

POLITICS OF HUMAN RIGHTS:
FACTORS AND CAUSES FOR DEJECTION
WITH US ROLE (PART-II)

TERJUMAN-UL-QURAN

July 2001

PROF. KHURSHID AHMAD



POLITICS OF HUMAN RIGHTS FACTORS AND CAUSES FOR DEJECTION WITH US ROLE (PART-II)

By Professor Khurshid Ahmad

America's expulsion from the United Nations Human Rights Commission, after having played a key-role for about half a century is not a mere coincidence or just a political happening. This is a reflection of the feelings of the countries of the world on the US role in world affairs, a clear indication of the emerging new trends in world politics, and an unambiguous warning for the powerful countries. This is not an 'isolated phenomena', but rather signals a trend and a turn that is manifest also in the expulsion of the United States from yet another important institution of the UN: the Narcotics Commission. The US President George Bush met quite tough protests during his maiden tour. The massive demonstrations in Quebec (Canada) at the time of the summit conference of the American countries and in Goldenberg (Sweden) on the eve of the summit meeting of 15 European countries and the issues raised are reflections of distrust in the US and feelings of dejection at its callous approach and ruthless policies.

It is clearly seen that the lava that was boiling underneath is now adopting different channels to come out. The feelings and moods that have been at the stage of being described as apprehension, unease, weariness, and anxiety have now blown into open expression of tension, discord, criticism and rather taking the shape of anger and rebellion. Such are the feelings of not some one country or group, but, by and large, of all countries and nations of the world. Only those who refuse to learn lessons from history and read the writing on the wall can commit the blunder of not analyzing the mood and the causes behind it.

This wave of anguish and protest against the U.S. and its global role is not because of some dyed-in-the-wool enmity or confrontation with the U.S. These are the very countries and peoples who have been looking towards the U.S. with great expectations and considered it as a power that came into being after itself waging a struggle against global colonialism, the one that ushered in an era of democratic constitutional statehood, whose military participated in world wars but whose own land was not tainted with the blood spilled in these wars, that emerged on the international political horizon as a champion of democracy, human rights and nations' right to self-determination. A wide-spread despair and dejection with such a world power, with such a speed and intensity that has taken all by the storm can neither be a mere coincidence nor a product of some scheme. There must be some solid reasons and causes for this, and there certainly are. To understand them is imperative for the U.S. as well as for those who have added their voice in the protest but whose real objective is to reform the world conditions and eliminate the causes and factors that may lead to confrontation on the global scale, so that the world is saved from wars and conflicts, mayhem and bloodshed. Imbalances in power and disproportionate distribution of resources between people and nations are a reality. Anxiety and confrontation for this reason alone would certainly be unnatural and uncalled for. But when imbalance starts taking the form of one power's domination and exploitation of others, then the doors of anxiety, restlessness and

confrontation are opened up. And ultimately, this results in collision and bloodshed. This is the very process that has started between America and other nations of the world. With the exit of Soviet Russia from the international scene as a superpower in 1989, this process got further boost and impetus.

With abundant material and natural resources, America can provide all facilities of life to its citizens. But, the dream of global domination, designs to control other nations' resources, and plans and efforts to mould the world according to its own perceptions and to impose its own values and ideologies on others are the root causes of confrontation and altercations. These ambitions are becoming elements of America's global strategy, since after the Second World War. During the Cold War era, these objectives were pursued in the name of the protection of the 'free world' and 'anti-communism', but these are pursued even more vigorously after the so-called end of the Cold War. Now the campaign (that has been given the name 'globalization') of making the new century 'the American Century' and coloring the whole world with American brush has entered the phase where a powerful country starts behaving arrogantly and considering others as mere zilch. In such a situation, it is no longer enough to have power, but to impress others with one's power becomes the objective. The arrogance of power does not allow one to give regard to others. This is the critical point where other nations too feel compelled to stand up for the protection of their independence, dignity and values. Today's international politics is striding towards such a critical phase.

