

Choosing the future, Learning from Iraq

Presented by Dr. Arthur Clark (March 20, 2005 at Panabaker Hall, Unitarian Church of Calgary)

I. Choosing the Future

In science as in everyday life it is important to ask the right questions. "Right," in the sense that the questions can lead to important ways of understanding something that matters to us. One question we must consider for the future of humanity is this:

What kind of future do we want for humanity?

Consciously choosing a future for humanity is not something that we have done particularly well. We have by and large been making the choice unconsciously. This choice-process has largely determined the course of world affairs and the conditions of human security. For the future, it seems important to make this choice more conscious, and to make it a better informed choice than it has been in the past. I think we can contribute something to that over the next hour.

Making a conscious and informed choice implies intentionality. To do this as a global community we would have to develop relatedness, cooperativeness, and capacity to communicate. These are some of the elements of emotional intelligence which Daniel Goleman presents as important for individuals, perhaps more important than IQ. Emotional intelligence, it seems to me, is also needed at the level of the local and the global community.

But we also need a sound way of thinking about the world, one that we can apply to whatever we hear about national and international affairs. A good way to start is to put our own prejudices in perspective.

II. The Map Is Not the Territory

It is worth remembering (and it is true whether we remember it or not) that our concepts of the world are not the world itself. Any way of understanding reality is a set of abstractions, and not the reality those abstractions represent.

In everyday life, as in science, we rely on our understanding of reality. We develop maps of the territory, and the maps have a profound influence on our behavior. Accuracy in the factual details of the map is essential, but it is also essential to remember that the map is not the territory, no matter how accurate its details. The map represents only selected aspects of reality. What the map represents and what it omits depend on the purposes the map is designed to serve. It is helpful to know your purpose as you choose your map.

III. My Bias

Since I will be giving you my own map (a way of thinking about the world that I have developed over the past 15 years) I had better tell you my own purpose, or my bias if you like, so that you can take it into account in deciding whether to use the map I will provide. Here is my bias. Human creative potential, and the uniqueness of that potential in each person, are the ways whereby we explore the possibilities of the human spirit and the varieties of the good life. Fundamental human rights are the necessary basis for fostering human creative potential. Fundamental human rights depend on a healthy global community and are threatened by violent contests for power. Therefore violent contests for power must be brought under control to foster human creative potential. A rule of international law is the framework within which violent contests for power must be brought under control. Much of what I say serves the purpose of promoting public awareness of international law as necessary to a healthy global community.

This bias leads me to insist that all governments comply with international law. As a citizen I am expected to abide by the law. I expect the same standard of behavior from my government. For that reason it is inevitable that the map I present will encounter resistance (to put it mildly!).

IV. Two options (a and b)

Based on my bias, I can express the choice-process, through which we decide the course of history, in terms of two conflicting options. We can choose a healthy global community under a rule of international law; or we can choose a continuation of the violent contests for power promoted by the old paradigm of the nation-state and nationalism. I will refer to these as options a and b. Think of a as the “advantageous” option and b as the “bad” option.

Martin Luther King Jr. once expressed a different version of options a and b. He commented that we must learn to live together as brothers (that’s option a) or we will perish together as fools (that’s option b). International law is part of the curriculum for learning to live together as brothers. We have been perishing together as fools for quite a while. We have the option of continuing in that direction, and very powerful forces (political, economic, and cultural) are moving us along the path toward option b. It will require a major and sustained effort to change that direction and move history instead toward option a. International law provides the guide lines for moving toward option a.

Historically law has included the idea of a lawgiver who is himself above the law. Contemporary law, including contemporary international law, rejects this concept in favor of the concept that all legitimate power derives from law, and all holders of power are subject to the law. But power tends to corrupt, and powerful states tend to reject the constraints of law and return to the old idea. A quote from Henry Kissinger makes this problem clear:

“Empires have no interest in operating within an international system; they aspire to be the international system. ...That is how the United States has conducted its affairs in the Americas, and China throughout most of its history in Asia.”

