned that I shall have something to say that is worthy of free speech. I must earn my free speech". My question is: Has George Bush earned the right to make any statement about what is moral?

- WAR IS THE REAL ENEMY --bumper sticker

It is encouraging to see some people beginning to think in terms of levels. Gandhiji said, "We must always discriminate between the person and the behavior." While we may condemn certain behaviors, we are wrong to condemn the person. It is easy for us to see that bad software does not justify condemning the computer which is running the software. But it is more difficult for us to differentiate between unacceptable behavior and the human being who is so behaving. When the elements participating in a process can be differentiated from the process itself, we shall make great progress toward applying to ourselves the obvious fact that alternative softwares may be adopted without writing off the computer.

• It is wrong submissively to accept that though something is past it is now history. The past and history are not the same thing, and the past, like the future, is never closed. Joseph Stalin once said, "History is what I write it to be". Yes, to the victor belong the spoils and one of the most important spoils is the ^{privilege of} power of writing and ^{sealing} imposing the record. Many politicians besides Stalin have also corrupted the record, but it seems Stalin is one of the few arrogant enough to boast about it. However, it is not necessary for free peoples ever to accept the official version. One of their most important freedoms is the freedom to reexamine history. More than being a right, it is an obligation to the future to continuously sift and reinterpret the evidence, even after an official verdict has been pronounced. Stalin's history has lasted sixty years, but with freedom and courage it will not prevail. In America we have had the freedom, now it is time to summon the courage to disclose the corruptions in the official versions. In the official versions of Pearl Harbor, the Kennedy assassination, the Gulf of Tonkin, Irangate, the drug imports and now the Gulf war. This is not rocking the boat, it is repairing the damage so the boat can continue to sail. We now have the pride necessary for war, let us also have the courage necessary for truth.

• This is not the first time in American history that our country has been divided and at war over an energy policy. From the early 17th century until the mid 19th century human slavery was a basic ingredient of American energy policy. There were at first few, then many, who saw that this was a policy that was wrong and was leading toward unsustainable economic and moral costs. Part of the country was adamant in not abandoning this flawed and outdated energy policy. The result was the most bloody war in America's history with an aftermath of years of reconstruction and decades of bitterness. Let us pray that the shedding of another flawed and outdated energy policy will not be so destructive.

- Perhaps it is proper here to update some remarks made by Lincoln on an occasion during that earlier energy war:

Again we are engaged in a great energy war testing this time whether the oil policy or any policy so conceived and so dedicated is to long endure. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to our children, to the future, and to policies which will preserve for them and for all the peoples of this land the blessings of reason, equity, and peace. And we here highly resolve that the honored dead, and those now sacrificing in the Middle East, shall not have died in vain; but that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of wakening; and that a new policy, of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish the earth.

Editor:

Martin Luther King Day, 1991

It is wrong to say that the administration has no energy policy. A long series of decisions culminating with the January 16 outbreak of hostilities in the Persian Gulf has made the official energy policy clear. The policy is to establish Washington control of Middle East oil resources through a permanent military presence in the Gulf. Over the past decade official policy has ignored conservation measures, down graded research on alternative sources, and abandoned the phasing in of renewable sources such as gasohol. And while the administration retreated from energy self sufficiency, it prepared forces for an attack under the conditions of desert warfare. Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait on August 2 provided a convenient launch platform for getting the desired military presence into the Middle East. Indeed, the construction of this platform was abetted by the administration's assurance to Saddam in late July of no U. S. interest in Iraqi-Kuwaiti disputes. One must wonder, however, whether Desert Storm could have been initiated without the prior collapse of Soviet power.

This is not the first time in American history that our country has been divided and at war over energy policy. From the early 17th century until the mid 19th century human slavery was a basic ingredient of American energy policy. There were at first few, then many who saw that this was a policy that was wrong and was leading toward unsustainable economic and moral costs. Part of the country was adamant in not abandoning this outdated energy policy. The result was the most bloody war in America's history with an aftermath of years of reconstruction and decades of bitterness. Let us pray that the shedding of another outdated energy policy will not be so destructive.