While America's being the sole superpower might be a reality for those who cannot see beneath the surface, but the efforts of dominating others and turning them into vassals is a dangerous game that has overturned the global chessboard. Domination and world rule are the goals for which, in addition to the foreign policy, a global network of military strategy and economic power and a complex system of intelligence and sabotage have been devised. Efforts are on to make this more effective. The US military presence in 40 countries of the world (some 200,000 troops that are equipped with the latest naval, air and ground military technology and apparatus), military agreements, trappings of economic mesh of state and international economic and financial institutions to hold the world in control, flood of NGOs as precursor to the global hegemony, and intelligence system that is run not only by the CIA but by many real and proxy agencies – are the constituents of this plan. While at times a specter of communism and Russia was used, at others a nightmare of international terrorism and rogue states was employed to justify these plans. The mandate that CIA had during the Cold War era is still the same. A secret White House report had said in 1954 that:

"There are no rules in this game. If the United States is to survive long standing, American concepts of fair play must be reconsidered. We must learn to subvert, sabotage and destroy our enemies by more clever, sophisticated, more effective methods than used against us."

(Brave New World Order by Jack Nelson Pallmeyer, p.43)

The present leadership of America and those in the helm in some Western nations are portraying China, North Korea and a few Muslims countries like Iran, Libya, and Sudan and even some individuals like Osama bin Laden as 'grave real threat' to the Western world. To face this so-called threat, they are not only creating an atmosphere to justify missile shield, safe zones, and prevention strikes but are bent upon doing this all and much more at all costs, which run into billions of dollars.

President Carter's national security advisor and professor of a famous university Brzezinski has clearly said in his latest book *The Great Chessboard* that the real goal of the US politics should be: America is the sole superpower of the 21st century and that no one should raise its head before it. For the first quarter at least, America should rule the world. This is the mindset that is creating a sort of arrogance among the US policy makers and political leadership. Naturally, this arrogance is causing tremors of dejection and anxiety in the rest of the world. Quite unhesitatingly and without any scruples, President Clinton's secretary of state Madeleine Albright had given expression to this mindset in these words:

"If we have to use force, it is because we are America. We are the indispensable nation. We stand tall. We are farther into the future."

(Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire, by Chalmer Johnson, Little Brown and Company, London, 2000, p.217)

It is the notion of being the sole superpower that is behind the arrogance and haughtiness of the US leadership. President Lyndon B. Johnson's words on US' status during his meeting with the Greek ambassador on the eve of Cyprus conflict are an eye-opener. Greece is a US ally and a NATO member. When Greek ambassador Gerassinos Gigantes pleaded for not being able to comply with the US order and alluded to Greek Parliament and Constitution, the US President got infuriated. Using abusive language he said to the Greek ambassador:

"Listen to me, Mr. Ambassador, F... your parliament and your constitution. America is an elephant, Cyprus is a flea. If these two fleas continue itching the elephant, they may just get whacked by the elephant's trunk, whacked good. We pay a lot of good American dollars to the Greeks, Mr. Ambassador. If your Prime Minister gives me talk about Democracy, Parliament and Constitution, he, his Parliament and his Constitution may not last very long." **(I should have Died, by Philip Dean – pen name of Gerassinos Gigantes, New York, 1977, pp. 113-114).**

In a bit different context, the same mindset has been given expression by General Colin Powell, then the Chief of Staff and now the Secretary of State, time and again. When America committed military invasion of Panama, a sovereign country, in sheer violation of international law, kidnapped its President and punished him, the General answered the critics:

We have to put a shingle outside our door saying super power lives here, no matter what the Soviets do."

(Speech of Michael Klare at Minnesota University on Oct. 5, 1990 titled "Facing the Smith: The Pentagon and the Third World in 1990s" in *Brave New World Order*, Jack Nelson Pallmeyer, p. 87)

Anger and fury over Pakistan's nuclear devices, one or two, speaks of the same American mindset. What General Powell had said to Pakistan's ambassador Syeda Abida Hussain is worth taking note of. Recently published book 'Between Jihad and Salam' of Joyce Davis includes her interview in which she says:

Powell asked her why Pakistan was so intent upon pursuing its nuclear program in light of US objections and its cutoff in financial aid.

'You know that nukes are unusable,' she said he told her, 'so why do you want to have nukes?'

I said, 'General, why do you have nukes?'

So he said, 'Oh, we're cutting back.'

So I said, 'From how many to how many, General?'

He said, 'We're cutting back from 6,000 to 2,000.'

I said, 'General, You're going to keep 2,000 nukes and you want us to rid ourselves of our few miserable whatever it is buried deep into the ground? You're asking us commit suicide. We're next to a nuclearized state. Would you surrender your nukes if, for instance, Canada or Mexico still retained nukes? Would you do that?'

'He looked at me and he said, 'Look, I'm not talking morality, Ambassador. I'm just saying to you that we're the United States of America and you're Pakistan.'