John Bolton, recently appointed by George Bush as his next ambassador to the United Nations, is even more explicit:

“It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law even when it may seem in our short-term interest to do so – because, over the long term, the goal of those who think that international law really means anything are those who want to constrict the United States. “

Bolton presumably believes that other nations, but not the United States, should be “constricted” in their tendency to carry out acts of aggression and otherwise violate international law at their discretion. My own view is that all countries should be so “constricted.”

Power tends to corrupt, and powerful states tend to treat international law with contempt. In one time and place it may be China, in another England. Today the world’s dominant military power is the United States. “The United States” includes a lot of people like me who prefer Martin Luther King’s option a. But Henry Kissinger and John Bolton are referring to a different “United States,” one that is driven by a “military-industrial complex” to use Eisenhower’s term, and that “United States” is driving history toward Martin Luther King’s option b.

V. Ideology and Culture in the Powerful State

Every powerful state develops maps designed to induce support for that state’s use and abuse of power, including its violations of international law. Since every powerful state both conveys significant benefits and commits major atrocities, the maps preferred by the state will emphasize

the benefits and ignore, obscure, or rationalize the atrocities. For the targeted adversaries of the state, the emphasis is reversed. So we are encouraged to think in ways like these:

Our nuclear weapons are OK. Our adversaries' nuclear weapons are not OK.

When we kill thousands of people it is an unfortunate necessity in pursuit of a noble goal. When our adversary kills thousands of people it is an atrocity.

When we invade another country and overthrow the government, it is an act of liberation. When our adversary does the same thing it is an act of aggression.

When we develop new military technology it is in the interest of peace. When our adversaries do the same thing it is a threat to peace.

And so on.

The embarrassing fact that international law does not recognize this sort of double standard, is easily handled by the intellectuals who support the powerful state: "International law won't work," "Foreign policy should not be constrained by legalistic standards," and so on. These concepts are widely adopted and promoted by the intelligentsia in a powerful state. If you decide to adopt such views, at least be conscious of the purposes you are serving.

Not only does the powerful state convey significant benefits (otherwise it could not recruit the support needed to maintain its power), but the powerful state's violations of law are usually associated with ample benefits for some group of people. It is absolutely essential to understand that any major act of aggression by a powerful state will benefit many people. This is an ongoing source of confusion in interpreting world events, so worth a minute of emphasis. Germany's *Anschluss* with Austria in 1938, and the takeover of the Sudetenland a few months later, was greeted with jubilation by many inhabitants of the targeted countries. Even the subsequent invasion and occupation of France by the Germans found its collaborators among the French.

Continuation of violence and lawlessness will always be associated with demonstrable benefits, even as it perpetuates the incalculable human and environmental costs and risks of the war system. We are in the process of choosing whether or not we will have a rule of law to replace this. Those are the stakes and they are epoch-making.

VI. Powerful States Are the Major Violators of International Law.

Powerful states are the major obstacle to achieving a rule of law. Weak states such as Rwanda are often guilty of hideous abuses of human rights. But such states cannot project their lawlessness globally or subvert the very institutions intended to serve the principles and purposes of international law. Only powerful states can do this, and for this reason powerful states and their allies are the major obstacle to establishing a rule of law. The problem is made worse by the fact that the most powerful states can veto actions of the UN Security Council.

Since the ratification of the UN Charter, the main impediment – in terms of power politics – to the achievement of collective security has been the veto. This privilege furthermore contradicts basic principles of international law as outlined especially in Art. 1, para. 2 of the Charter.

Hans Kochler,
Democracy and the International Rule of Law:
Propositions for an Alternative World Order.
Springer-Verlag, Vienna, 1995, p. 90

Law as written and defined must be based on sound principles or it will not endure. The veto power is a serious flaw in the UN Charter and needs to be corrected if we are to achieve a rule of law for our future security. It's a choice.

VII. Two Ways of Thinking about Iraq

Here are two ways of thinking about Iraq: The one promoted by the powerful states that attacked Iraq in 2003 was that Saddam Hussein was solely to blame for all the bad things that happened. A very different way of thinking about Iraq is that violent contests for power and contempt for international law were the source of the problem, and the responsible parties included the government of the United States and its allies as well as the government of Iraq. Those who make the maps that support US power want to exclude the United States and its allies from responsibility in the devastation of Iraq. That asymmetry, the unwillingness to acknowledge and address a major part of the problem, should be important to any rational observer. If we refuse to acknowledge and address a major source of a problem, the problem will persist. If you prefer option a, then it makes sense to acknowledge and address all the significant sources of the problem.