Perhaps we may be permitted to update some remarks made by Lincoln during that earlier energy war: Again we are engaged in a great energy war testing this time whether the oil policy or any policy so conceived and so dedicated is to long endure. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to our children, to the future, and to policies which will preserve for them and for all the peoples of this land the blessings of reason, equity, and peace. And we here highly resolve that the honored dead, and those now sacrificing in the Middle East, shall not have died in vain; but that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of waking; and that a new policy, of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish the earth.

Albert Wilson
Box 1871
Sebastopol, CA

HISTORY

GEOBUSH.P51

DISK\SCRAPS

February 27, 1991

What I do not like about George Bush's decisions is their reckless destruction of options--both his own and others'. Options are a form of wealth, but his decisions have converted a world of choice and opportunity into a deterministic one-way dead-end street. The doubling of the number of troops in the Gulf on November 8, two days after the election, was not only the destruction of the option of rotation and therefore of sanctions and therefore of peaceful resolution, but its timing was a slap in the face of the American electorate. His recent call for the people of Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein destroyed that route as a viable option for Iraqi opposition groups. Whatever their original support within Iraq, opposition groups receiving Bush's blessing now become tainted with association with the American enemy and have been made into Quislings so to speak. Their stability for survival has thus been undermined. The decision, after waiting six months, to start the ground war immediately after a willingness to pull out of Kuwait was put on the table, not only removed the opportunity to stepwise negotiate an agreement satisfactory to all parties, but was a slap in the face of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev has since stated that Soviet-US relations have become very fragile. And now the adamant refusal to consider a cease fire has begun to ignite the Arab world with, on this date, unpredictable consequences.

We must ask, what is it that George Bush wants? If it is a new peaceful world order, then his decisions are serving to preclude it. We must conclude either he has some hidden agenda, or is navigating without ever looking at any geopolitical map. If his agenda is a personal vendetta against Saddam Hussein, (He won't let the Iraqis do the job, he must), then how is it within the framework of a democracy for one man to be given the resources of the United States of America to do his personal thing. President Truman repeatedly emphasized the importance of reminding himself of the difference between Harry Truman and what he might personally want and President Truman as steward of the national interests of the United States. Is George Bush capable of making this distinction? If Bush has some covert but non personal agenda, then the sacrifice of American and other lives and billions of dollars of resources for an objective withheld from the American people and Congress is, by any definition, dictatorship.

Let us fly our flags for the troops and tie our yellow ribbons to bring them home, but let us never Heil Bush.

P.S. And I don't like the Bush energy policy either.

HISTORY

GEOBUSH2.P51

DISK: ~~SCRAPS~~

February 27, 1991

A Vietnam veteran last night on PBS, on the McNeil-Lehrer hour, made a statement which I feel is of greatest significance. He put it that the meaning of the sacrifice that veterans make for their country is destroyed upon the declaration of a new war. The meaning that Vietnam veterans had finally found in their sacrifice, was scrapped when war was opted in the Persian Gulf.

Those who died in France in the First World War, the war fought to end all wars, had their sacrifice obviated when the United States entered the Second World War. Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, was a sacred day. A memorial not only to the dead and to those who sacrificed, but a symbol that "these dead shall not have died in vain". This sacred symbol was later destroyed and downgraded to "Veterans Day". We will remember the veterans, but ignore and betray what we told them they died for.

This cynical betrayal of the veterans of each war by politicians who not only minimize the material debt owed to veterans, but discard the lessons dearly bought with their blood, has been repeated four times since the last shot was fired in the war to end all war. Now those who are sacrificing and dying in the Gulf, are already being told they are fighting for peace and a new world order. In each war a golden apple is dangled before the fighting men, an apple written with "You are dying to make the world a better place". But as soon as they have done their job the apple is put away, to be brought out again for the next generation of sacrificial victims, and the cruel hoax is brainwashed away.