And I said, 'General, I thank you, because you've been honest.'

Running amok with power, not giving importance others, to regard others as abject, and to scorn them by indulging in conceit, arrogance and high-headedness – all this does not enhance one's stature, only lowers it.

President George Bush sounded promising when he said during his election campaign:

“If we are an arrogant nation, they will resent us. If we are a humble nation, but strong, they’ll welcome us.”

The whole world had appreciated this. But his attitude changed soon after his assumption of the Presidency. Whether it is the countries of the American continent or of Europe or the developing countries, the language of colonialism is being used for all, propensity for solo flight and designs to mould the world according to its own interests and perceptions are openly talked about. The priority is given to fulfilling the agenda of those multi-national corporations with whose support he has come to power. International agreements are being cancelled unilaterally and claims of being no more under the compulsion of observing them are made. The ABM (Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty) is an international agreement according to the international law, but the way of abandoning it unilaterally is being adopted. The Kyoto Accord on global warming, which the Clinton administration had accepted, has been forsaken.

The clamor about an imaginary threat of ‘rogue states’ acquisition of nuclear weapons and subsequent use against America is meant to boost the arms industry. To ‘thwart’ such a threat, an unreliable program of missile shield with a cost of \$100 billion is underway in spite of resentment from Russia, China and even the European countries. The message that is being delivered to the world is that it is America that takes decisions while the rest are to play second fiddle. This is what created sentiment of distrust and anxiety against America in the past and even today it is the main reason behind the growing anti-American feeling. This has become a part of the mindset of American ruling establishment. America considers itself above the law and constitution, agreements and international conventions. Law is for others, not for the superpower. Just as aptly the historic remark ‘all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal’ in George Orwell’s satiric novel ‘Animal Farm’ applied to yesterday’s rule of Russian dictator Joseph Stalin and Brezhnev, it is as true an expression of today’s American attitude.

A former US Attorney General Ramsey Clark has cited many examples to expose this mindset. While the Gulf War and the US crimes in the region are the subjects of his book *The Fire This Time* (New York, 1994), it brings to light the American mindset that has given rise to anxiety at the global level. He says that America violates international law as and when it wills to, and there is no one to check it or hold it accountable:

“The United States invaded Grenada, bombard Libya, and supported militancy activities against other UN members in Africa, Central America and Asia. While the General Assembly and Security Council have protested, they have not acted.

On December 20, 1989 the United States invaded Panama, killing hundreds and probably several thousand. That invasion, less than eight months before Iraq invaded Kuwait, was condemned by the UN General Assembly. No action was taken although the United States violated all the international laws later violated by Iraq

when it invaded Kuwait, plus a number of Western Hemisphere conventions and the Panama Canal Treaties.” **(p.150)**

The United States which never sought a peace conference between Israel and the Palestinians in the year when the Palestinians could bargain as a near equal, suddenly has sought to force settlement independent of the UN. Yet these inherently unfair negotiations offer little hope for peace. The Palestinians cannot even choose their own negotiators as Israel can veto any choice they make. Every day of the negotiations Israelis seize more land from Palestinians, take their homes by force and build new settlements in their territory. The United States appeared at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva and urged the Commission to ignore Israeli human rights violations against Palestinians." **(p.151). [This is the Commission America has been ousted from in May 2001]**

Ramsey Clark showed in detail how America got the resolution 678 passed in utter disregard to articles 24 and 33 of the UN Charter resorting to high-handedness, pressure and fraud, rather open bribery; how assumed the command in open violation of the clear directives of the Charter (that command of the military action under the UN aegis would be with the representative of the UN). Then, America and Britain are collaborating getting things their way. No one could stop them from getting away with it despite protest from the UN Secretary General. **(p. 153-155)**. During this period, America did not presented any report to the Security Council, as is required by the Charter. Violation of not only the UN Charter, but of the US Constitution too was committed. According to the Constitution, the Congress is authorized to declare war. But the President got the authority from it through a resolution and then declared war without taking the Congress into confidence. **(pp.156-161)**

On the very day when the US military was attacking Iraq **(Jan. 16, 1991)**, a member of the Congress from Texas, Henry Gonzalez, tabled a motion against President George Bush for violation of the Constitution, but this could not make its way forward in the ensuing war jingoism.