VIII. Advantages and Requirements of a Rule of Law

There is a lot we can learn about the importance of international law from the case of Iraq. Iraq has remained at the center of world attention since the end of the cold war. It provides an object lesson in how violent contests for power, contempt for international law, and subversion of the institutions of international law, have devastated a generation and placed the global community in perpetual jeopardy.

The government of Iraq became a conspicuous violator of international law and Saddam Hussein was its champion. Iraq's aggression against Iran in the 1980s cost several hundred thousand lives and wreaked havoc on both Iraq and Iran. That conflict had been supported by other states including Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United States. In other words, the international community not only tolerated the Iran-Iraq war, they supported and encouraged its progress. They also cynically supported, and then betrayed the armed insurgency in Kurdish areas of Iraq, which culminated in the brutal suppression of that insurgency in the late 1980s. An armed insurgency within a state is obviously a security threat to that state. This basic toleration and support for war and its perpetrators, and the willingness to foment civil war in pursuit of *realpolitik*, is the choice governments – our governments - have made in this era of our history. This ideology is and will likely remain fertile soil for dictators, warlords, and tyrants from the petty local tyrant to the global tyranny of empire. If we want a different future we will have to change the soil.

International law offers a different kind of soil for a different kind of future. The international legal system is predicated on a strict control of any international threat or use of force. It does not preclude the use of force as a last resort, but it insists that any such use of force must remain within constraints of self defense (as narrowly defined) or, if extending beyond that, under auspices of the United Nations and under constraints of the requirements of the UN Charter. The rationale derives from basic considerations of human rights, and human rights law is an essential part of the international legal system. However, advances in human rights must take place within the framework established by the UN Charter's law of non-aggression (Article 2). Louis Henkin, formerly editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law and advisor to the State Department on international law, expresses the relationship as follows:

Peace was the paramount value. The Charter and the [United Nations] were dedicated to realizing other values as well – self determination, respect for human rights, economic and social development, justice, and a just international order. But those purposes could not justify the use of force between states to achieve them; they would have to be pursued by other means. ... The purposes of the United Nations could not in fact be achieved by war. War inflicted the greatest

injustice, the most serious violations of human rights, and the most violence to self-determination and to economic and social development.

Louis Henkin, "Use of Force: Law and U.S. Policy,"
In *Right versus Might: International Law and the Use of Force*
Council of Foreign Relations 1991

The UN Charter was intended, as its opening lines state explicitly, to save post world war II generations from the scourge of war. Not only did the UN fail to save a generation of Iraqis from the scourge of war, the UN Security Council itself became an instrument for administering the scourge of war and economic sanctions on Iraq.

A rule of law can enhance trust in the global community and reliably diminish the use and threat of force. It can constrain the pathologic aspects of power, and channel power in more constructive directions. It can free up resources from weapons expenditures, and allow those resources to be used for health, education, and other programs that foster development of human potential.

By contrast, lawlessness encourages criminality and irresponsibility among the most powerful. It diminishes trust, increases the costs of transactions, devastates the global community, and leaves our future to military adventurism and the hazards of chance. That is why Mary-Wynne Ashford, and other Canadians associated with Physicians for Global Survival, are advancing the concept that ***war is a disease that threatens the health of the global community***. Choosing to think of war and lawless violence in this way, and consistently applying this way of thinking, can itself advance our progress toward option a.

International law therefore offers certain advantages for our future. But to achieve a rule of law certain requirements must be met. A rule of law must be respected for its inherent justice or it will not endure. No police force can for long impose a rule of law that violates certain requirements:

1. Law as written and defined must be **based on sound principles**.
2. Law must be **equitably applied**.
3. Law must be **applied consistently in accord with its most fundamental principles and purposes**.
4. Law as written and defined must be **developed** consistently in accord with its most fundamental principles and purposes. (The need for democracy in the global community).