Of course it is wrong during a war to bring to mind anything that would lead those sacrificing to question what they are really doing. They need the Big Lie. It is as essential to them as food and fuel as munitions and medicine. So, What does it mean to support the troops? It means to believe the Big Lie.

This I believe: I was Somewhat amazed to read an account of the Vice President's Sermon at the Crystal Cathedral. The Los Angeles Times said that Mr. Quayle had preached about the theology of a Just war and had quoted Augustine, & Aquinas in his justification for the war in the Middle East. The thought went through my mind, "the silence of the Churches, and of how our politicians are becoming our theologians." The second Ecumenical Service for Peace in St Eugene's Cathedral had about 20 persons present..... apparently, we are not enthused about the church's opinion on the subject...no news media ... no bishop this time.

My Love to you all, Fr. Evan,
February 20, 1991

POSTSCRIPT TO THE GULF WAR

This weekend we are to celebrate the victory in the Gulf War. To honor our troops and praise our weapons technology. This is very important to do, for it is the act of 'sealing' the war, the act of setting the record for the future, not in the history books, but in our psyches. It is sealing how we are to think and feel about the war, how we are to remember it. While some historians may disagree with the official version and write books giving other points of view, that will not matter because what is written in the collective psyche can never be contravened by an historian. It is in this sense that Joseph Stalin was absolutely right when he said, "History is what I write it to be".

It is also very important to seal the war at this time. This is so the war can be dissociated from its causes and consequences and treated in our psyches as an independent salutary event. If the war could not be surgically removed in our psyches from the manipulations leading up to it and from its tragic consequences for millions of people, then we could never celebrate it and that would be bad for future wars. This was bungled and allowed to take place during and after the Vietnam War and this created difficulties for our policy makers.

So let us celebrate our illusions lest they be eroded and reveal us to ourselves. Though we believe in separation of church and state, we must recognize that both have assumed the responsibility for making us feel good and right about ourselves the way we are. Since this is a continuing necessity, neither will ever be successful according to the definition that "Success is when you have worked yourself out of business".

*"Politics is the reason,
war is only its tool"
- Clausewitz*

From SF Chronicle Sat Apr 6, 1991

Bush proclaimed April 5, 6, 7 to be

"national days of thanksgiving" for the Mideast conflict.

*He requested that bells across the country be set ringing
at 3pm Sunday.*

ibid p 8

*There was a prime time salute "to the troops" (read Bush)
on Wednesday evening, April 3rd on CBS.*

"The All-Star Salute to Our Troops"

Bush said, "America rediscovered itself during Desert Storm."

also Note: Gasoline is now below \$1.00/gallon

May 30 It is now \$1.18/gal

EXPAND THE WAR?

Our local newspaper published the results of a recent poll on opinions regarding whether to expand the war on terrorism. [Conducted Feb 15 to Feb 22, Sample size 402, Margin of error 5%]

The primary result, according to the paper, is that support for expanding the war is slipping. Last October 66% favored full military action, now 48% are opposed to extending military action. It must be kept in mind that this poll reflects only the opinions of registered voters in Sonoma County, an atypical segment of both California and of the U.S. as a whole. [Of course, it is typical of California that every part of California is atypical of whatever whole is considered.]

The poll reports:

- Republicans are more in favor of extending the war than Democrats.
62% of Republicans favor broadening the war, 18% opposed
24% of Democrats favor broadening the war, 58% opposed.
- Those under 40 are evenly divided on broadening the war.
Those over 40 are more opposed, and those over 60 are strongly opposed.
- An overwhelming majority of those earning less than \$40,000/year oppose broadening.
More than half of those making more than \$100,000/year support expanding the war.
- Those with high school education and some college are evenly divided.
Those with college and graduate degrees are strongly opposed.
- Men, in toto, are evenly divided
Women are more likely to be opposed

What profiles can be derived from the poll's results?