America also contends that the US Congress can revoke or amend any international law or agreement. While no one can challenge its law, it can, nevertheless, amend, cancel, or express its reservations on any law or agreement. Ramsey Clark says:

“The position US policy makers like is that Congress can alter, amend, repeal, or ignore any international law. This is a declaration of independence from the world community and a warning that the United States will not be bound by any international rule not to the liking of Congress.” **(p.166)**

Similarly, the American attitude towards the international court is self-centric, of its own domination. Ramsey Clark tells:

“While nations do abide by decisions of the International Court of Justice, which was established by the UN Charter, such obedience is largely a matter of choice, at least for the powerful nation. A prime example of this was the US refusal to acknowledge the Court’s jurisdiction when the Sandinist government of Nicaragua claimed damages for US military aggression against it. The United States had battered Nicaragua with direct attacks, counter warfare, and severe economic sanctions and had spent close to \$ 48 million to create artificial unified opposition political party, stealing an election in utter contempt of democratic principle.”
(p. 166-167)

About the US President, Ramsey Clark has reached this conclusion:

“With an imperial President uncontrolled by democratic law or public opinion and free to interpret international law as he chooses, there is little limitation on his arbitrary decision to go to war, or the arbitrary use of military force to destroy an enemy.”
(p.169)

It is not difficult to imagine how perilous would be the situation of world peace and international law in such circumstances. In the words of Ramsey Clark:

“International law as practiced by American foreign policy makers, is not a coherent set of principles and procedures. Instead it is what these policy makers will accept – principles that are thoroughly politicized, then savaged by discretionary actions... The position of the US Government reflects the determination of power not to be accountable.”
(p.168)

Ramsey Clark declares the assassination attempts on Libyan and Iraqi rulers an open and criminal violation of international law (The Hague Regulation, Article 23) as well as of the US law (Presidential Order 12333), since both hold the murder of a head of state as a crime, though it may have been committed during a war situation. **(p. 170)**

That America has not accepted the convention on international tribunal against crime is but a reflection of this mindset. Under it, criminals of any country can be proceeded against under the international law and can be held accountable for crimes against humanity. American contention is that this court could proceed against only those whom America or its Congress declares criminals. Moreover, America also contends that UN force, whenever and wherever it is formed, should be under the US command. An official US document DD-25, which was released during the Clinton presidency, says in clear terms:

“The President retains and will never relinquish command authority over US forces. On a case to case basis, the President will consider placing appropriate US forces

under operational control of competent UN Commander for specific UN operations authorized by the Security Council. The greater the US military role the less likely it will be that the US will agree to have a UN Commander exercise overall operational control over US forces. Any large-scale participation of US forces in a major peace enforcement mission that is likely to involve combat should ordinarily be conducted under US command and operational control.”

(Carnegie Institute's *Ethics and International Affairs*, vol.14, p.60)

This means that whether it is a coalition force or the one cobbled together under the UN, its command should vest in America. From General Eisenhower and General McArthur to the Peace Force in Bosnia and Kosovo, America has always insisted for its own command, and the rest have always had to bow before its obstinacy.

With this mindset, such designs and assertions, America propagates its image as of a champion of democracy, protector of human rights, upholder of law, and preacher of justice; while the strategic goal is that the whole world should accept American values and see through its prism. But this is the very reason that is creating distance between the US and the rest of the world, the sum and substance of colonialism.

Tony Smith, professor teaches political science in the famous American Tufts University, has written in *Ethics and International Affairs* (vol. 14, 2000) that the US power is neither unlimited nor has it any right to impose its own system and values on others. This is but a form of liberal imperialism, which has no justification, whatsoever:

“The second objection to the promotion of American values for other peoples is as compelling: more often than not, inherited cultures, institutions, and structures of power are themselves powerful obstacles to the advent of human rights and liberal democracy as they are practiced in North America and Western Europe. Seen from this perspective, the effort to promote American style values and institutions abroad is ill-fated, not so much because US power is limited as because its application even in massive generalities will in all likelihood do little to reform patterns of belief and practice that are fundamentally antithetical to the American way of doing things. Are China or the Muslim World or Russia likely to be changed by American demands that they conform to our expectations?”

(See, Tony Smith, "Morality and the Use of Force in a Unipolar World", *Ethics and International Affairs*, 2000, Vol.14, p.12)

Renowned American thinker Walter Lippmann had made a sterling point:

“Where one nation arrogates to itself the responsibility to shape a world order, it invites others to combine against it. In a world where nuclear weapons will, in all

likelihood, be widely distributed before the end of the century, this is not, a reassuring road to national security for the American people.”

