Clash of the Last Men and Its (A)moral Roots
Dragan Pavlovic

1. Between Might and Right
1. Introduction
On the September 11, 2001 we were all Americans. This is probably the greatest nation of all times, the very incarnation of our most noble moral aspirations, that suffered, the crime was so awful and we could not feel otherwise. Nevertheless, the American administration has been filling us since with serious concerns, worries, and profound doubt: is the ideal of justice, democracy, prosperity and humanism in danger? America, instead of saying that it will enter the 21st century with peace, has said it will enter with war. (Here, as elsewhere in this text, we mean governments and administrations and NEVER people.) A serious international crisis is, no doubt about this, in front of all of us, and we should face it together. Our purpose here is to state what we think the problem is and to try to present some of the most important factors that could be acted upon immediately. These factors have been largely neglected not because they were obscure and difficult to spot. They were neglected because some earlier measures that were undertaken and previously proposed measures that were meant to "solve" the problem have been the result of the basic problems themselves and not the result of metanalysis; as a result, the proposed measures risk to take us even deeper into the crisis. Since suggestions that will follow could be received as a surprise, we will give some evidence in favour of such suggestions. Our intention is to show only that although unexpected, the hypothesis proposed is highly testable and has been widely known, and still neglected.

2. The Problem
The recent tragic events, unconventional terrorist attacks on symbols of the Western and particularly American economic and military power made it clear that a serious international crisis and an imminent conflict with the entire Islamic world seem inevitable. To properly handle it we might look for its causes and probably would find them in unequal development of technology, economical imbalance, conflicts of interests, rapid increase of urban society, cultural conflicts due to increased speed of communications etc. To do something about these, and prevent further deleterious effects in an immediate future is illusory. Long-term co-ordinate measures, a fundamental social action, would be needed to solve such basic problems. However, those being probably the real causes, if we would have to take a temporary but immediate action, it would be better to identify the most prominent results of those general, structural factors, that could be acted upon and then hope to obtain more time to prepare and undertake necessary fundamental measures over much longer period of time.

Some words of precaution are needed though. The singular events will not be discussed here because their real nature is not known. However, it is clear that we live in the world of aggression and are almost not aware of it. In the last 20 years there has been so much aggression that we are even not seeing it any more. There is no longer need for a proof. Look at the news tonight. Aggression is today seen as normal behaviour. A new extreme of it is not shocking us any more, although it surely should. The quantity of aggressive "words" spoken every day by our leading politicians, with clear intention to kill other human beings, to kill other persons "out there" - is absolutely outrageous. In addition, there is a permanent war that is permanently justified (the USA alone fought 47 wars in the last 50 years).

It will help, probably, if we would point out also that there are about a couple of billion people in the world that do not have any notion of our aggressiveness, our wars and our desire to kill that we perpetuate in our media from early morning to late in the night. To learn then, all of a sudden, that their unknown head of state is guilty of something and has to be killed. They experience then that some of them are also killed on the way, their land destroyed, their generation dispersed. Their whole life is then annihilated and if they are lucky, very lucky, they will live long enough to see their land recover slowly, and come to the state it would have come to, may be even faster, in any case - at the end of their miserable life.

A second word of precaution is that what will be proposed below, is simply a hypothesis, as any other. It could be false, and we might be wrong all the way through. If it proves to be false, we would know at least that we made an effort to demonstrate legitimacy a difficult hypothesis. Here, of course, this is not pure exercise, but real life hypothesis. Our future could change for the worst if judged true but it is false, or inversely.

The hypothesis is as follows: We are facing diffuse terrorism mainly coming from Middle Eastern countries and state terrorism on the part of the USA, in the form a new authoritarian political system ("MEIT", as we will call it later, that stands for Military and Economical Integrative Totalitarianism). Both are imposing danger for peace and human existence. We will see later that this is of course neither fascism in a strict sense nor one strong form of MEIT (as we defined it). It will probably be correct to say that US displays a strong TENDENCY towards one specific form of political behaviour that we defined as MEIT. We will use this concept not as an exact description of US political practice but as a fairly convenient "ideal type" (after Max Weber) that serves to coherently outline the main characteristics of US politics. This also leaves a hope that a return to the traditional American democratic values is still possible

3. The World Picture Sketch
Following the fall of the Soviet Union and the appearance of the US as the only superpower allied with the West European countries, the New York terrorist attack made clear that the world is facing problems as never before. A conflict between poor and rich, between different ideologies and economical interests has been clearly defined. There is that kind of confrontation between not only former Eastern block countries and the West but literally all the southern part of the continent of Asia and the West. A conflict that becomes a military confrontation. That desperate act of 11th September was done by people who strongly believed that those were the only means available to them to fight against those they consider the cause of their misery. That act was at least conditionally approved by those people and could therefore been done by them, although we do not really know who did it. This may be seen as a criminal act, but in their eyes this was a courageous military action with the available means. The cruelty of that act is absolutely outrageous. Although they probably unrealistically believed that everybody would immediately understand their motives, this has not happened. It would be blindness not to see that they were certainly motivated by something that was real, although their response was deeply wrong.

Many states and individuals are facing today a danger to be either discriminated and suffer a shortage of the most essential elements for their survival, or to be annihilated. This does not necessarily put all humanity at risk of a world catastrophe, although this could not be excluded, but puts weaker nations in danger of further impoverishment and possibly annihilation.

4. The Causes
The driving force of Middle-East terrorism is a deep conviction of the non-western European World, and more precisely Muslim World that they are treated with hate and despised by the West and particularly the US. This feeling that dates many centuries back is linked to the western-European and American racism that culminates during the period after the WWII. The second part of 20th century represents an exacerbation of hate,of being despised and of unfair treatment of the non-Europeans of diverse religions, certainly Muslims and Arabs have been particularly targeted. American military presence in the region, alongside recent military actions and the maintenance of a state of war is the modus operandi of the US coupled with a willingness that the state of affairs is not resolved; multiple collaboration of the USA with terrorist groups of different and opposing interest justify that conviction. It is particularly obvious that unwillingness to resolve the problem of the Palestinian people is of very great importance. The ambiguous and often encouraging stance, particularly on the part of the US towards terrorism (training and support of Afghan terrorism, Albanian terrorism) and self-practice of it (assassinations, military interventions) had, as it is obvious now, deleterious effects. The recent arrogant position toward some essential needs of the Middle-East people (resolution of the Palestinian problem, Gulf war) contributed to the development of terrorism also. And finally, acquisition of Nazi minority policy by the West - encouragement of "human" rights and NOT "just state rights" - gave a signal that was interpreted with precision: all means to achieve political goals are possible. This was a precondition justifying military rebellion and it legalised terrorism. Recently, a quite ridiculous thesis has been advanced: the undemocratic states are the cause of terrorism and they should be dismantled using violent means! In reality, non-democratic states (whole eastern block, China etc) were never the source of terrorism. Those were state terrorisms of the democratic world (the US CIA activities and their Middle-East "policies" for example) that predominated and probably instigated terrorist response in the regions of crises.

5. Fascism and its "Neo-Appearance"
There are other similarities with WWII Nazis that could be listed. Fascism and Nazism are notoriously difficult to define and explain. Dictionary definitions are seldom suitable since they often do not leave the door open to the evolution of the term.

"Behemoth", an excellent study about Nazi ideology and practice was written during the WWII (1). We will make a comparative list of concepts to point out some differences but also striking similarities the US new authoritarian political system has with nazi ideology. Similarities are numerous, but differences seem to be not only in time but also in most important declared aims and certain methods. Although it may appear that we have very different things before us we will certainly be struck to discover that they resemble each other in their most important aspects: their magic attraction, brutality, destructiveness and lack of a real, universal humanism. For this purpose we will not call them "old" and "new" authoritarianism. The term "MEIT" (defined below) may be, for this occasion, appropriate.

A short account of chapter 5 from "Behemoth" is summarised in Table 1. Some other statements, terms, concepts and practices of National Socialism and MEIT that are generally known are also included. Although many of them, if taken isolated, would not be alarming, but taken as a part of the "syndrome", they are frightening. This will be a presentation of methods closely related one to another both having strongly correlated concepts and actions that offer a secure explanation. These strong correlations will enable a reader to come to an obvious explanation for the aggressive politics of the US - a new MEIT ideology.

Table 1. Nazi terminology mainly according to :Franz Neumann: Behemoth, Structure and Praxis of National - Socialism 1933 - 1944, Oxford University Press, 1942; 1944.

_____

Nazi terminology - NATO terminology

Dissimilarities

_____

one Fuerer   - oligarchy
blitz Krieg   - permanent war
time limited action - long term action
relies on collaborators - relies on terrorism (Mujahedins, UCK, Contras, etc.)
leading power acts first - leading power acts either first, induces, or goes with (J. Nye*)
brilliant past - no past
military treat - economical and military treat
no obvious cultural pressure   - cultural pressure
predominantly occupying - not real occupation (collaboration)
change of government impossible – change of government still possible

Similarities

_____

high moral aims - same (selective human rights)
ends justify the means - same
technological superpower - same
power ground for exclusive rights - same
racism - no open racism, Anglo-Saxon chauvinism
strong nationalism - same
one party system - virtual ”multy”-party system
strong national pride - same
anti-Semitism (Jewish) - anti-Semitism (Arabic)
Arian values - American values
human rights superior to state rights - same
space conquering forces - same (just potentiality)
popular conciseness of large spaces - same (just potentiality)
Central Europe (Mitteleuropa) - NATO Europe
federated super-state - NATO world
German spaces - NATO spaces
not internationalism - American interests, Amirican model
interests of Reich - American interests
no League of nations - UNO in the service of the USA
destruction of France and England - destruction of Eastern European Empire
master race - American nation
guardian of honour   - guardian of human rights
new military technique - same
use of the arms of massive civilian destruction - same
use of illegal arms - same

massive civilian victims - same

increase of "defensive" force of our people - same

birth rate stimulation - same

new International law to be used "outside" only - same

space possessing powers in the East -cheap producing powers in the east

there is no place for neutrality - we decided to know everything or American interests are everywhere (Brzezinski)

world economic socialism - New World order

racial will - minority will

racial self-determination – minority self-determination

individual rights make up group rights – same (applied on minorities)

proletarian race against - free market against

plutocratic democracies - national economy

United Europe - United World Economy

common philosophy - common values

third Reich - NATO world

strong Reich - Strong America

incorporation into Germany   - incorporation into NATO world of Europe

race is raw material   - minorities are raw material

power should increase - same

political leader is one among many - same (political leader is a figure)

Versailles Treaty is invalid - Treaties are obsolete

loss of human lives is justified - same

killing children is justified - same (Albright)

propaganda - propaganda + media black-out

use of puppet Government - use of puppet Governments`use of terrorist CIA activity

assassinassions - CIA assassinassions

use of bombastic language - same

controlled police state – secret service-controlled state

divide et impere - same

power justifies rights - same

war is the solution - same

kill prisoners - take no prisoners (Rumsfeld)

athletic body culture – healthy food and fitness (Bush, 2002)

Etc

_____

* Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye: Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition., Boston, Little Brown, 1977.