IX. Learning from Iraq

I will use six specific examples from the case of Iraq to illustrate how international law was either ignored, or violated, or used as a pretext for violation of its most fundamental principles and purposes. These are only examples. Moreover it will not surprise you that some experts in international law can always be found who will devise a way of interpreting international law to support whatever the powerful state wants to do. Leaving aside those apologists for power, the following interpretation is consistent with the evident purposes and principles of international human rights law, humanitarian law, and the law of the UN Charter.

1. Rejection of Iraq's proposals for a peaceful withdrawal from Kuwait (1990). Confronted with the almost universal rejection of its act of aggression against Kuwait, Iraq made a series of proposals for a negotiated peaceful withdrawal from Kuwait. These proposals were made through diplomatic channels and never widely publicized, but there is good reason to believe they were serious proposals. They were rejected by George HW Bush, and the violence of Iraq's invasion was massively escalated by the coalition forces under the banner of the UN in January 1991.

The UN Security Council could have responded to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in accord with the fundamental principles and purposes of the UN Charter. Evidence indicates that, had it done so, hundreds of thousands of lives could have been saved, the waste of a generation and incalculable environmental damage could have been avoided, and tens of billions of dollars could have been freed up for any number of uses to promote a healthier global community. Rejecting these opportunities, the UN Security Council violated the Charter's principles and purposes in its response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait of August 1990. The law of the UN Charter was used as a pretext for violating the most fundamental purposes and principles of the UN Charter itself.

2. Propaganda for war. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been ratified by the United States and Canada. Article 20, paragraph 1, of the Covenant reads as follows:

Any propaganda for war shall be forbidden by law.

From August 1990 onward propaganda for war against Iraq was pervasive in the western media. Newsweek produced a series of covers that were particularly graphic examples of standard war propaganda devices: demonizing the targeted adversary, glorifying war, and framing questions in ways that promoted violent outcomes. But Newsweek was just part of the culture of the warfare state, and the violent outcomes were promoted by political leaders, intellectuals, and pundits. As a result of the propaganda, large parts of the North American public have supported the use of lawless violence against Iraq.

3. Destruction of civilian infrastructure. International humanitarian law deals with the conduct of warfare, and is specifically intended to protect civilians and others not engaged in combat. One of its requirements is that infrastructure essential for survival of the civilian population, such as water treatment facilities, not be destroyed. In the war on Iraq in 1991, water treatment facilities and other parts of the civilian infrastructure were devastated by the coalition forces, specifically by US air attacks. After the war, economic sanctions made it very difficult to restore adequate water supplies, and this led to an increase in water borne diseases, which accounted for thousands of deaths among the most vulnerable in the Iraqi population, typically children under the age of five. This is of course exactly why humanitarian law had specified the prohibition in the first place, and exactly why it is essential for all parties to a conflict to comply with international humanitarian law. In particular, with the overwhelming ratio of force in favor of the forces attacking Iraq, I find no merit whatever in efforts to justify such violations.

4. Use of disproportionate force (1991). The savagery of the onslaught against Iraqi forces in Kuwait culminated in the "Highway of Death," in which fleeing Iraqi forces, with an unknown number of others, were attacked from the air by US forces. The retreat was a large convoy of trucks, buses, and other vehicles. The front end was bombed, and the back end, and everything in between. It was "like shooting fish in a barrel" as one of the observers noted. International humanitarian law forbids disproportionate use of force and attacks which lead to great loss of life and have no justifiable military purpose. The incident referred to as the "Highway of Death" was one of the many violations of international humanitarian law by the coalition forces attacking Iraq in 1991. It indicates much more clearly than any rhetoric the cultural climate in a warfare state. It is essentially the cultural climate that enabled Iraq's barbarity in its war against Iran in the 1980s. If we acquiesce in such acts when "our troops" commit them, we are in effect acquiescing in such acts when anyone commits them. It's a choice.