With regard to expanding the war, we note that those who are older, more educated, and less wealthy are opposed, while those younger, less educated, and more wealthy are in favor. What unites the disparate members within these two opposing groups?

What do the less educated, younger, and wealthy have in common?

The agenda for expanding the war is the agenda of the wealthy who profit most from war, and they have in their employ the masters of spin and manipulation. The young and less educated are more easily manipulated than the educated and more mature, so we have the pro-war coalition of the wealthy manipulators and manipulated less educated and young. Of course, youth is adventuresome and restless and war has always been their thing until they experience it.

What do the older, the better educated, and less propertied have in common?

The older and lower income have personally experienced many of the pluses and minuses of the culture. They are in touch with reality. The better educated have assimilated the pluses and minuses of the culture, know history and the folly of repeating it. All three components of this coalition know about many of the patterns of life and the consequences of certain choices. Youth and the less educated lack the direct or indirect experience of many cultural patterns and become the political and military fodder of those whose agendas are the seizure of wealth and power.

TEN REASONS FOR GOING TO WAR AGAINST IRAQ

1. Obtain a back up oil supply¹
2. Wag the Dog²
 Distract from a dismal economy and faulty economic policies
 Distract from the corporate crimes of Bush's supporters and cronies
3. Elect Republicans to patriotically stand behind the President and our troops.²
4. Force the Democrats into the position that opposition to policies is seen as treason.²
5. Test new weapon technologies.³
6. Give the defense department "attractive targets" to hide its irrelevance against terrorism.³
7. Test effectiveness of spin techniques, especially the power of fear.²
8. The "Lord Acton" effect, the psychoneuroses that go with power.⁴
9. Obsessed into believing our own spin.⁵
10. "He tried to kill my Daddy"⁶

FIVE REASONS FOR NOT GOING TO WAR

1. SADDAM IS DETERRABLE
2. WAR IS NOT CONFINABLE TO A SPECIFIC AGENDA OR ARENA. .
3. THE DOCTRINE OF PREEMPTION IS GLOBALLY DESTABILIZING.
4. ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS EXIST.
5. COUNTLESS INNOCENT PEOPLE WILL DIE.

¹Dick Cheney's reason

²Karl Rove's reasons

³Don Rumsfeld's reasons

⁴Joint reason

⁵The public's reason

⁶Bush's reason

A TWO LEVEL WAR

While planners in the Pentagon have long worked on plans for the United States to be able to fight a war in two parts of the world at the same time. [an upgrade of a two front war], they have never contemplated fighting a *two level* war. And that is what we now face, on one level a war against **terrorists** and on another level a war against **terrorism**. These are two distinct wars and thinking of them as one and the same will lead to defeat. Further, neither of these wars fits the patterns of traditional war. The war against terrorists is a *random* war. Unlike past warfare, and even different from guerilla warfare, the nature of the war that terrorists wage consists of random strikes at random targets with random weapons at random times. Nothing is predictable. No longer does being there firstest with the mostest have meaning. You cannot mass superior forces if you do not know where or when to mass them. There is no conventional or traditional defense against this type of warfare except intelligence, and a new and superior form of intelligence is called for. But even if the war against current terrorists is won, it would not be a victory, since for every terrorist killed or captured, so long as the underlying causes of terrorism remain, dozens more are ready to take their place. Hence the second level of the war, the war against terrorism is a war to abolish the conditions that create terrorists. The precedent for this type of war is the Marshall Plan, a non violent war against the causes of war that followed WWII. While our invasion of Afghanistan and Israel's invasion of the west bank may have succeeded in eliminating current terrorists, without there being a follow up "Marshall Plan", there will be no victory over terrorism.

The challenge is to shift from level one to level two. If there is too much momentum on the part of terrorists, it becomes impossible to initiate a Marshall Plan. So a goal of a level one war, the war against current terrorists, is to check the activities of terrorists for a sufficient time for the a Marshall Plan to be initiated and for its benefits to kick in. Once a populace has recognized the benefits of the aid being supplied and acknowledges it source, that populace itself will place the checks on would be terrorists. Indeed, the only group that can effectively place a check on terrorists is their own community. If it is made clear that resumption of terrorist activity will result in terminating the plan, those in the community will have additional incentive to curtail any terrorist activity.