_____

The number of cited similarities may help distinguish without much difficulties Fascism and the US MEIT (defined later) from classical imperial wars. There is one concept that is behind most effective methods of both devastating ideologies and we will dwell around it for a little while. We have little doubt that American hawks of war from the Pentagon carefully studied Nazi methodology in order to use it when needed. There is evidence that Franz Neumann helped a lot about that matter, although, most probably, unaware of then remote consequences. Immediate promotion of the high human principle of "humanitarism" is now the main method that is used in destabilising and conquering other states. This is identical with Nazi methods. An early concept about the use of promotion of ethnic rights as the means to divide and subdue probably dates many centuries ago but a notorious example is a letter from the Prinz Max von Baden to the Reichkanzler Graf Hertling. Max von Baden explicitly suggest that the aggressive politics of the German Reich would not succeed if this would not be enveloped in a noble principle of promotion of minority rights (2, 3, 4). The methodological problems were thereby solved and Adolf Hitler accepts it with the words that "human rights braak State rights" (5). It become an accepted doctrine and is no wonder that Heinrich Himler would repeat it: "When handling the foreign people in the East we will have to take care as much as possible to recognise different kinds of people and to promote them. (...) I would like to say with this that we not only have great interest not to unite those people from the East, but on the contrary, to split them in as much as possible more small pieces."(6).

Remarkable is also the observation that Herman Goering made when talking about the methods of how to persuade people to go to war (7). We have surprising similarity in the recent events:
"Why of course the people don't want war. Why should some poor slob on a farm want to risk his life in a war when the best he can get out of it is to come back to his farm in one piece? Naturally the common people don't want war: neither in Russia, nor in England, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."

6. MEIT defined
We think we could now state the main characteristics of MEIT that stands for Military and Economical Integrative Totalitarianism. Let us have a look of the definition of fascism that is given below:

FASCISM A political doctrine opposed to democracy and demanding submission to political leadership and authority. A key principle of fascism is the belief that the whole society has a shared destiny and purpose which can only be achieved by iron discipline, obedience to leadership and an all-powerful state. Fascism first developed in Italy, under the leadership of Benito Mussolini (dictator of Italy from 1922 to 1943) and later influenced the development of German fascism in the Nazi movement led by Adolf Hitler (dictator of Germany from 1933-1945) . While fascism increases the power and role of the state in society and suppresses free trade unions and political opposition, it preserves private ownership and private property (8).

Although, as shown in Table 1. above, there are important differences – implying that the new concepts have to be defined, the characteristics given in a definition are also central for the US MEIT. That the US political system is authoritarian is not controversial, although if the term "totalitarianism" is employed it should be understood to include the political system as a whole - some kind of international totalitarianism. Its democratic structures although existent, are alienated from the citizens and we would prefer to use "democtratism" to denote it. Even number of American political theorists and politicians would admit that a "republic" is a better term to use. Suppression of individual liberties is not extensive but is open-ended and openly justified as well as is extensive propaganda and media control. The main characteristic of MEIT is a tendency to expand to unlimited international space, to impose or partially impose a particular goal on other communities, to force them to comply to the economical demands that are no subject to any negotiations. And if resistance is shown by the weaker state, military means are easy to employ and often are the first measures used. Contrary to all the declared principles, "undemocratic" states, as long as they would integrate into economical system, are tolerated. Permanent power growth is justified by the power itself. Similarity with Nazi ideology and practice is obvious.

The driving force of MEIT is their unparalleled military power (thanks to technological advances) that generates ambition to ensure submission of the whole world and assure the acquisition of surplus goods for itself as well as control of main energy sources. Imposition of Western values, as superior, serves to justify the actions. Western values are considered in turn to be superior because of unprecedented success of technology in the West, this of course being a circular explanation. Humanitarian actions are considered as justified even if they include highly inhuman methods and the just war (bellum justum) concept is in its unprecedented renaissance – to ignore jus in bello all together!. It is claimed that the US decisions are not a subject to democratic argument, since the US is a democracy itself. This undermines any need for UN consultation or any examination of the rightfulness of US decisions, as repeatedly declared by the most prominent US politicians. It is implied that power (Might) is generating not only Rights but also knowledge. This is absurd, of course. Increased knowledge about the physical world could teach us how to go around in relation to nature, but increased knowledge about the social world would not allow us ever to prescribe to others how they should organise their society; we would need first to explain the meaning of life itself, and we are far from this. US methods for achieving the mentioned targets are unlimited and its use of terrorism is justified by an entirely ambiguous objective to defend the "human rights" of ethnic minorities (except when they are turned against the US). The arms that the US is using are considered legal even if the other side does not have them, and the arms the weaker side might use in response, are considered illegal. Guided missiles are, for example legal, yet suicide bombers are not. The atomic bomb would be legal, but bacteriological war illegal, etc. These methods are identical with those used by fascists-nazis before and during the WWII.

7. Some Aspects of MEIT

In all countries listed below (Table 2.) people love America, love American people - and hate the US. Because of obvious reasons. In how many countries is the US not liked? In too, too many. Why? The list is too long. We will try to give some reasons, but it should be clear that this is just the tip of an iceberg. As professor Bill Thomson stated (referring to the Americans in one letter on the Internet):

"We Americans, comprising some 4% of the world's population, consume approximately 40% of its resources. We appear to assume that the resources found in other parts of the world are

somehow our birthright. Imagine how this is experienced in third world countries, many of whom have been the recipients of United States military attacks.

1. We maintain this consumption, in large part, because we have the most powerful military in the world, and since WW II we (the Americans; my note) have not hesitated to use it for political and/or economic gain in places like

Table 2.

_____

China (1945-46),
Korea (1950-53),
China (1950-53),
Guatemala (1954),
Indonesia (1958),
Cuba (1959-60),
Guatemala (1960),
Congo (1964),
Peru (1965),
Laos (1964-73),
Vietnam (1961-73),
Cambodia (1969-70),
Guatemala (1967-69),
Grenada (1983),
Libya (1986),
El Salvador (1980s),
Nicaragua (1980s),
Panama (1989),
Iraq (1991 - present),
Soudan (1998),
Afghanistan (1998 and 2004)
Yugoslavia (1999).

2. We have bombed each of these countries in turn, and in NO case did a democratic government, respectful of human rights, occur as a direct result. Through our weapons and/or proxies, innocent civilians of Indonesia, East Timor, Chile, Nicaragua and Palestine have also been victims of the United States. Is it any wonder that the level of hatred of the United States is so high? Former President Jimmy Carter stated, "We have only to go to Lebanon, to Syria, to Jordan, to witness firsthand the intense hatred among many people for the United States, because we bombed and shelled and unmercifully killed totally innocent villagers, women and children and farmers and housewives, in those villages around Beirut...as a result, we have become a kind of Satan in the minds of those who are deeply resentful. That is what precipitated the taking of hostages and that is what has precipitated some terrorist attacks." (New York Times3/26/89)

3. Forty-nine percent of our income tax dollar goes for present and past military-related activities. On April 16, 1953, former President Dwight Eisenhower noted that "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed." For the cost of a Stealth bomber, we could put an additional teacher or social worker in every middle and high school in the United States. The cost of the proposed missile defence shield would add several more. Which of these options would add most to our national security?"

Similarly, Thobani in "On American Foreign Politics" (ZNET commentary, "War Frenzy"; http://www.zmag.org/thobanireplies.htm) stated:

"In the aftermath of the terrible September 11th attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon, the Bush administration launched "America's War on Terrorism." Eschewing any

role for the United Nations and the need to abide by international law, the US administration initiated an international alliance to justify its unilateral military action against Afghanistan. One of its early coalition partners was the Canadian government which committed its unequivocal support for whatever forms of assistance the United States might request. In this circumstance, it is entirely reasonable that people in Canada examine carefully the record of American foreign policy. As I observed in my speech, this record is alarming and does not inspire confidence. In Chile, the CIA-backed coup against the democratically elected Allende government led to the deaths of over 30,000 people. In El Salvador, the U.S. backed regime used death squads to kill about 75,000 people. In Nicaragua, the U.S. sponsored terrorist contra war led to the deaths of over 30,000 people. The initial bombing of Iraq left over 200,000 dead, and the bombings have continued for the last ten years. UNICEF estimates that over one million Iraqis have died, and that 5,000 more die every month as a result of the U.N. imposed sanctions, enforced in their harshest form by U.S. power. The list does not stop here. 150,000 were killed and 50,000 disappeared in Guatemala after the 1954 CIA-sponsored coup; over 2 million were killed in Vietnam; and 200,000 before that in the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear attacks. Numerous authoritarian regimes have been backed by the United States including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, the apartheid regime in South Africa, Suharto's dictatorship in Indonesia, Marcos in the Philippines, and Israel's various occupations of Lebanon, the Golan Heights and the Palestinian territories. The U.S. pattern of foreign intervention has been to overthrow leftist governments and to impose right wing regimes which in turn support U.S. interests, even if this means training and using death squads and assassinating leftist politicians and activists. To this end, it has a record of treating civilians as entirely expendable.

It is in this context that I made my comment that the United States is the largest and most dangerous global force, unleashing horrific levels of violence around the world, and that the path of U.S. foreign policy is soaked in blood. The controversy generated by this comment has surprisingly not addressed the veracity of this assessment of the U.S. record. Instead, it has focused on my tone and choice of words (inflammatory, excessive, inelegant, un-academic, angry, etc.)."

We have to admit that to characterise the US in such a way must be extremely surprising to many, particularly to the Americans. The Germans were also surprised that such a noble task, that the Third Reich apparently declared on all levels, proved to be a real human catastrophe. Every single aggressive action of Germany were justified in a simple and convincing way. If we examine the list of the US wars – more then 47 in number, as some historians have stated – each was fought outside American territory, each had its justification coupled with ambiguity and almost all finished with obvious disastrous results: poverty, social destruction, injustice and misery. The number of wars, even if some were (for the sake of argument) fully justified is frightening and we have to be blind not to see in it the most aggressive foreign policy ever in history. Egoistic nation-centric optics of both Germany and the US disabled their own populations to view from a global perspective the real meaning of that deadly ambition. Both wanted to establish a kind of order - to bring a profoundly idealised world picture which did not count with the fact that the real world is populated with a milieu of peoples that have their own history, customs, traditions, life philosophy, preferences and limitations. The doctrine of sacrifice for the benefit of further generations was also characteristic of communist ideology. Today US ideology imposes that principle on others. The end of WWII already showed signs of that aggressive ideology in Japan (Hiroshima and Nagasaki) and in defeated Germany and many other countries (a list given above). Carpet bombing is an Anglo-American invention, introduced, presumably, by Air Chief Marshals Arthur Travers Harris and Charles Portal in WWII. Those criminal activities par excellence

have nothing to do with people of America (similarly, the WWII crimes had nothing to do with the German people). The macro factors, governments, state administrations and gross social structural factors are in the origin of the most important social events. As professors Frank Jackson and Philip Pettit state, macro factors "program" for the micro events (9). This would not completely eliminate the responsibility of all individuals but makes it negligible in comparison with the responsibility of particular individuals that take decisions and contribute directly to the character of macro factors. However, there is a dangerous catch there. Although the macro factors (governments in our case) evidently modulate public opinion, it is taken that in principle, and this is an invention that makes part of the American dream: every individual is a maker of his own success and happiness. In the other words, if we have bad politics, bad government – we are responsible (and not that government!). On our dispositions we always have democratic ways to correct those mistakes, choosing somebody else for the office; if the new man would fail, WE would in fact fail again! This is the *perpetuum mobile* of our western democracies. It seems to me that the communist governments lost because they openly claimed responsibility and then, when their politics failed, they had to take the consequences. In the western democracy we, the people, are always responsible. This is of course serious problem that could be solved if more responsibility would be claimed from the people who take decisions.