5. Economic sanctions (1991-2003). Based on the false claim that Iraq was (or might be) continuing its programs for weapons of mass destruction, economic sanctions were superimposed on the destruction of the 1991 war against Iraq. The sanctions were a state of economic siege, designed to ravage the economy of Iraq. They were successful in this purpose, which was contrary to international law. According to estimates from various sources, the economic sanctions are largely responsible for the deaths of several hundred thousand civilians, chiefly young children. Two directors of the UN "oil for food" program resigned in protest over the sanctions. Denis Halliday referred to the economic sanctions as tantamount to genocide. He and Hans von Sponeck (who was to have spoken to you today) have been persistent, authoritative voices on the unconscionable effects of western policies against Iraq. In a paper that reviewed economic sanctions as they have been applied to various countries, Belgian jurist Marc Bossuyt concluded that the economic sanctions on Iraq were unequivocally illegal under existing international law.

6. Act of aggression: Invasion and occupation of Iraq (2003 – present). Two major invasions involving Iraq have occurred since the summer of 1990: Iraq's invasion of Kuwait which is estimated to have killed as many as five thousand people and the US/UK invasion of Iraq in 2003 which is estimated to have killed more than one hundred thousand people. Intellectuals working to support the power of the United States government have provided maps to help us understand these complex matters. In those maps the five thousand deaths are an atrocity and the one hundred thousand deaths are an unfortunate necessity in pursuit of a noble goal.

The deaths of a hundred thousand people which result from an invasion and occupation of a country should raise some serious questions. What is the value of the life of one human being? Is any political leader, or for that matter any person, competent to understand the value of the lives of one hundred thousand human beings? Which was the greater threat to international peace after 1991: Iraq or the United States and its allies such as Canada? There are other questions like these, which can cast some light into the darkness of our ignorance if we ask the questions and answer them honestly. That is not a task for political leaders and the intelligentsia who serve them, but for the global community, connected as it can be by common sense and emotional intelligence.

The current arguments supporting the occupation of Iraq emphasize the emergence of "democracy." (See for example Charles Krauthammer, "Three Cheers for the Bush Doctrine," in the Canadian edition of Time magazine for March 14.) Holding an election is not entirely meaningless, and perhaps it is one of the meager benefits to be salvaged from the devastation of Iraq. Having experienced several hundred thousand deaths and the devastation of a generation due to the sanctions and the invasion, Iraq now gets an election. And this is supposed to win support for further acts of violence by the government of the United States.

But hegemonic power is inconsistent with real democracy. "Making the world safe for democracy" was the phrase used in the mid twentieth century when the United States helped overthrow the democratically elected government of Guatemala, and supported the subsequent military dictatorships in that country which killed perhaps two hundred thousand Guatemalans. Real democracy is no more the reason for US policy in Iraq than it was for US policy in Guatemala. Our great leaders are willing to sacrifice tens or hundreds of thousands of lives to achieve something, and it certainly isn't for an election in Iraq. What are the real reasons for the acts of aggression by the government of the United States?

Kissinger pointed out that the powerful state (empire) aspires to be the international system. What if the effort to achieve that hegemony threatens human survival? Where would our great leaders place their priority? Ballistic missile defense is another aspect of the problem that faces us, and just beyond the turn of the staircase we can anticipate the weaponization of space. The weaponization of space can be rationalized as easily as the deaths of one hundred thousand people. That will provide some more lethal options for anyone able to get their hands on the triggers.

Referring to the decisions that are leading toward ballistic missile defense and the weaponization of space, Noam Chomsky considers the relative importance assigned to hegemony and survival:

Throughout history it has been recognized that such steps are dangerous. By now the danger has reached the level of a threat to human survival. But as observed earlier, it is rational to proceed nonetheless on the assumptions of the prevailing value system, which are deeply rooted in existing institutions. The basic principle is that hegemony is more important than survival. Hardly novel, the principle has been amply illustrated in the past half-century.

We might add that it is amply illustrated by the case of Iraq.

X. Pessimism is a Waste of Time.

The question whether we can achieve a rule of law and a healthy global community is an empirical question. Like the question whether we can find a satisfactory cure for ovarian cancer, the only serious way to answer it is to pursue the effort. And a hundred failures do not answer the question. Only achieving the desired outcome provides a definitive answer to the question, and then the answer is yes. That's one of the really neat things about empirical questions. Pessimism is a waste of time.