Specifically, what should be the steps in a Marshall Plan to combat the causes of terrorism? First, people must already have had sufficient experience that the violence reduces their day by day lives. Second, since it is those with nothing to lose who are the most likely terrorist recruits, people must be given something to lose.* Third, people must perceive that the vector toward peace is daily improving their lot. When this stage is reached political and economic grievances can be put on the negotiating table. In the absence of violence, reasonable people can prevail and the road to justice taken.

* They do have their lives - but suicide bomber philosophy has altered this

THE VOICE OF THE VOICELESS IS TERRORISM

In **macro** acts of terrorism the voiceless have finally found a voice. In the past an act of terrorism had limited impact. However, the advance of technology has allowed vast power to be concentrated in the hands of the few. And though the few who developed this power thought they had exclusive ownership, the nature of the technology was such that a clever set of but a few could seize it. The real horror of 9-11 was the realization that this power had been seized, and worst of all, seized by the lowest caste, the voiceless.

It will be argued that it was a very wealthy man, one who could have belonged to the ruling club, who was responsible for organizing macro terrorism. His agenda for personal power foresaw he could adapt the restless global pool of the voiceless to his purposes. But Bin Laden's agenda let the genii out of the bottle. Whether he is tracked down and killed is now of little consequence. The voiceless, with or without al Qaida, cannot be put back into the bottle of silent passivity.

The war against terrorism has not been properly formulated. The real battle front is not against existing terrorists but to keep the billions of voiceless from becoming a reservoir of recruits. For every terrorist killed or captured in the presently formulated war, ten more will spring up. This war will go on, as the Pentagon predicts, for many years. But to bring terrorism to an end a war must be fought, not against, but on the side of the voiceless. For this war, carrier task forces will be of great use; not as mobile bases for bombing, but for bringing material and medical resources to those who have been deprived and suppressed.

All of this is about the external war. But most importantly there is an internal war that must be won in America. This is the war against arrogance, unilateralism, and going-it-alone. This is a war against a "cowboy mentality" that thinks we can ride into town shoot the bad guys (and a few innocent bystanders) and then ride off to collect the proceeds from the round up, leaving the town in turmoil. And we don't give a damn whether them Brits, Euros, or anybody else likes it. Our Western movies have become our archetype.

The internal war is between the visions we share with the founding fathers and the policies of those who have become drunk with power. Between a patriotism based on loyalty to the Constitution and a patriotism based on support of those who have seized 9-11 to spin it into oligarchical power. Whether we like it or not, there are rules beyond those of our own making that we must live by or perish. There are perennial human values and laws of nature that possess a wisdom we seem to lack or have repudiated. There is one law of history that may be especially applicable in the world today:.

WHOM THE GODS WOULD DESTROY THEY FIRST MAKE MAD WITH POWER

NATION OF LEMMINGS

*Honest difference of views and honest debate are not disunity.
They are the vital process of policy making among free men.*

—President Herbert Hoover

In San Francisco at a recent mass demonstration against the war in Iraq, an irate bystander on the curb fulminated against the marching demonstrators, "How can these people have no appreciation of all those who have made sacrifices for our freedom?" What is the logic here? If Americans have made sacrifices for obtaining and preserving freedom, then what is wrong with exercising that freedom? Is freedom some sacred icon to be worshiped only in speeches, put in some national holy of holies, but desecrated if exercised? Too many Americans revel in a rhetoric employing such phrases as 'freedom and justice for all', but in practice are fearful of the very concepts such phrases stand for.