8. Conclusions
The algorithm of terror is simple. A high ethical principle is declared and its immediate fulfilment linked to aggression if necessary. Islamic fundamentalism and the USA state terrorism are in that respect quite similar. This was also the method of the great German Reich when trying to establish a "higher" model of society. Today, for the MEIT states, it is the high principle of "humanitarian rights"; for the Islamic fundamentalists these are high religious principles.. All are not defined in concrete terms permitting their use for a given purpose that stays undeclared. If we would accept the principle, and since the principle is a high moral one - we would have to, then it is inconsistent not to accept the means. The higher the principal the more immediate aggression is justified. Our personal social experience contradicts this of course. In our closed world, we mean society, aggression does not pay off. It is however possible outside of our social circle. Criminals shrink their social circle and follow its moral rules perfectly well. State criminal activity takes place outside of its borders (as the US is doing) or inside its borders, but separating societies to which aggression is possible or forbidden (as in Nazi Germany where Jews were persecuted but not the "Aryans").

Is the hypothesis here proposed sound? We would claim that it might be, without going further. We have nevertheless compared a simple explanation of the behaviour of the US, based on power driven illusion of superiority that justifies imposition of its own values with belicose means; an explanation that concurs with current explanation of policy that is based on complex concepts of actual foreign relations that is full of contradictions, unexplained actions and that is rich with ad hoc hypotheses. A simple theory that explains the majority of events against a very complex theory that fails to give satisfactory explanation without auxiliary means. That presented concept of MEIT may be false in some details and not accepting it as it has been given here is understandable. However, accepting delivered image of what is current policy in essence, is hazardous not only because it is delivered by the controversial actor itself, the US, but also because we see clearly, no doubt about this, that it contains blatant lies about its motives and moral concerns.

Yes, it is possible to kill off all who are on the "other" side (citing Mr. Rumsfeld, "not taking prisoners"). and create a "better", uniform and obeying world. The Nazis failed though. Will the new "saviours" of the world also fail to produce THEIR history? Yes, this is very likely.

Notes.

1. Franz Neumann: Behemoth, Structure and Praxis of National - Socialism 1933 - 1944, Oxford University Press, 1942; 1944.

2. Die Denkschrift des Prinzen Max von baden uber den "ethnischen Imperialismus, In: Reinhard Opitz (Hrsg), Europastrategien des deutchen Kapitals, 1900-1945, Paul Rugenstein verlag, Koeln, 1977.

3. Some significant passages we could find in Mathisa Kunzel. Mathias Künzel: Der Weg in den Krieg:, Elefanten Press, Berlin, 2000, p 95-96: "Seit über achtzig Jahren wird Machtpolitik in Deutschland auf besonderer Weise verbrämt. Im März 1918 verfasste Prinz Max von Baden, der bald darauf zum Reichskanzler ernannt wurde, eine Eingabe an den Kaiser. Ihr Titel: „Die Denkschrift über den ethnischen Imperialismus" (In: Reinhard Opitz (Hrsg), Europastrategien des deutchen Kapitals, 1900-1945, Paul Rugenstein verlag, Koeln, 1977, S. 420-440).Behandelt wird darin eine Fragestellung von höchster Aktualität: Wie kann eine imperiale Machtpolitik so präsentiert werden, dass sie selbst "im Lichte der schärfsten Weltkritik, auf Zustimmung stößt". "Will der deutsche Imperialismus dem Ansturm der Demokratie mit ihrem Anspruch auf die Weltverbesserung Stand halten, so muss er sich ethnisch fundieren". Mit dem reinen Machtanspruch kann die Demokratie mühelos fertig werden...darum müssen wir allgemeine Menschheitsziele in unseren nationalen Willen aufnehmen."

4. As cited in Mathias Kuntzel: (Idem): Schon bei Baden werden jene "Menschheitsziele" aber volkisch definiert. Der Weltkrieg, der er den "Panzer" der früheren Weltordnung sprengte, habe die Geschicke ganzer Völker erneut zur Entscheidung gebracht.....Neu entstandene Staatengebilde bedürfen die Anlehnung und des Schutzes.... Wir sind ihre Nachbarn und Befreier.(p. 254)

5. Idem. Ein anderer Ideologe griff dies auf und gab diesem Gedanken eine Überschrift die auch heute nicht nur bei Konservativen, sondern auch im grün-alternatieven Lager auf Beifall stößt: "MENSCHENRECHT BRICHT STAATSRECHT" Der Autor dieser Lösung, Adolf Hitler, präzisierte diesen Gedanken wie folgt (" A.Hitler, Mein Kampf. Bd.1, 35 Auflage,München 1934,S.104.): "Wenn durch die Hilfsmittel der Regierungsgewalt ein Volkstum dem Untergang geführt wird, dann ist die Rebellion eines jeden Angehörigen eines solchen Volkes nicht nur Recht, sondern Pflicht...nicht die Erhaltung eines Staates, sei der höchste Zweck des Daseins der Menschen, sonder die Bewahrung ihrer Art (....) Dieser Vorstellung entsprechen wurde im Zweiten Weltkrieg sogenannte "Volksgruppen-Komandos" auf der Suche nach "Volksmischgebieten" durch ganz Europa gesandt, um dort den "Völkischen Selbsterhaltungstrieb"(Hitler) von staatlichen Minderheiten im ersten Schritt aufzuwiegeln, dann ihnen das Bedürfnis nach "Autonomie" anheim zu geben und drittens deren Staaten bei Bedarf auseinander zu sprengen. "In Frankreich sollten mehrere neue Staaten entstehen, für jede "Minderheit" einer. Die Bretonen, Burgunder oder das "Volk" von Savoyen rief die deutsche Zentralgewalt zum Kampf auf. Deutschlands Europapropaganda pries "Autonomie", "Identität"...., heizte den Separatismus an und spaltete die okkupierte Nationen. (See also Walter von Goldenbach and Rüdiger von Minov in a book Von Krieg zum Krieg, Köln 1999, p.6.

6. Heinrich Himmler (15. Mai 1940) (In: Reinhard Opitz (Hrsg), Europastrategien des deutschen Kapitals, 1900-1945, Paul Rugenstein Verlag, Köln, 1977, Teil IV: "Bei der Behandlung der Fremdvölkischen im Osten müssen wir darauf sehen, soviel wie möglich

einzelne Völkerschaften anzuerkennen und zu pflegen, also neben den Polen und Juden die Ukrainer, die Weißrussen, die Goralen, die Lemken und die Kaschuben. Wenn sonst noch irgendwo Volkssplitter zu finden sind, auch diese.

Ich will damit sagen, dass wir nicht nur das grosste Interesse daran haben, die Befohlkehrung des Ostens nicht zu einen, sondern im Gegenteil in möglicht viele Teile und Splitter zu zergliedern.

Aber auch innerhalb der Völkerschaften selbst haben wir nicht Interesse, diese zu Einheit und Grosse zu furen, ihnen vielleicht allmählich nationalbewusstfein und nationale Kultur beizubringen, sondern sie in unzaelige kleine Splitter und Partikel aufzulosen."

7. Internet (reference unknown)

8. Robert Drislane, Ph.D. and Gary Parkinson, Ph.D. The online version of this dictionary is a product of Athabasca University and ICAAP.

9. As we have pointed out earlier (D. Pavlovic, Justice, tribunal et héritage helléniques "Dialogue", No 18 (Editorial),. 1998): Quoi qu'il en soit, il ne sera pas simple non plus de partir de la responsabilité pour arriver à la culpabilité. Mais une telle approche, une approche structurelle globale, permettrait de mieux analyser le processus d'éclatement d'un conflit et satisferait en même temps au droit international. Ainsi condamner des crimes individuels prendraient son sens véritable et le tribunal sa pleine valeur juridique. D'ailleurs, la plupart des théories servant à expliquer les phénomènes sociaux ne tiennent pas seulement compte des facteurs micro (les individus) mais également macro (les institutions, les structures, les normes sociales).

La question du passage du niveau micro au niveau macro a été longtemps discutée et la littérature en sciences sociales continue à en débattre. Max Weber, en 1904, dans "De l'éthique du protestantisme et de l'esprit du capitalisme" (Max Weber, The Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism, Scribner's, 1958) en a donné un exemple classique en expliquant l'influence des valeurs sociales religieuses sur l'organisation économique de la société.

Passons maintenant brièvement aux explications théoriques. D'après certains théoriciens (ceux du holizam méthodologique, le point de vue prédominant), (i) les facteurs macro filtrent les préalables psychologiques des phénomènes, neutralisant tous ceux ne concernant pas ces phénomènes (Robert Nozik, Anarchy, State and Utopia, Basil Blackwell, 1988, p.22), (ii) les facteurs macro produisent les préalables psychologiques aux phénomènes (Louis Althusser, Reading Capital, New Left Books, 1970, p.180), ou bien (iii) les facteurs macro programment la réalisation des phénomènes en accroissant leur vraisemblance (Frank Jackson et Philip Pettit, "Structural explanation in Social Theory", in David Charles et Kathleen Lennon, Reduction, Explanation and Realism, Claredon Press, 1992). D'autres théoriciens (ceux de l'individualisme méthodologique) privilégient les facteurs micro (Jon Elster, Explaining Technical Change, Cambridge University Press, 1983). Enfin, certains chercheurs prennent en considération aussi bien les facteurs micro que macro et proposent une solution complexe de compromis (James Bohman, New Philosophy of Social Science, Problems of Indeterminacy, Polity Press, 1991). Le comportement agressif des groupes est un phénomène social qui, comme tout autre, peut faire l'objet d'une analyse des relations de cause à effet. Punir les crimes de guerre commis, bien que ce soit totalement justifié sur le plan moral, ne supprime pas la cause des crimes. Les conditions de guerre, qui d'un point de vue théorique correspondent au niveau macro, en sont une cause incontestable.

II. *Amorality* and Logic of the "Empire"

_____

The Iraqis are militarily weak, and all agree about that, have never been involved and are not prepared to get involved in terrorism yet. At least not as much as the number of neighboring states have been and are now likely to be. The objective of the war is then, to remove Mr. Saddam Hussein and probably assure more freedom for the Iraqi people.

When not only a majority but the totality of the Iraqi people, women, men and children are not ready to sacrifice some of THEIR lives to get rid of Mr. Saddam Hussein and therewith probably achieve more freedom, how can some of us justify that the US imposes a sacrifice of some of THEIR, Iraqi, lives for THEIR just probable freedom?

Do we affirm that there are people who do not dispose with their lives and that it is the US Administration who decides about that?

_____

1. Prologue

With the Iraq war, we are confronted with a serious international crisis at all levels. While conflicts between Western European countries, including Russia, China and number of other states on one side, and the USA on the other, are diplomatic in nature, the conflicts in the Middle East are military. There is general impression, at least in the USA, that there is no balance of power. Which political conflict will turn to become military, as at least the present American administration seam to believe, is on the single world power - the USA to decide. Similarly to the 30's (this was the Ligue of Nations then), the UN is in a position today either to function as an instrument of the US political aims, or to become "irrelevant". Indeed, power relation between countries is the real basis of international relations. Quite obviously, power may be ultimately challenged only by some other power. But to use the power itself as a justification of its existence, although probably frequent in the past, has become unusual today. Various moral and logical strategies are developed to justify, disapprove or limit the use of power. Misuse of moral and logical arguments is of course common. I will try to treat briefly one small section of these important issues. As always, I will not pretend here to state what the matters of facts are, but what I suspect that the matters of fact could be. However, I have very little doubt that the picture given here is much different from the reality.