What can be done to move toward a healthy global community under a rule of international law? The task may seem so impossibly large that anyone thinking about it might become paralyzed, unable to generate any idea that seems worth pursuing. There are many possible ways to answer the question, but my purpose in offering an answer here is to dispel the sense of impotence, and to prompt creative engagement in the progress that is needed. Your ideas, your lives, your work, are what matter, what will be decisive. Never underestimate the importance of your life and your work in the world.

One way to answer the question is to examine what has been done, what is being done, and what needs to be done. By understanding in detail how progress was made in the civil rights movement or toward

ending apartheid in South Africa or in advancing women's rights, we can gain insight into how the next stage of progress can be achieved. By examining what is being done, the initiatives of people in many parts of the world, we may find important local work we can support, or ways to build synergy between a local initiative and one that people in some other part of the world have started. Still we need to think about what needs to be done.

At CANDIL, we have discussed two general ways to generate progress. One is initiated by someone enthusiastic about a particular project. We would ask the individual to develop an action plan to make the idea a reality. The idea needs to be substantive and consistent with the organization's vision. The person with the idea and the enthusiasm drives the project. Another way to generate progress is to look at the larger goal, define a specific problem that obstructs progress toward the goal, develop a possible solution to the problem, and then test the solution. Solving the problems of manageable size gives positive reinforcement for the ongoing effort. So it's somewhat like progress in medical research. Scientists and physicians working to find a cure for a particular form of cancer, for example, maintain enthusiasm and effective engagement for years, even if the larger goal of a cure eludes them. **The global citizen of the future can be thought of as being engaged in research promoting health of the global community.**

To generate some discussion on what needs to be done, I'll suggest five points.

Emotional well being at the personal, local, and global levels. Learning to live together as brothers requires much more than international law. It is essential that we learn to care for ourselves, otherwise we will deplete our personal effectiveness, and our empathy for others will evaporate. And we must connect as human beings to local communities and individuals, near and far, to experience directly their unique gifts and their humanity.

Power. We cannot make the changes we seek unless we gain power in the political, economic, and cultural domains. Power takes many forms, but we need financial resources, the resources to effectively communicate and examine ideas, and the political leverage to decisively influence decision making in every government (particularly the most powerful governments and their allies). We must always work outside the corridors of concentrated power but increasingly we must work inside those corridors as well.

Passion. Passion, vision, enthusiasm, and innovation provide the energy and staying power necessary for the work that lies ahead. WB Yeats defined a crippling problem when he wrote

The best lack all convictions, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

It is of life and death importance for our future that we change that equation.

Problem recognition and definition. We need to be able to define obstacles to the progress we choose, and define them with a precision and insight that suggests solutions to the problems, ways to get past the obstacles.

Project generation and completion, testing possible solutions to defined problems. As in medical research, we must learn from the experiments (successes and failures) and communicate what we learn to others working toward the same goal.

XI. Conclusion

Yesterday (March 19) I picked up my laundry at a local cleaner's. The young woman at the cash register must have been in her early twenties. She was listening to the radio as she gave me my change. She laughed at something on the radio. Explaining her laughter, she said, "If you're rich and famous, you can get away with anything."

"Like the president of the United States," I said.

"Exactly," she said, and laughed again: "Mass murder," she said.

The young woman's map of our great leader's work may not be sophisticated, but it probably reflects common sense, a shared knowledge that reaches around the planet and cannot be extinguished. Relentlessly the intellectual courtiers in the corridors of power tell us how their great leader's use and

abuse of power are promoting democracy and freedom and so on and so forth. And the people with common sense hear it and sometimes it works for them and sometimes it doesn't. You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time but you just cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Words like human rights, peace, security, freedom, democracy, law, or justice can be used to promote violence and the power of a particular state; or to promote a healthy global community under a rule of law. They are words that refer to matters of life and death importance. But all too often we use the words with the same ignorance that Camus identified as the source of evil.