We pride ourselves on being a nation of self sufficient do-it-ourselves individualists. Indeed, individualism is held to be a basic feature of Americans. Its attributes are written in and guaranteed by the Constitution. But doesn't individualism imply diversity? Yet diversity is not favored in the United States. In fact, just the opposite.. We are in reality a nation of conformists who like to think of ourselves as rugged individualists, but we fear and suppress that which is different. Our icon of individualism is one of our traditional illusions.

About 1830 Alexis de Tocqueville visited the new republic of the United States. He was amazed at the degree of conformity that prevailed as contrasted to his experience of Europe. He reported that Americans had traded the tyranny of a British monarch for a home grown tyranny of conformity. Everywhere there was intolerance of non-conformity.

In the 1950's after China entered the Korean War, it was found by the Chinese that only about five percent of American prisoners of war possessed initiative and had to be kept in high security compounds. The remaining 95% were like sheep. They were easily convinced that non-conformity should have inevitable and inescapable punishments. Conformity seemed to be second nature for them. This was in contrast to the Turkish prisoners of the international force that was fighting against China and North Korea. If the top echelon of 5% of Turkish troops was removed, a new top echelon emerged. Turkish prisoners were enterprising at every level. This seems very strange. We think of Americans as having invented enterprise, but this is true of only the top 5%, the mass of Americans are sheep, or worse, they are lemmings.

This raises an important question: How can a nation of conformists, fearful of differences and diversity, sustain a democracy? While dissent is not only a basic right and is essential to the preservation of the democratic process, a majority of Americans today hold dissent to be unpatriotic or even treason.

Americans believe that 'speaking with one voice' is the foundation of our security. Conformity assures our safety. Dissent and diversity are not only unpatriotic, they are threats to our democracy. This Orwellian inversion has taken over the thinking of most Americans, not unaided, but abetted by scientifically honed psychological spin put out by the media masters and those who control them. But a nation that eschews differences and diversity is ultimately doomed to extinction.

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER PART I

“At 12:18 p.m. on Friday, February 26, 1993, a bomb exploded in the World Trade Center, collapsing walls, igniting fires, and leaving 50,000 workers and visitors gasping for air and stranded in darkness in the shafts of the 110 story towers. The explosion, which carved out a 200-foot-wide, five-story-deep crater in the lower levels, knocked out the tower’s police command and central operations center, rendering the complex’s emergency evacuation system useless.”¹

“Ramzi Yousef was the mastermind of this February 1993 World Trade Center bombing which killed six people and injured more than a thousand. Ramzi Yousef & Co. were ready to use dynamite and a Ryder truck [to fulfill their objective] to spit in the face of Americanization-globalization and stomp on it, by using the system against itself”.²

“Did he want a Palestinian state in Brooklyn? Did he want an Islamic republic in New Jersey? No, He just wanted to blow up two of the tallest buildings in America. He told the Federal District Court in Manhattan that his goal was to set off an explosion that would cause one World Trade Center tower to fall onto the other and kill 250,000 civilians. Ramzi Yousef’s message was that he had no message, other than to rip up the message coming from the all-powerful America to his society”²

At his trial Ramzi Yousef said: “You keep talking about collective punishment and killing innocent people. . . You were the first one who introduced this type of terrorism to the history of mankind when you dropped an atomic bomb which killed tens of thousands of women and children in Japan and when you killed over 100,000 people, most of them civilians, in Tokyo with firebombings. You killed them by burning them to death. And you killed civilians in Vietnam with chemicals, as with the so-called Orange agent. You killed civilians and innocent people, not soldiers, in every single war you went to. You went to war more than any other country in this century, and then you have the nerve to talk about killing innocent people. And now you have invented new ways to kill innocent people, You have so-called economic embargo, which kills nobody other than children and elderly people, and which , other than Iraq, you have been placing the economic embargo on Cuba and other countries for over thirty-five years. The government in its summations and opening statement said that I was a ‘terrorist’. Yes, I am a terrorist and I am proud of it. And I support terrorism so long as it was against the United States government and against Israel, because you are more than terrorists; you are the one who invented terrorism and are using it every day. You are butchers, liars and hypocrites.”³

¹ From the book, SKYSCRAPERS, Black Dog Publishers, 1996 p 67

² From the book, THE LEXUS AND THE OLIVE TREE, Thomas L. Friedman, Anchor Books, 1999, p 402

³ ibid p 404

ONE STATE OR TWO ?