Some very limited aspects of ethics and logic will be given here. How they are treated, depends very much on the standpoint that is taken. Therefore, it would be fair to admit here in the beginning that I adhere to the concept that the US is a great power that, seduced by that power, pays a bit more attention to its own interests then it should. In the other words, the foreign policy of the US is under influence of its power self-seduction. Consequently, it aims to enlarge power and occupy more space by its power and influence, and to assure a good future for its citizens - unfortunately by unequal distribution of goods in the world, inflicting injustice to number of other states.

I can understand that this is not very easy to perceive from inside the US which is, as a result of mentioned power seduction but also the Sept. 11 event, in a kind of social neurosis. This explains surprisingly big internal support for its foreign policy. The administration of the US is just putting at work that neurosis which, unfortunately, facilitates appearance of extreme intentions of some mentally disturbed personalities, who in the circumstances of social

neurosis, may and do display psychotic behaviour, which would otherwise probably never be apparent. In plain words, I suspect that there are some of psychotic high officials, some people at the top of the US administration, who simply misinterpret the world picture and do things that could be described insane.

This disturbance I will name "moral atavism". This has been, however, often the case in history. On one hand, concrete moral concepts (but not basic principles) evolved through time and some of them, that would be unacceptable today, were accepted then. Certainly this did not belong to pathological states of mind. Aristotle himself held non-Greeks for lower men, for example. Brutality and wars are considered even nowadays to be "normal" and accepting war does not necessarily indicate mental problem. On the other hand, and this is essential, we can recognize today, that some aggressive behaviour on the international level may belong to the pathological states of mind, although statesmen are seldom in a position to be aware of this. In the 30's, while certainly mentally disturbed, Hitler was not identified as such. Today is the US administration that displays similar pathological behaviour. The mechanism of how does the power produces such social neurosis and leads to psychotic behaviour of some political leaders have been extensively studied and will not be treated here. I would recommend the reader to address to classical textbooks of psychology. We are unfortunately far from a complete understanding of what is going on in human psyche, and even farther from possible measures that could be undertaken to prevent appearance of these so deleterious effects of power.

An extremely patient reader, who would manage to read all this text below, will probably realize that hardly anything new is in it. She or he may ask them "why so many words only to say things that we all already knew?" I must admit, I am puzzled as well: how could it be that we all know all this I try to demonstrate below, and still, many do and say - just the opposite? Are human beings irrational? Why do we do our simple, everyday things with extreme rationality: we walk, eat, sleep, move things, behave strictly in accordance with our logical and rational thinking and the world picture that we have. This is how we behave towards external physical world. And yet, in the sphere of our human relationships, we construct ideologies (religions included) that do not have anything to do with the world? We are not prepared to jump from the window of 20 stores building to demonstrate power of mental energy, because we in fact know that "mental energy" can not hold our body supported only by the thin air. But we are preaching that metaphysical powers can move mountains or other similar nonsense. Our rational side is reserved for natural phenomena, but our loved human beings have the honor to "enjoy" our irrational side. Are we in fact lying so badly and almost all the time? Are we all capable, when we want to influence other people and make them do things as we want them to do, to adhere to some abstract concepts and faulty logic and pretend to know the future and to be wise? Are we such miserable, shameless creatures? Why we accept other people lies? What is this what we want to achieve when we are in front of out TV sets and see and hear plain lies and still behave as if this does not disturb us at all? We do nothing to correct it! Why? Are we also ready to say fair well to reason as that stupid man is? That stupid, ignorant man who came into possession of too much power but has too little knowledge, while being convinced that the opposite is the case. And little knowledge, some probably heard it, is dangerous thing.

2. Introduction

One of the most difficult moral question is what to do when we believe that death of a great number of human beings could be avoided only by killing one or more innocent people.

Situations like this are rare situations that most of us never meet in our lifetime. However, it appears that they are permanently present in international relations. Reality of such situations has been claimed ever since and has been a basic principle of all wars in all times. Interestingly, more the power one state gains, more often will it be "able" to perceive such situations and show intention to intervene militarily in order to "protect the many by sacrificing the few". In modern democracies and "civilized" societies, it has been repeatedly claimed that we have such situations when a ruthless dictator of some totalitarian regime is about to or has started with the execution of his political opponents or rebelling ethnic group, or when such dictator, by his cruel politics or the military potential, presents an imminent danger for peace. Hitler, who was not a democrat but Germany certainly was one of the most civilized counties, perceived such a situation and used that ground to attack Poland (Hitler, A., 1939). In the recent past, as its power increased, the US has been perceiving these situations more and more often. In 1999 this was Serbian Kosovo crisis that was characterized as such an occasion; in 2002 Afghanistan, and in 2003 Iraq (see Bush G., 2003). In the first two countries military intervention produced many thousands of innocent victims. After these military interventions there has not been made a single attempt to analyse whether claimed benefits of the interventions had been achieved. Similarly, there is no serious study that examines moral implications of recent military interventions. We claim that in today's constellation of international relations such interventions can not be morally justified. To allow military interventions for such rare cases of human right abuse, fundamental changes in international arbitration and decision-making would have to be made.

There is at least one sufficient moral reason, which has some ramifications, that does not allow such interventions. Utilitarians suppose that benefit from military interventions could, in principle, in well-defined situations, justify killing some innocent human beings. A decision for such actions has necessarily to be based on not only reliable but also **certain predictions**. We categorically reject this supposition. We reject it on the ground that social events can not be sufficiently well predicted. The actions, which inevitably would produce human victims, can not be based on weak predictions that we are able to produce. We simply can not know with sufficient certainty that benefit of killing some innocent human beings would lead to sufficiently great number of saved lives. In addition, in these circumstances we also should either have **consent** of innocent victims, or their assumed consent "without reasonable doubt", which is extremely difficult or impossible to obtain or to assume. Such general utilitarian approach may be useful in number of other circumstances but not if human lives are at stake. The second reason, that is in fact a ramification of the first one, is to reject the military interventions in such cases because they do not present **self-defense** situations in a strict sense, which would be the only condition that might permit such actions.

The third reason for rejection is the slippery-slope argument. If such military interventions were to be allowed, there is a risk that they will be used in the future in not sufficiently well defined circumstances. In principle these circumstances can hardly ever be exhaustively defined. The situation in which we find the international community today is a good example of these difficulties. Efforts to undertake such human life saving actions are accompanied by badly designed mechanisms of control, there are no mechanisms that could help us to verify sufficiently well whether there is a cases of self-defence or whether imminent danger for great number of human lives really exists or whether real humanitarian reasons for such an action really exist. This is why I do not think that we can permit such an action to take place today.

There are no signs that even great powers are ready for a resolution of that difficult dilemma. In fact, international factors that are supposed to perform these military actions almost always block the verification procedure. The reasons for an interventions are in fact either not given

or the evidence is declared to be confidential. It is even not tried to inform limited number of state leaders of permanent members of the Security Council of the UN about details of danger that presumably exists. This has grave consequences. If, in the end we would find that, for example in the recent crisis, Iraq really was in possession of the weapons of mass destruction, substantial responsibility would in fact be on the US that presumably had this concrete information but did not give it to the other members of the international community and in so doing did not permit them to take right decision. No doubt, the intervening powers count to some extent, on the post hoc proof for their insufficiently justified actions. Indeed, their recently stated objective – removal of the Iraqi regime – obviously has been conceived as a way out of that unpleasant impasse. The UN has not approved this and the intervention in Iraq rests to be illegal.

To rely on the post hoc justification of undertaken military measures is unfortunately unreliable, since the side that intervened militarily would attempt and would always succeed in procuring some false evidence (committing *post hoc ergo ante hoc fallacy* – see below) that would "justify" that action. There is additional danger that may have grave consequences also. If such actions are once permitted, then the "evidence" that would "justify" such actions may produce a "proof" that such unilateral action was justified once and encourage further similar actions. The opponents of such unilateral actions would be then in a difficult position to demonstrate the existence of *post hoc ergo ante hoc fallacy* and would lack the arguments to support the thesis that International Community has to play decisive role in those affaires. This is a danger of the present US intervention in Iraq, which should certainly not be allowed in the circumstances. On the contrary, a reliable international arbitration must be established that could, independently, evaluate military interventions that are linked with doubtful moral justification. This is not easy though. If this is the intervening state who evaluates need for the intervention and if the same state evaluates the moral justification of the same intervention after it was accomplished, we can never be sure whether one military intervention were really needed.

This is why in the actual situation of international relations all military interventions are to be declared morally wrong in advance and should be postponed until necessary independent proof would be assured. We urgently need mechanisms that would assure just use of military force for the rare situations that may need such interventions. The responsibility of big powers would be to establish independent mechanisms of control and to explicitly and factually renounce to exercise influence on them.

We may now proceed to some less general themes that are actual these days and give some more detailed description of the problems treated above.

The era of satellite television permitted that probably some of us watched with interest a program on the German television where various journalists and men of politics took part (ZDF, "Berlin Mitte", January 30,. 2003). The Iraq crisis was the theme of that discussion. Some important arguments were advanced, although these arguments were not new. We hear them all the time everywhere. I have some methodological objections related to what have been said above, that concern the way how it is being dealt with that serious international crisis that will, as it seems now obvious, produce an escalation of war in the Middle East. Therefore I propose to examine some aspects of morality and logic of the actual conflict.

However, the terms "morality" and to lesser extent "logic" might sound quite odd in that respect. One might wonder whether the author of this text knows that Empires do not pay much attention to morality and logic and you might have a kind of suspicion that nothing

particularly interesting would be to expect to find in the text that follows. So why should one read it? I think that it should be read because we are ready to introduce a surprise for you at the very beginning and claim at first that the USA is NOT an empire. This might take you aback, and if proven true, would certainly disappoint a number of the US government researches that have been working for years to help build a real empire-state. A state that would be as great as Rome was, but modern, powerful and "religiously" seducing as the Third Reich tried to be, and still, much lasting longer then all Empires ever lasted. If one thought that it already were an empire, he would be, I maintain, wrong, although not much away from truth. Indeed, to include the USA into the relatively large family of empires that world has seen so far, one would have to introduce some light adjustments to the definition of the empire (compare Duverger, M. 1980.). This is not an enormous task since the definition of an empire, according to Duverger, is quite flexible (or may be even not existing). One could introduce something like "relatively loose economic control of the virtually ruled states", "targeting of their energy resources", "destruction of the local economies", and so on.

This might be enough to call the US an Empire or at least to loosen definition a little bit, introducing some modern concepts. But let us accept the old definition of empire, for the sake of argument, and assume that the USA is not an empire in the classical sense of the word, but an example of a just, democratic, prosperous state with all that goes with it and that it is deffending common interests of the civilized world.