The evil that is in the world always comes of ignorance, and good intentions may do as much harm as malevolence, if they lack understanding. On the whole, men are more good than bad; that, however, isn't the real point. [Human beings] are more or less ignorant, and it is this that we call vice or virtue; the most incorrigible vice being that of an ignorance that fancies it knows everything and therefore claims for itself the right to kill.

Albert Camus, *The Plague*

One of the definitive questions for this century is whether we will survive the plague of that ignorance which currently infests our governments and our global community.

Arthur Clark
Calgary, Canada
March 2005

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Arthur Clark is a citizen of Canada and of the United States, served for two years (1971-73) as a Captain in the United States Army Medical Corps, and is currently a Professor in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Calgary. He is a co-founder of CANDIL (Canada, Democracy, International Law) and of the Dr. Irma Parhad programmes at the University of Calgary. The Irma Parhad programmes are in honor of his late wife, who was born in Mosul, Iraq.
2. Some of the issues concerning Iraq are treated in more detail in my essay "Iraq, international law, and responsible citizenship," in the book (edited by George Melnyk) **Canada and the New American Empire**. This book is especially useful because its contributions, from various Canadians who are exemplary global citizens, give a glimpse into their lives and work. Examples include Calgarians Trudy Govier, David Swann, Donn Lovett, George Melnyk, and Bill Phipps.
3. CANDIL's website includes a working paper on Iraq which establishes a series of principles for progress out of the catastrophe that western policies have produced in that country. For history and perspectives on Iraq, I commend to your attention the works (books and recent articles) of Dilip Hiro, who has been writing authoritatively about Iraq and the Middle East for years. There are many other authors doing excellent contemporary work on this: Robert Fisk, Phyllis Bennis, Naomi Klein, to mention only a few.
4. The phrase "The map is not the territory" is from Alfred Korzybski, who was interested in the issues under discussion here when he wrote the book **Science and Sanity** about 70 years ago. The phrase "Pessimism is a waste of time" is from Norman Cousins, whose books **Human Options** and **The Pathology of Power**, are excellent resources.
5. The work of Hans Kochler is particularly important for choosing the future. I have made extensive use of his book **Democracy and the International Rule of Law: Propositions for an Alternative World Order** (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995).
6. The resources available for global citizens are already vast, and expanding. CANDIL can provide information on local resources. I recommend the website www.commondreams.org for news and commentary. The books mentioned in the following notes are not intended to be a comprehensive bibliography. They are almost randomly selected because they were useful in the course of preparing the text of my comments for March 20. A recent book which does have a more comprehensive bibliography for active citizenship, is Paul Rogat Loeb's **Soul of a Citizen: Living with Conviction in a Cynical Time** (1999). The book is also engaging because of its many stories of active citizens, their successes and setbacks.
7. I mentioned Daniel Goleman's book **Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ**. It was published by Bantam Books in 1995.
8. Jonathan Schell's **The Unconquerable World: Power, Nonviolence, and the Will of the People**, published by Henry Holt and Company in 2003, is an important account of the pervasive and powerful effect on history of non-violent movements, with an assessment of their chances for moving us toward a healthier global community. On page 386 he draws his book toward conclusion with this observation:

Fifty-eight years after Hiroshima, the world has to decide whether to continue on the path of cataclysmic violence charted in the twentieth century and now resumed in the twenty-first or whether to embark on a new, cooperative political path. It is a decision composed of innumerable smaller decisions guided by a common theme, which is weaning politics off violence.
- It is important that Jonathan Schell and many others are reaching this conclusion independently. It appears to be something emerging in many parts of the world, outside the corridors of concentrated power and outside the military-industrial complexes.
9. Noam Chomsky's unfailingly powerful work includes the recent **Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance** (Henry Holt and Company, New York, 2003).
10. Again, there is such a huge literature, and so many resources, related to this work that needs to be done, that it would have taken me an additional month just to begin to assemble a more comprehensive bibliography. "Agenda 21" (The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century); Gene Sharp's study, **The Politics of Nonviolent Action** (3 volumes, published 1973); the work of Saul Alinsky; and so much else would have been included in that more comprehensive survey.