There is an excellent example of a cross-dialectic developing in the Middle East. There are two cultures, the Palestinian and the Israeli, and within each culture a split on whether there should be one state or two states. Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist and Palestinian groups have only one thing in mind: the destruction of Israel and expulsion of all Israelis. This view is also held by many in other Arab states. But there are many Palestinians and Arabs who favor peace with Israel and the co-existence of two well defined states. Within Israel there is also a division of opinion. Large numbers seek peace and are supportive of the co-existence of Israel with a Palestinian state along the lines drawn out in the Oslo and other agreements. But there is also a powerful one-state group within Israel that wants no Palestinian state whatsoever and for the State of Israel to include all land west of the Jordan and possibly some on the other side. This view also has its supporters in other countries, especially in the United States. So we have the cross-dialectic consisting of four groups: One state Palestinians, One state Israelis, Two state Palestinians, and Two State Israelis. Two issues splitting each of two groups, making four positions.

The primary contest in a cross-dialectic is which of two issues is to prevail. In the case of the Middle East: Is the one state, Israel or Palestine, issue to prevail or is the two state peace vs. terror issue to prevail? So far in this battle of issues, the one-staters are winning. The death to Israel one-state terrorists have achieved a one-state response from Israel's Likud party. This is due to the great power of terrorism in fomenting fear and revenge. It has succeeded in mustering both Israelis and Palestinians to a one-state view. But those with a more detached view clearly see the one-state view is flawed. An Israel expelling all Palestinians from the land west of the Jordan would never enjoy peace with surrounding Arab nations. And would probably be 'excommunicated' from the society of nations. On the other hand the "death to Israel" gangs are even more flawed. The terrorist fanatics, dedicated as they might be, are doomed by their hatred to the ultimate self destruction of their cause. This is not a matter of personal martyrdom. It is destroying what you believe in by your blind hatred. But, to humanity's despair they take others with them in their self destruction

Another factor working within a cross-dialectic is the proclivity of humans to reduce all problems to an us/them, good/evil format. This may be because we all have limited information processing capacities and our craniums are unable to entertain anything more complex than two factors at one time. The cross-dialectic recognizes this and places its hopes on the right selection of us and them. Is the us to be Israel and the them Palestinians or is the us to be Peace and Co-existence and the them to be the terrorists and their nation level pupils.

State terrorism

SOMETIMES HOW IT SEEMS

In one sense it seems that Osama bin Laden and Bush, the Taliban and the Pentagon, al Quaida and the CIA, are all getting their orders from the same invisible command center. Or at least all of them have agreed on the scenario to be acted out and the parts they will play. This invisible command center may be physically fictitious but it is psychologically real. Life repeatedly presents us with menus, a set of choices we may make, and though the menu given to bin Laden is not identical with the menu given to the Bush Administration, the two menus have some common entries, and both parties after looking over the menus selected the **polarization** option. The option which reads: "You are either with us or against us".

This particular option has the property of oversimplifying any situation. It eradicates the need to consider other implicit and significant issues that complicate the picture. It allows dismissal of side effects by defining success not in terms of viable solutions but in terms of us winning and them losing. This is the option of choice of those who have difficulty with thinking in terms of final outcomes and long range consequences and who are comfortable only with modeling everything in terms of a win/lose game.

The convenience of the polarization option lies in that has many historical antecedents. Precedence is our conventional guide, even in those circumstances where it has never worked. It is a well trodden path and the familiarity of the subsequent menus and follow up options renders decision making [and blame passing] easier than would be the case on an untrodden path. But in these times "in which everything has changed", which call for innovative initiatives and the exploration of alternatives, it is fair to say that the polarization option is the selection of the dullard ^{or} and the coward.