Let us assume also that we are in the world of justice, fairness, and that all tendencies of politics are improvement of social justice. We are clearly assuminga lot, although we certainly can not exclude that quite often intentions to actualize exactly that kind of world are sincere. This is as least how the present US Administration is trying to present us how the world is. Why shouldn't we start exactly there? We can now examine the morality and the logic of the today's international conflicts from exactly that (from the world powers) declared standpoint. Let us look now at the problem itself: the problem of justification of killing humans, the problem that we are permanentlly facing in the modern world. The stability of the social order greatly depend on coherent moral concepts. Therefore, no matter whether we would accept or not a presence of an empire, presant international "order" has to provide satisfactory moral stance in the relation to killing of humans.

For some readers the second part, that concerns some basic ethical issues, could be boring. However, I try to defend a position, that is quite unusual, to show that killing humans is not entirely an ethical problem. This is a much more a basic problem, an existential problem. I argue that trying to solve the problem of killing in the moral sphere leads to contradictions and even widely accepted erroneous justification of killing. My position is that the problem if defined as existential, although it strongly supports a pacifist position in principle, still does not justify extreme pacifism. However, such an approache dismissis completely a possibility that the problem can be solved by an ethical argument. If this summary of what will follow would now satisfy some readers, they could without loosing much, just skim through the first section and go to some specific fallacies that are given in the second section and that are quite amusing.

III. Logical games

The present Iraq dispute is so rich with fallacious arguments and I must admit that they can not and will not be given her comprehensively. To start with, I have to underline that it is essential to take into account that the real meaning of "war" is killing human beings, and of the modern war, killing civilians. Number of recent wars, lead mainly by the US, proves this. The arguments of Iraq crisis may be simply solved by the acceptance of certain obvious principles: 1. That the law, i.e. the International Law must be obeyed (see Russow below), what means explicit Security Council decision on military action (the 16 previous resolution do not mean free hands, as some US politicians maintain), 2. That decision must be based on the strength of the arguments and not force and intimidation or blackmail and bargaining (Germany and France have been threatened, the "New Europe" and Turkey financially bribed.). 3. Demands on all sides cannot be theoretical but concrete and given in observational terms and palpable material terms. This is all not respected. Let us see what is put forward as argumentation.

Obviously all of you are aware of the strategy of the "one side open-end" demands that the US have been using for quite long time without any opposition whatsoever. This is very well known form of, on purpose badly defined demand where the side that advances a demand has, by one cunningly formulated demand, left itself liberty always to declare that the satisfactory response was not given. This is of course an unfair proposition. The opposition by the civilized world to such a demand would be justified since there cannot be a demand, a proposition that does not have a theoretical solution – a solution that COULD BE formulated. Such a proposition is empty. The proposition we are talking about is in addition accompanied by some very well known logical fallacies. All of this is motivated by the desire of one that states a demand, to achieve some target that is set in advance. Nevertheless we are in the political framework and, it could be answered that that kind of arguments are common in politics and even permitted and is not a prove of unfairness. It could be advanced that the aim of politics is not the truth but successful argument. This is indeed the essence of the very well known stance that politics is immoral. Of course all aspects of politics do not have to be immoral. Indeed, the aim of politics is neither the truth nor a better argument, but successful argument. Although politics does not necessarily have to be immoral, nobody is disturbed if it is immoral. Moreover, this could be justified.

This is, I am afraid, widely accepted position and has become a praxis, since, as it is often said, "it is not possible, most of the time, to pursue the truth and to endlessly compare arguments". Decisions have to be taken in a limited frame of time. As a consequence, quite often, the only criterion for what will be done is neither truth nor better argument but the most successful argument which fulfillment could be achieved even by the use force. Such is politics. Such is life, some would say. Even in science we mostly accept what we can in a given space and time framework. There are numerous examples of unsuccessful but true theories that had to wait very long time to be accepted. I presume that we would agree that to achieve the truth is over-ambitious and that we would have to accept the best solutions arrived at after satisfactory argument examination, after a fair and exhaustive persuasion, as a reasonable replacement for it. I will name it "morality of persuasion" that has its rules, its logic and constitutes quite important part of our life, going far beyond politics and science. Are we too often on the wrong side of morality? Or, could we be wrong all the time? Are we too often at odds with "morality of persuasion"? I do not think so. Even if we were, and this is condition cine qua non, as long as the consequences do not go beyond very well determined

limit, this does not even matter. Consequences determine whether we may accept relaxed arguments that are not both, true and sound arguments.

This would mean the following. As long as politics, similarly to science, do not by its fallacious argumentation, lead to destruction and killing, we can accept that, "for the time being", such and such decision has to be accepted even if not proved to be at least the best between alternatives. However, if the decision leads do the destruction and killing we talk about a completely different matter. This is another category of things and the rules of argumentation that are permitted in science and politics do not apply any more. We are not any more in the sphere of "morality of persuasion". We are well deeply inside an existential sphere, and outside of morals, where logical games could not be allowed any more. The reasons behind are neither moral nor logical; they are existential. This is at least my position.

We will start with the above-mentioned requests of the USA to their opponents. It consists almost always of a principal demand that has a form of a "one side open-end" demand, and a "reserve" demand, that is so excessive that it could not be satisfied. As I will show later, these lead directly to the armed conflicts. The absence of the deserved response of the International community to that kind of argumentation of the US and the lack of the refusal of the International community to take part in such unfair handling – tolerance by Europe and other countries, of the arrogant US stance – is bringing again and again the world peace in the real danger. Let me explain in one less recent example how that blackmail runs, although you have certainly already grasped the issue.

The American demand, during the Yugoslav war, to the Serbs was that in order to stop the war they had to decide on some measures that will be accepted by the opposing side (Croats, Muslims or later Kosovo Albanians). The "reserve" demand was to sign Rambouillet Agreement that was equivalence to self-destruction in fact. The opposing side was simultaneously advised, you would certainly remember, not to accept any of the Serb proposals! This constituted a full-blown "one side open-end" demand since it did not contain a theoretical possibility that would satisfy the demand. The blackmail was literally formulated as follows: If the Serbs do not accept proposed solution they will be bombed. If the opposing side did not accept the proposal that the Serbs accepted, the Serbs would be bombed as well. We know what happened. The Iraq crisis offers the other example of such unfair demand.

This time Iraq is demanded to disarm and the "reserve" demand is to remove Saddam Hussein. The demand "to disarm" is "one side open-end" demand that logically could never be satisfied. The answer to such a demand cannot be even theoretically formulated. In that situation the "reserve" (to remove Saddam Hussein) demand is even not necessary. The US may always respond that the disarmament has not been complete. Let me give one example, although the matter is quite clear. If somebody accuses you of stilling money and asks you to return the money, normally he has to state at least "how much' he expects you should return. This is needed because in spite of your returning money he may continue to insist and claim that you did not return all the money. The similar situation would arise if he would ask for more then you in reality had stolen. In both circumstances, just relying on the demand formulated in that way (the *Argumentum ad ignorantiam*, explained below; see also Thompson, B.; Damer, E.; or Walton, D. for further analysis), he would be free to proceed as follows. In both cases he may just continue to exercise pressure on you, continue with his claims; even inspect your pockets, your home, find nothing and still claim that you retained somewhere some of the stolen money. He may inspect your neighborhood, your bank accounts, find nothing and still continues with the demand... Etc. to eternity. Or this may go

on until he would not attempt to destroy you in some way. This would, of course, then remove the problem.

These kinds of demands do not have fair solutions. If the other side (Iraq) does not show the weapons, it will be bombed. If it shows some weapons, it would be told that that is not enough. Or what is even more ridiculous, will be immediately bombed – as was in fact declared. Iraq may show even more weapons, and it would be told that this is not all. It may show all that in reality has, and would be told that it has some more and would not escape being bombed. That kind of demand closes the argument from the start and Iraq probably reckons that it would be better to say right now that it does not have any weapons of mass destruction and let itself being bombed, but showing some heroic resistance by using some of the weapons that it hid. I suspect (temporary only) that to be in some way false and that showing all the weapons might have some advantages. If Iraq will be bombed in any case, some moral advantage could be gained if, after the war would be finished, there would be found that Iraq did not have any more weapons than it declared. However, these who would take such an action now will not be there then to enjoy that moral satisfaction! Of course, to save the face, the aggressor might after the war ended, demonstrate some weapons that have been found (since there are certainly weapons that have been hidden) or invent some false "evidence" showing that Iraq was hiding some weapons, what will be quite likely in a such embarrassing situation for the aggressor. This will be however *post hoc ergo ante hoc fallacy* – supposition that the *cause* of some act is - its own *effect*: pretending that the outcome of the intervention (finding weapons) was the cause of the military intervention. We have an example in Kosovo war. In the Kosovo war the exodus of all inhabitants of the region was taken as the cause, the reason for the bombing of Yugoslavia. This has been officially disapproved by the report of the OSCE but ignored by the political circles even until now! Or, the aggressor will, in order to justify what was done, bluntly formulate the "reserve" argument" – removal of Saddam Hussein" – to have been the main reason for the aggression in any case, and the issue will be dismissed. I presume that this has been probably also a result of the analysis of the experts behind American administration. This however does not make the intervention a legal one.

The best solution for Iraq is then not to show any weapons. As we can see, there is no theoretical solution to the demand that is advanced by the USA, and the best solution for Iraq is obviously to maintain its present position. In fact there is only one "solution" that would not resolve the argument itself but the situation, which is similar to the above stated example of "stolen money": **destruction of the subject** that has to respond to that ridiculous demand. However, it would not resolve the argument but simply remove it. This is why the solution is not in the hands of Saddam Hussein, as some "political analysts" say. It is in the hands of the US.

The TV discussions that we often see these days illustrate number of false arguments. There was, for example, an interesting case of use of "appeal to authority" fallacy (*argumentum ad verecundiam*, by a prominent CDU politician) combined with *peticio principii* fallacy.

Argumentum ad verecundiam **and** *peticio principii*
*Argumentum ad verecundiam (*Invincible Authority) Classification: A deductive fallacy of soundness with a falsehood in the major premiss, in the Ad Vericundiam family. Description: The argument supports a position by appealing to the mere opinion (or say-so) of a particular authority as sufficient to settle the question, without a consideration of supporting arguments. (Thompson)

Petitio Principii or Begging the Question. Classification: A deductive fallacy of circularity. Description: The words and phrases used to express the conclusion are synonymous with the words and phrases used to express the conclusion. That is, the premisses merely restate the conclusion. (Thompson)

In our example, one CDU politician used former resolution of the Security Council to prove one specific matter of fact concerning the same resolution, although the validity of the same decision was actually questioned. Simultaneously we heard that the Resolution 1441 states that **the other side (Iraq) has to prove that it does not have weapons of mass destruction**. Of course one further interesting fallacy - *argumentum ad ignorantiam.* Number of war fans impos a burden of proof on Mr. Hussein maintaining that he has to show that he does not have the weapons of mass destruction, and we both know that this is an error of "*affirming the consequent*" that has been known for over 2000 years. We use in medicine something called "abduction", i.e. "hypothesis", as C. S. Pearce called it, but we are fully aware how uncertain it is. You can try to cure somebody by following abductive reasoning (including "primum non nocere"!), but you can not hang somebody executing the sentence that was pronounced by following some predictions of abductive reasoning.

Argumentum ad ignorantiam.

Classification: A deductive fallacy of soundness, with a falsehood in the major premiss, in the Ignoratio Elenchi family. Description: The argument mistakes lack of evidence for evidence to the contrary. In effect, the argument says, "No one knows it is true. Therefore it is false." (Sometimes, in order to make the claim that "no one knows," the argument insists on an inappropriately strong standard of proof.) (Thompson)

If Iraq really does not have these weapons its not showing them is declared to be evidence that it has them. A proposition "Iraq does not have weapons of mass destruction" has not bean proved (and, as we believe, can not be proved) and is assumed in advance to be false (*argumentum ad ignorantiam*). I beg your pardon. How do you in fact prove that you do not have something? You show - nothing. That type of *asymmetrical dispute,* where the burden of proof is just on one side (Iraq), presents a praxis in diplomatic relations that carries an extreme danger for peace. This illustrates quite clearly power politics of the US.

Argumentum ad baculum (Appeal to Force)

"Classification: A deductive fallacy of soundness with a falsehood in the major premiss, in the Emotional Appeals family. Description: The "argument" is actually an explicit or concealed threat. In effect the argument says, "Accept my position, or I will punish you." (Thompson)

This refers to even more ridiculous arguments that were advanced: that a war can and will be decided and started without approval of the Security Council of the UN (*argumentum ad baculum,* appeal to force – used repeatedly by the USA). Reasons given were "there were number of the Security Council decisions, so it could be proceeded with the measure that ..." (*fallacy of many questions,* see below).

But bombing was not mentioned in all these Security Council Resolutions what is also a fallacy of "increasing the punishment if the jurisprudence is ambiguous or insufficient". Opposite is in fact correct: if the jurisprudence prescribes some punishment, it could be decided NOT to apply it because of some facilitating reasons but it could not be decided to INCREASE the punishment! The same reason applies to the question of "automatism" that

could follow from some Security Council resolution. A military action has to be explicitly permitted but the application of less violent measures may implicitly follow. To interpret this in a reversed order, as the US is reputedly doing, is simply a crime. And so on. It was advanced also that "the decision of the Security Council is not important if it does not approve the intervention" (!?).

Fallacy of many questions
"Illustrated by 'Have you stopped beating your wife?', the fallacy was first noticed by Aristotle. It lies not in the question but in what is inferred from the answer. Putting B for 'I have been a wife-beater' and S for 'I have stopped', then a negative answer is equivalent to '(B and not-S) or (not-B and not-S) or (not-B and S)'. If the questioner infers that he may disregard one or more of these alternatives, his inference is transparently invalid". (Woods)

It was also tried, during one discussion, to prove an issue by accumulating "reasons" that all just do not prove one thing: that without an approval of the UN there can NOT be a war, even "just" war, even the so-called "humanitarian" war. Advancing more and more arguments does not help. We can assemble hundredths of bad arguments and they will still prove nothing. Hundred baskets with the holes in their bottoms, if put one over the other, are still leaking.

Argumentum ad hominem
"Ad hominem is a Latin phrase meaning "at the man." Fallacies in this family all share the characteristic that they concern themselves with the person responsible for the argument, rather than the argument itself. They falsely assume that characteristics of the person responsible for an argument imply that the argument itself must have certain characteristics, or that the characteristics of the person responsible for the argument are relevant to the acceptability of the argument itself." (Thompson)

We can say in thousand of ways how Mr. Saddam Hussein is a bad person (a version of *argumentum ad hominem*). But just one appropriate reason (that I would certainly think that is impossible even to imagine) is needed to show why the Iraq should be bombed now. And that reason – we simply DO NOT HAVE. If somebody would ask you to approve of some killing would you approve it without at least ONE down to earth reason. One such reason can not compromise state security, but would lead to (still in my opinion wrong) acceptance of that killing. If such reason existed it would be certainly communicated at least to very limited number of leading politicians of the states that now risk to oppose the US military action.

That ridiculous "argumentation" goes on these days without an end. There is one argument that was advanced long ago without being seriously challenged although its deep immorality is obvious. We are told that some country should be liberated from some dictatorship by our military intervention. This meaning killing some thousands of innocent citizens as collateral damage. Now in that given country it is hard to find one that would like to die for that cause. They may consider their living conditions quite hard but not that hard to want to sacrifice their particular lives. Yet the US administration wants to take that decision against their will. Such is, for example, a childish story that a military action is needed to remove Saddam Hussein, although it is certain that no Iraqi citizen would accept to die for that ridiculous cause. I personally think that presently we do not have a single country in the world where the humanitarian situation is that bad that we should sacrifice lives of other people for our democratic ideas.

The Iraqis are militarily weak, and all agree about that, have never been involved and are not prepared to get involved in terrorism yet; at least not as much as the number of citizens of neighboring states have been and now are likely to be. The objective is then, to remove Mr. Saddam Hussein and probably assure more freedom for the

Iraqi people. When the ordinary Iraqi people, women, men and children are not ready to sacrifice THEIR lives to get rid of Mr. Saddam Hussein and therewith probably achieve more freedom, how can some of us justify the intention to sacrifice THEIR lives for THEIR probable freedom?

Let me finish with an illustration of argumentation that I recently heard. A very high member of the US administration declared, similarly to Mr. Bush, "if the Security Council does not handle the issue, the US (and Britain) will have to handle it alone". In fact the phrase goes as follows: if the Security Council does not do as the US demands = declare a war to Iraq, then the US will declare it in incapable and attack Iraq. Amusing way of saying quite nasty things. Or even better: The US sent the message to Turkey (since Turkey refused to cooperate and did not allow US troops to enter Turkey): It is not yet an appropriate moment, but we are going to tell Turkey when the time comes how disappointed we are with their refusal. What do you think it means? I can finish now as I started, with moral question, and this was quite moral one, but quite of low moral.

International concerns

We will now try to break another link between politics and killing. In order to better explain the absence of link between amorality of killing human beings and politics I will introduce a point that is of substantial importance. It seams, at least to me, that the excessively used phrase that "war is a continuation of political conflict by military means" (Klausewiz) is false. This may be true in some limited sense but does not explain out the war and is dangerously misleading. The time has come to realize that war has very little to do with politics. The main target in war is human life and that has nothing to do with politics. This is a point where in reality politics gives up and killing of human beings begins. As we showed above, this is where moral stops and we have to deal with "amorality", the absence of moral. If we would realize this, we would probably have more understanding for the mission of the United Nations, The Charter of the UN and the International Law. The logic of war would then be placed there where it belongs, to the class of things that are correctly named "criminal logic". This might permit more efficient handling with the international crisis issues and help prevent escalations similar to this one we are facing right now. We would, I hope, then rightly perceive the sophistry of argumentation of the aggressors and be better prepared to respond adequately to these unfair and criminal games of logic.

On one hand, these are some of formal reasons why a peaceful solution cannot be found within the presently formulated argument. Therefore even if the respect of the Security Council of the UN would be fulfilled, this would not solve the inherent problem of the argument and would not remove inevitability of the war. This would only postpone the violent "solution". The solution is not contained in the argument itself that is a kind of *aporia*. If we were to look for a solution, it has to be looked for outside the given argument, i.e. the argument has to be restated in order to construct one in such a way that it would contain a theoretical solution that then could be, with the help of a vigorous diplomacy, achieved. In this context the so-called logic of deterrence shows also to be false. It is advanced that the deterrence has to be real if it is going to work. This is of course true, although there must be a possibility for successful removal of deterrence. This means that there should be a way to remove danger of being bombed by complying with the requests. Not only this: there should be established an award if it is complied with the demands. If only punishment is certain, and this is the real meaning of the hard position of the US, non-compliance with the requests of the UN is preprogrammed. Thereby the war is also irreversibly programmed to happen.

Having the weapons of mass destruction, on the other hand, cannot be a reason for a military intervention. All the states that are in the position of "realpolitical" relations with their neighboring states have to have these weapons as the means of deterrence. Direct danger of being attacked by a neighboring state is permanently present. This encourages these states to arm themselves and increases the danger of the local conflicts and, in turn, together with the war logic of the superpower explained above, this would be a state of affaires that guarantees armed conflicts and persistence of crisis. Also, if we maintain the state of "realpolitical" relations and refuse to comply with the International Law (as the US has been doing for years) then the process of militarization is going to persist and the current crisis will be repeated in all its possible versions in the future. On the contrary, increasing the strength of the international community and making the war, including local wars, illegal and submission of all the states to the UN arbitration inevitable, might increase security of these states and remove the need of these states to permanently increase their military power. A profound change of the "paradigm" in the international relations is necessary. The maintenance of the realpolitical relations in certain regions that has been encouraged by the western countries, and particularly by the US, garantees military confrontations.

The factual respect of the decisions of the UN by the all would be, if at all, the only way to solve the crisis that we actually have and might have in the future. We have much reason to believe that the UN may become the institution that could, in the rare cases of emergency, and independently of the potential intervening states, mediate in arbitration of difficult cases where a military intervention may be contemplated. In the arbitration of whether there is a case of need for self-defense or humanitarian need the great powers that would secure an eventual intervention, should be excluded. This is, of course, the opposite of what the foreign policy of the USA in the Middle and the Far East has been and what the attitude of the USA towards the International community and the International Law is.

The US (administration) may be now living, although with a substantial delay, their nation-state period (as stated by F. Fukuyama) and they find it quite hard to sacrifice their sovereignty and to submit themselves to the international institutions. As the mentioned author continues, European lived their nation-state period during their long history and that transition – submission to the international organizations, do not disturb them that much. This is why the Europeans insist on the respect of the decisions of the Security Council of the UN and the US is not. The Security Council of the UN is not an instrument of democracy or justice. It has been created to operate in the circumstances of power politics to assure that some power state does not do something that the other do not approve. As simple as that. No decision of the Security Council means no action of any state is allowed, and not just the opposite, as the US wants to interpret that no decision about their military action mean they are free to do as they want. Indeed, from the other side of the ocean the kind of "patriotism" that displays the present US administration and the nation-state period that they believe they are going true resembles more some much earlier period - the period of the Roman Empire. It would have been probably better if they lived their nation-state period, or whatever it is, true some other creative forms of life, letting the Peace in peace.

_____

References

Bush, G. *Proclamation*, March 16, 2003. "We concluded that tomorrow is a moment of truth for the world. Many nations have voiced a commitment to peace and security, and now they must demonstrate that commitment to peace and security in the only effective way: by supporting the immediate and unconditional disarmament of Saddam Hussein. ...The dictator of Iraq and his weapons of mass destruction are a threat to the security of free nations. He is a danger to his neighbors. He is a sponsor of terrorism. He is an obstacle to progress in the Middle East. (Compiled by Rick Rozoff)

Damer T. Edwards, *Attacking faulty reasoning. A practical guide to Fallacy – Free Arguments*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, Ca., 1995.

Duverger, M. *Le concept d'empire, in «Le concept d'empire*, Centre d'analyse comparative des systems politiques, PUF, Paris, 1980.

Fukuyama, Francis, *Has history restarted since September 11?* John Banython Lecture, Melbourne, August 8, 2002.

Hitler, A. *Proclamation to the german Army*, September 1, 1939. "The Polish State has refused the peaceful settlement of relations which I desired, and has appealed to arms. Germans in Poland are persecuted with bloody terror and driven from their houses. A series of violations of the frontier, intolerable to a great Power, prove that Poland is no longer willing to respect the frontier of the Reich.
In order to put an end to this lunacy, I have no other choice than to meet force with force from now on. The German Army will fight the battle for the honour and the vital rights of reborn Germany with hard determination. I expect that every soldier, mindful of the great traditions of eternal German soldiery, will ever remain conscious that he is a representative of the National-Socialist Greater Germany. Long live our people and our Reich!" (Compiled by Rick Rozoff.)