To replace precedence: If the option selected leads to subsequent menus with increasing options then you know you have chosen correctly. If the option selected leads to subsequent menus with diminished options, [as is the case with the selection of the polarization option], then you know you have chosen incorrectly.

Terrorists have in common with all extremists the inability to cope with complexity. They must simplify all issues into black and white, them and us. They have lumped all Americans into the same package of being exploitive, arrogant, imperialists. They ignore the reality of millions of Americans who are compassionate sharing people dedicated to world justice and peace and the fact that we contribute billions of dollars each year to other countries to raise their standards of living. But for their agenda to work, the world must be polarized. The jihad must be all of us against all of them. No neutrals, no non-combatants, no innocents.

To counter the terrorists' attempt to polarize the world into a them and us, we have responded by attempting to polarize the world into a ^{us} them and ^{them} us. The result has been a cooperative effort in polarization. In order to fit terrorism into the traditional patterns of conventional warfare, where force directly encounters force, U.S. leadership had to lump entire nation states and terrorists into the same package. In order to supply targets for our global weaponry systems (CVN's, 8800 mile range B-52H Stratofortress bombers etc.), and give them a role to play, sovereign states such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, etc. were equated to terrorist cults, ignoring the fact that a country that may contain a dozen terrorist cells also contains several million individuals who have nothing to do with terrorism. The logic behind this is as irrational as is the fanaticism of the terrorists. In fact, our us/them policy coincides exactly with their policy of a global jihad against the United States.

It is well known that in order for conflict even to be possible there must first be some agreements, agreements on the rules of war so to speak. The agreement that has been reached by both sides in this terrorism war is that there is to be global polarization in order to exclude any alternative solutions. Both sides have agendas that would be thwarted by alternative options. So you are either with us or against us, you are not allowed to be neutral and if you choose to criticize the polarization you will automatically be classified as one of them.

This has been the ultimate triumph of logic based on the law of the excluded middle.

With the masks removed and the contenders unveiled, the world is now in a war between the supporters of the madness of arrogance and the supporters of the insanity of hatred. The rest of us are not allowed to be neutral. Our role is to be collateral damage.

*The type of leadership that has created the present world crisis,
is not the type that can solve it.*

ONE YEAR LATER

I have been reading and listening to all those who feel they want to say something about this day. The views are varied, across a spectrum of memories and emotions, but not condensing to any single or simple conclusion. The official theme of "Patriot's Day" is acted out by many, but inside are deeper themes that belittle what we are told to think and feel. The 9/11 event is beyond the control of spin doctors. Its meaning is too profound to be tampered with. People are still probing their hearts and intellects to find what it all means. But perhaps it cannot be put in place. There is no place for it except in history. On the other hand the difficulty may lie in really not wanting to know what it means.

We have talked among ourselves extensively ^{to} this day. We try to formulate questions, but do not wish to hear the answers. We too are part of the great refusal to look at this event with all settings of the zoom lens. The pain of high magnification, the personal pain of all those individually affected, while great is bearable. It is bearable because it is the familiar pain of personal loss. But the pain of the big picture, framed in history and by our collective perceptions, is more fear than pain. What we have held as certain has evaporated into mist, a mist that not only obscures our view, but which may contain self created constituents of our demise.

Our belief in causality requires us to focus on causes, on what has gone before, on what has led up to this. Professionals in all fields want first of all to know the cause of a disease or a malfunction.. We feel we cannot heal or cure without treating the cause. This is our universal mind set. But is it not possible, if we know what good health is, what felicitous functioning is, to work toward proper performance in directed steps? Do we humans have the power to liberate the future from the control of the past? Yes, if we are willing to abandon our business as usual responses to cause~~s~~. Modern physics invalidates the traditional idea of cause and effect. This means, translated to the societal level, we can go where we hope to go if we refuse to be obsessed with causal chains.

9/11 has shown much has changed. Now the challenge for us is to change ourselves.