Russow, J. Global Compliance Research Institute. In *US ENGAGED IN AN ILLEGAL WAR, states:* Under the Charter of the United Nations, the following purpose is clearly enunciated:
…to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
…to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
…to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
Under the Charter of the United Nations, force is only authorized if sanctioned by the UN Security Council, or under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which affirms:
…the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)
The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in

place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.

In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.

The US has misused Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.

Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.

As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue stated defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice,

Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.

Thompson, Bruce, *Home page*:
 http://www.cuyamaca.net/bruce.thompson/Fallacies/intro_fallacies.asp.
Thompson states: This page was created for the use of my General Introduction to Philosophy (PHIL 110), Critical Thinking (PHIL 125), and Logic (PHIL 130) students at Cuyamaca College. Naturally, other visitors are also welcome. Since it is increasingly important to judge the quality of information on websites, and since one criterion of quality is the credentials of the author, I have attached a copy of my resume. Also, anyone who wishes to contact me is welcome to do so. My email address is bruce.thompson@gcccd.net. The material on this page is not, so far as I know, under copyright; and I hereby give my permission for this material to be used by others. However, some of the examples and exercises may, accidentally, have been taken from other, half-remembered logic books. If so, it is not my intention to use material without permission. It is just that I have used some examples so often over the years that I no longer remember whether I wrote them myself, or borrowed them from another author. Please let me know if you notice any flagrant plagiarisms. I will be glad to remove them.

Walton, N. Douglas, *Informal logic. A handbook for critical argumentation*, Cambridge University press, 1994.

Woods, John, Prof, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* from Oxford University Press (http://www.xrefer.com/entry/552710).

III. Beyond Crisis

1. Solutions

There is a solution to the problem. The single choice that we have today is not to accept, as an excuse for our indiscriminate immediate action, any high moral principle all together and to remember this in future generations. In the past a struggle for the highest general moral principles led to great tragedies. Fast arrival to the target was always declared as an obligation, since, as we said above, the goal was a high moral principle. Such was communism, such was National Socialism, and such is the New World Order. The self-propelling mechanism is set in extremely high moral principles that preclude any resistance to its immediate implementation and any defence against its inhuman means. (On the contrary, we are, of course, inclined to believe that Popper's piecemeal engineering strategy of human progress is a single possible way to a better world.)

We have to make clear that those are the means and not the ends that make our actions human or - miserable. Our means of achieving some not ambitious political aims if enveloped with high humanity will make us go further. Our great aims accompanied by faulty means will take us back in dark ages. We have at first to abandon the mad ambition to change the world in our lifetime, no matter how high the moral principles is leading us. If we, on the contrary, have an intention to bring IMMEDIATE "justice" to the whole world, we have to count that we would have to employ extreme violence to achieve that goal. This would be a secure reservation for Hell and we would certainly deserve it. If somebody would ask us to do or let him do something dirty, we should be sure that he would, in order to prevent us of stoping him to do this, give us the most noble reasons for his actions. More concretely, the long and tragic history of violence teaches us that, if someone, in order to persuade us to do something brings some Biblical high morality arguments, we should, even before he would even tell us what is this we should do, give him a strong kick in his as.

2. Immediate Action

Opposing terrorism and its specific form - US authoritarian political system (MEIT) - is of paramount importance and actions against them will have to be taken simultaneously. The reason why is quite obvious. Since the driving force of the first is the second, the task should be targeting the US authoritarian system first. However, this being a long process, a trial to stop terrorism as such may be favoured also in the short run, and this must start immediately, until methods for global actions will be developed. Some actions against the US authoritarianism are a conditional sine qua non for effective action against Middle-East Terrorism (MET). Middle Eastern countries are in absolute necessity to fight against MET. A global approach will help gain their confidence. Their taking part in anti MET could make of them a significant force for the fight against-MEIT, particularly in acquiring them as collaborators to the other Western countries that are not involved with MEIT. We will suggest some principles that are certainly not comprehensive.

1. It should be recognised that declaring a highest possible moral target and linking it with its IMMEDIATE fulfilment leads to a large human tragedy. We should develop means to prevent this happening again and stop its course today. This is nothing new, but we maintain this to be of utmost importance and have to repeat it: that if we set our moral target very, very high (we should, of course, but...) we may falsely also decide to arrive at it immediately. To do this we

then have to disregard the means because such high moral target "justifies" (we could think) all the means – including killing other people. This is at least how the aggressive politicians explain, in principle, all the time their immoral actions. We might ignore this when it concerns the politics on the law level, local politics, where damage is not too important. But when human lives are at stake, we should have to do all we can to make clear what is the logic behind it and try to stop it.

2. Contrary to what Hitler declared in "Mein Kampf", it should be recognised that state rights are at least equal with human rights and that is a "just state" and not justice for ethnic minorities thatsupposedly must be protected first.

3.UN action, and not the US terrors must be used to destroy the terrorist organisations, in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

4. The US must not mimic the same terrorist actions that it condemns when done by others. Supposedly not "targeting" civilians is not enough - not hitting civilians while targeting terrorist is absolute must. Such terrorist activity on the US part is wrong -- both morally and strategically (since revenge would bring more revenge and would alienate the rest of the world). (This implying that even UN violent military antiterrorist action can hardly be ever employed.)

5. The US must consider the Palestinian problem and take immediate steps toward a solution. A lasting peace requires fair treatment for everyone.

6. USA has to bring to justice those Americans who

a. created and promoted international terrorism, were financing, training and helping in various ways terrorist movements all over the world, Al Quaida included.

b. pursue the politics of state terrorism, promote the breach of the International Law, neglect US obligations to the international community and to the UN.

Accepting these principles, the question is how we should proceed now? Certainly, all cited points have to be put to work immediately, publicly and SIMULTANEUSLY. There are some other solutions but these are linked with serious problems. Although this is quite unrealistic, we may decide to start acting in a just way right now. Can we start acting in a "just" way without repairing previous injustice? Under "repairing" we mean also to bring to justice and punish for wrong doings. If we cannot start acting in a just way without repairing previous injustice, how far in the past we should repair? For example, the Arabs would like to see a number of top politicians from the West being judged together with their own "terrorists" for previous crimes. A great majority from the Arab world is convinced that a couple of million Arab people died directly or indirectly because of diverse US activity in that region in the last 20 years. From their point of view the WTC disaster is a "minor" incident of terrible events that have happened, although it may be the first that hit the USA.

Many would not call the WTC disaster a terrorist act either. If war is accepted as a means to achieve some ends, and if we would also reject arbitrarily to decide what kind of arms could be used, then the means that terrorist use are not less legal then guided missiles, which they do not possess. If only the more powerful are to decide, then sophisticated arms will be accepted as legal and the other side will simply have to perish. This of course would make all such rules unacceptable in principle and invalid. We would then have to accept that, in principle, the more that means of massive destruction are developed, the greater chance we will see the so called "terrorist" methods at work.

If we can start acting in a just way without repairing previous injustice, this would mean that the US should not bring to justice those responsible for the disaster of WTC. Then, the Arabs and the other extreme Muslims, might, under these circumstances, accept to stop with killings now.

We think that none of these is realistic, that the first three points are the closest to how the real world looks like, but that each could be attempted and may be partially fulfilled, leaving the risk for more conflicts.

3. The instruments

This would be what concerns immediate action that is needed. A more basic approach is necessary in order to stop both deadly deviations. We do not doubt that a World initiative will be needed. The means are yet to be defined. An original approach, suited to the specific problem, is a must. Somme suggestions will follow..

a. The role of the UN should be examined and a commission formed that would examine its activity and status of the organisation with respect to its Charter and The International Law. A particular problem that the UN should face is misbalance of power after the disappearance of the Soviet Union. It may look as a contradiction, but these are the US that should help construct an effective defence against the single power misuse of the international order. They would suit that function very well indeed since they ARE a superpower that is in fact misusing its military advantages. A proposal made by the USA of how to limit unfair and dangerous influence of a single superpower on the international relations would be a step towards a fruitful dialogue.

b. Formation of Alliance for Defence of State Sovereignty. That body should be at the initiative for all other listed actions. This is essentially a kind of "anti-NATO" alliance that would assemble particular states in opposition to the NATO Alliance (not excluding some NATO members also) with the precise goal to protect particular counties against attacks and pressures not in accordance with The International Law protecting states, their sovereignty and peace.

c. Muslim Conference. Solution of the Middle East problem has to be sought and terrorism as mean of achieving some ends discouraged and democratic peaceful solutions proposed.

d. World Peace Conference. This conference is urgent. It should examine recent events as well as status of UN and International justice.

e. Anti-terrorist Tribunal for US (point 4. above). An active US support of terrorism in recent decades should be examined and exposed. Its most deleterious effects have been seen all over the world and only recently within the US. Its exposure and condemnation will have a strong moral impact not only on the US but also a number of other countries that have supported terrorism.

f. Replacement of the Hague Tribunal and abolition of ICTY.

4. Answers to the four Common Sense Questions

We often face common sense arguments that look solid, but are faulty. Our present day media are full of them. In the last ten years we have been presented with such absurdities like this one: the situation is critical and we do not have a better choice then to go to war. The argument was always put forward by the war-makers themselves. All those questions are, more or less of the same nature: destined to distract us from freethinking and impose single-

minded solutions. If we rejected them at start and tried to find the right solution we would not have been so deeply involved in crisis as we are today. Those questions are as follows.

1. If we are misinformed, do we have a right to act and in so doing make mistakes?
2. If all (authorities) hold an identical opinion, do we have to accept it also?
3. Do we have to tolerate the US aggressiveness?
4. Do we have a choice?
5. Are not all wars just the same?

These common sense questions often have to be answered in a non-common sense fashion. Otherwise we risk living our lives in common sense misery. The first question, however, may have a common sense answer. We ALWAYS have a duty, before acting, particularly if our actions have heavy ethical implications, to make maximum effort to learn all about the matter before action is taken.

The subject matter of this short text is such that we must learn much more about events in order to be able to accept or reject the stated rhetoric posited upon us. We can be assured to be able to do it easily.

The second question concerns obedience to authority (argumentum ad verecundiam). There are fields of our life where without obeying an authority we might face considerable difficulties. The cognitive authority is based on knowledge and we are seldom able to challenge it. On the contrary administrative authority could be challenged on the basis either of knowledge or common sense, since it is not based on expert knowledge. There are no experts on whether Afghanistan should be bombed or not, as there are certainly experts for molecular biology or fluid mechanics. This is not only common sense issue but also a moral issue. Again, the moral nature of an argument, obliges us to examine the argument itself. We doubt that our subject here could be left to rely on any authority whatsoever. The fact that a majority of Western politicians have a similar points of view should be meaningless to us. If anything, this should invite us to examine very carefully the arguments themselves. The foreign policy has, nevertheless, nothing to do with the knowledge of some foreign country since it will not be governed by the real needs of that country that is the object, but by the interest of the country that acts. Experts exist but are not heard insofar as their dissenting opinions challenge the interests of the politicians in question. Recall, for instance, that key American politicians did not know "how come the Serbs occupied Bosnia?", (not knowing that they "occupied" it 13 centuries ago). One might have a similar experience if asking actual "authority" (that learned, we can assure you, exactly yesterday that Pashtuns lived in Afghanistan) what language it is that Afghans speak? for example

Would the world be Hell without the US? We believe that this is not the subject of the question the crisis of today raises at all. In any case, the randomly distributed power secured balance of power and relative stability in the second part of the 20th century. The nuclear deterrence, it may look absurd, secured stability. A power that has no opposition, as French political philosophers pointed some centuries ago, would lead inevitably to "absolute corruption" and terror. The Greeks know this as well and tried to limit in advance the length of the mandate of dictators that were sometimes needed in times of crisis. The World needs some guarantee of the International Justice and International Law. We do not seem to have it in the US, and we have to reconstruct these ideals, since we invested so much in the wonderful society of the New World. (If we do not, we are likely to have Hell but WITH US.) Or we will have to invent other ways that will assure the application of International Law.

Whether we do have a choice deserves a common sense answer: we always have a choice. Our very argument here should have shown that there is a number of alternatives. Equally, if

we would look at the Table 1. we will realise that there is a significant difference between Nazi and MEIT wars, and the imperial wars. The majority of concepts from the table 1. are not typical for the imperial wars.

5. Not A Conclusion

We all want a better world, more justice, more rights, more freedom, and more humanism. We want it fast. The goals may be brilliant, but the means we use are - miserable. Humanism is losing. Decency should start with proper actuality. War advocates should be stopped at the gates.

Innocent people die in the havoc of wars and our obligation is to protect these people from the disasters of wars and to avoid wars at any price. But there are individuals who kill innocent people by their decisions. Such people are highly dangerous.. We should all attempt to protect society from such persons of inherent evil.

I do not think that we can conclude here. All problems of the society that existed centuries ago are still present. Couple of thousand of years of "civilisation" have been too short to solve even the essential controversies. Hellas, we have a false conviction that we have achieved quite much; in reality achievement is meagre. Our democracy seems to disappear as soon as we turn our regard away from it. We do not know enough about the other people desires, esteems, convictions and hopes and still believe that our values are better and try, insatiably to impose our customs to the others. We talk about progress and are forgetting that we kill people more then our ancestors did. We are convinced to be justified in doing this, forgetting that the "primitive" people from the past were equally convinced. It is not easy to make advances in the huge moral field if we falsely maintain that we already have achieved a state of justice and moral wisdom. Why should not we try to make the task easier, simpler and try just one single thing, one improvement only. If I am wrong all way through this essay, you will pardon me since I probably got too scared from the mounting violence without a real reason. Assuming that I were indeed wrong, there is a single but essential objection to the US and our Western society that is surely justified, that is contained in a simple question: "Why kill?" Hence, a small improvement could be at hand. The US has to try just this: stop killing people. This would certainly be a good start.

Conclusion

As we have come to the end, it is of utmost necessity to underline that number of arguments exposed here, have been pushed to the very extreme. This was done with the purpose to awaken us from the conformist slumber and force us to examine critically the problems of international relations. Indeed there is no need to be in despair. The world is certainly better then it seams to be if seen through these pessimistic glasses. But we could, if we tried to act more rationally, make it look quite desirable place to live even to those who have lost all their hopes.

IV. Epilogue: Above or Beyond the Law

Introduction

If the description given in the preceding text would look quite exaggerated, we would think that more realistic picture that we will try to give below is not much different. More general approach will be used, though, with the hope that more objectivity would be achieved. However, less concrete conclusion will be drawn. The purpose would be to achieve something that could not be achieved by simple stating matters of facts, since the matter that we deal with is of chimerical, moral nature.

Indeed, we seem to be dreaming. We look at the world as if it were not much older than we can remember. We do not doubt that we have made progress through history as human beings, and we are proud of it. As children we may not even have had a bicycle or ridden the train; and now we can have breakfast in one part of the world and dinner on the opposite side of our planet Earth. Basic essential human rights are not an issue any more in this, our part of the world; we struggle for even more rights - extra rights are the order of the day: homosexual rights, even animal rights, and so on. War? That is the business of fools, of lower people, they can have wars if they wish, but here war is forgotten. If we hear about such things from the other side of the world, it all sounds as remote as tales from an old history book. We have moved beyond ... The new era is on its way; the world has profoundly changed forever.
But is it so?

If we would shake our heads, open wide our eyes, and look back through history, we could clearly see how profound an illusion this is. The reality is cruel. Conflicts between states have been constant and have all too often escalated into bloody wars. This has been an infallible pattern now for not only hundreds but many thousands of years. History looks rather like conflict – war periods randomly distributed over the planet, with uninhabited areas proportionally less exposed. When it has happened that some large region remained relatively spared for a fairly long period of time, then people always, without exception, started to believe that the time of war was past and gone. However, those exceptional periods always came to an end and the hopes for lasting peace proved to be in vain.

Today we have no serious reasons to believe that the future will not resemble the past. The present period of peace in the Western world is negligibly short, if compared to the sweep of history, and the cycle of war and peace periods following endlessly one upon another -- much too short to enable us to conclude that the miracle has occurred. Hence, there are more wars to come in the future.
The same applies to the frontiers between states. They have been changing over the centuries, and the long history of changes only offers the promise that there will be more changes to come, the Europe of the future is not going to resemble the one we know now, and that this is going to happen, unfortunately, through conflicts and wars.
In the past, the slowness of communications and the restricted range of deadly weapons resulted in more or less local wars. With the advance of technology, communications and the world population, people have been able to travel faster and attack at greater distance, and wars have been becoming more universal. Yet so far, the real World War has not quite been possible, even though very major wars, particularly in the past century, were possible. Some of you may still remember what they looked like.

Today at last, thanks to technological progress, truly universal war is practically at hand. So this is the sort of war we can expect to see next.

All major wars in the past were fought for a "universal" cause, for freedom, for world order, for a prosperous and peaceful future, for improved humanity, for "high" human ideals. We know today that all without exception were ruthless lies and the result of ignoble motives, immoral purposes and self-deception. Significantly, it was always the leaders of the most powerful states, the ones most advanced in military technology, who took it for granted that eternal wisdom and utmost humanity went hand in hand with power. They believed that their concept of a better world then had to be imposed – indeed even that failing to impose it would had been highly immoral and unjust. Thinkers who opposed those attitudes were marginalised since the reigning power had their own thinkers, their own philosophers, own writers, own wise men, own elite. And so it went on. In short, there were many common features to distinguish aggressive states that probably could be recognised should they appear again today.

Yet absurd as it may be, in the past, they were seldom identified in time by large sections of the populations. Why, I do not know. Perhaps it was because they were never exactly the same, born in different times and different places, in different cultural environments; and in spite of this, they all displayed these similar features.

Above or Beyond the Law

There is in particular one feature, so systematically present, so well represented, that always followed sometimes long periods of maturation of those so characteristic and yet atypical and unrecognisable ideological traits that I mention, which is so strong that its appearance should by itself be able to wake up the most somnolent from their deadly dreams: THEY (the states i.e., their leaders) always put themselves above the law, violating their own laws, the laws of other countries, agreements between states, treaties, international conventions. Always. In the earlier times those were not the laws in narrow sense but rather customs or frequently unwritten agreements. In the twentieth century the laws par excellence, just borne to assure everlasting peace, were violated. To do this, very strong reasons were given, always, without exception. The essence of all reasons was that fulfilment of essential human duties had to overcome humanly made, imperfect laws. THEY would promote first an untenable thesis that violence could be combated by equal or even greater violence. To achieve their ultimate goals, THEY had to turn upside down the famous Greek argument of the justice beyond the law, justice emanating out of human categorical imperatives, a priory knowledge of right and wrong, our ideal of justice. (Antigones' refusal not to bury the body of her brother and to let it be torn apart by animals; she was convinced that the universal law is higher than human made laws and that such a vicious act could not be let happen). The ancient Greeks knew that laws couldn't entail the entire human moral intuition. They knew that we may, in the rare cases, in order to fulfil that ideal of justice - the laws steam to and just fall short of – and go beyond the law, but only to forgive and to pardon. What a tyrants would do is that they would either virtually apply the law but exceeding what it prescribes, or go above it and violate it (for the "higher" cause!) punishing more, oppressing more, destroying and killing, and this makes the "fine" difference of the moral and immoral.

Here is the famous passage form Sophocles" "Antigone".

(...)
CREON. And thou didst indeed dare to transgress that law?

 ANTIGONE. Yes; for it was not Zeus that had published me that edict; not such are the laws set among men by the justice who dwells with the gods below; nor deemed I that thy decrees

were of such force, that a mortal could override the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven. For their life is not of today or yesterday, but from all time, and no man knows when they were first put forth.

Not through dread of any human pride could I answer to the gods for breaking these. Die I must,-I knew that well (how should I not?)-even without thy edicts. But if I am to die before my time, I count that a gain: for when any one lives, as I do, compassed about with evils, can such an one find aught but gain in death?

So for me to meet this doom is trifling grief; but if I had suffered my mother's son to lie in death an unburied corpse, that would have grieved me; for this, I am not grieved. And if my present deeds are foolish in thy sight, it may be that a foolish judge arraigns my folly. (...)

In the other words, Sophocles was saying that we can break the law only if in doing this we commit a less violent act, and then we certainly do not increase the punishment, we diminish it or pardon altogether. Only then we may, in some special circumstances, break the human-made and imperfect human laws. But what THEY (the states mentioned above i.e., their actual leaders) would so systematically do, and we should so easily see it if we just open our eyes, is that, contrary to Sophocles - who would break the law only to pardon – those states would introduce more cruel, more violent measures, not only to impose by force the ”utmost human values”, but to punish, repress and even exterminate. They would do all of this in a simple and clear way – with sword and fire. This, and at least this - we must always be able to recognise at its very beginning. Before the announced (first) world war, before it is too late.

Morals about Imperatives
I will let the reader discover examples of that pattern in history. Ancient Macedonia, the Romans, the Ottomans, Napoleonic France, our colonial predecessors, Nazi Germany, are some of the most obvious cases. And there were others as well. Today, we must be very well aware that quite recently, the UN Charter and more then 50 treaties and international conventions, as well as a few national Constitutions, were violated.

In politics, not declared desires, promises and bare words, but acts and results of those acts show what was really wanted. 78 days of bombing of Yugoslavia, led to NATO occupation of Kosovo and installation of second huge military NATO basis in the Balkans (against small Serbia!?), ethnic cleansing of the totality of Serbs from Kosovo (those who still rest there are in the ”reserves”), having as a result reinforcement of Belgrade government, subtotal destruction of the country's industry, death of couple of thousands of civilians, pushing the entire population deep in misery. Those who did it all recognise now (secretly though) their failure and plan further (again military) actions to correct it. This will further help ”revive” the history, some were so anxious that was dying.

Again, we should not confuse entire nations with states, actual governments, and some political leaders. At the very end of the 20th century, we are witnessing a dangerous, perhaps deadly, turn, taken by some of our leaders of the Western world, with the NATO Alliance at the summit. The pattern is easy to recognise, although, some of us have missed to spot it. Fortunately, we are the creatures able to learn, and this could be learned. Only knowledge, under condition that we use it, and this being an imperative today, could help us, probably, make that future does not resemble the past. Yes, not an easy task, but possible.