(ref. *Intervention and Revolution*, by Richard J. Barnet, 1972, p.312)

Richard Barnet concludes his book in the following words:

The United States can use its still great power to help create a world environment in which poor nations can pursue their own paths to development. But until Americans give up the pretense that we have a right or a duty to manage social and political changes around the globe, there will be no peace for Americans."

(Ibid, p. 332)

In our view, it is not some fault or infirmity on the part of the countries of the world that is the main cause of distrust with America, but the malaise lies in American arrogance that it is the sole superpower and will remain so forever, that it is its right that the world bows before it and accepts its hegemony. The world will certainly accept it as a power, in consonance with the ground realities, but will never be prepared to bow before it. The world will maintain with pleasure a relationship of friendship, but will never accept subjugation and servitude. If America shows some realism by giving up the strategy of seeking domination and unchallenged rule, this would only add to its dignity and honorable standing. If it learns its lesson as evident in the result of the UN Commission of Human Rights and gives up its arrogant, haughty and insolent attitude, then the globe can become a better place for both itself and others.

America has to ponder over its own attitude and contradictions in its words and deeds if it wants to understand the reasons for dejection and distrust with it. In this context, *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*, a book published last year, is an eye-opener. (Blowback is a CIA term that stands for the consequences of policies that were kept secret from the American people.) Its author Chalmers Johnson is professor at the University of California, San Diego (America) and head of the Japan Policy Research Institute. The book was published in May 2000 in America and Britain, simultaneously. Asking America to ponder over its attitude, the writer says what is creeping in the minds of all concerned people of the world:

“I believe the profligate waste of our resources on irrelevant weapon system as well as continuous trail of military ‘accidents’ and of terrorist attacks on American installations and embassies are all portents of twenty-first century crisis in America’s informal empire, an empire based on the projection of military power to every corner of the world and on the use of American capital and markets to force global economic integration on our terms, at the cost of others.

What we have freed ourselves of, however, is any genuine consciousness of how hard one might look to others on this globe. Most Americans are probably unaware

of how Washington exercises its global hegemony, since so much of this activity takes place either in relative secrecy or under comforting rubrics. Many may, as a start, find it hard to believe that our place in the world even adds up to an empire. But only when we come to see our country as profiting from and trapped within the structures of an empire of its own making will it be possible for us to explain many elements of the world that otherwise perplex us. What has gone wrong in Japan after half a century of government guided growth under US protection? Why should the emergence of a strong China be to any one's disadvantage? Why do American policies towards human rights, weapons proliferation, terrorism, drug cartels, and the environment strike so many foreigners as the essence of hypocrisy? If Washington is the headquarters of a global military-economic domination, the answers will be very different then if we think the United States as simply one among many sovereign nations. The term 'blow-back' (a CIA invention) refers to the unintended consequences of policies that were kept secret from the American people. What the daily press reports as the malign acts of 'terrorists' or 'drug cartels' or 'rogue states' or 'illegal arms merchants' often turn out to be blow black from earlier American operations." **(P.7-8)**

Chalmer Johnson has carried out a post-mortem of 50 years of American politics with solid documentary proofs and references. From the Central and South American states to Vietnam, China and Japan, he has explored each period with each and every event. How the military, CIA, multi-national corporations, and global financial bodies have been, and still are, interfering in others' affairs at the behest of America and in its interest. How international law and norms have been violated, and entire nations destroyed. How dictators have been patronized and how corruption has been used as a tool, and how opponents have been removed from the scene. What contrivances were employed to kill democracies and to bring in favorite military and civilian opportunists to power? These are the tales that are now confirmed by official documents, which are being published on the completion of the period of secrecy, though there still are 13.5% of these documents that have been denied access to in the name of national security. After giving all this detail, the writer says:

America's 'dirty hands' make even the most well-intentioned statement about human rights or terrorism seen hypocritical in such circumstances. Even when blowback mostly strikes other peoples, it has its corrosive effects on the United States by debasing political discourse and making citizens duped if they should happen too take seriously what their political leaders say. This is an inevitable consequence not just of blowback but of empire itself. **(p.19)**

Chalmer Johnson warns the entire American nation:

“Terrorism by definition strikes at the innocent in order to draw attention to the sins of the invulnerable. The innocent of the twenty-first century are going to harvest unexpected blowback disasters from the imperialist escapades of recent decades. Although most Americans may be largely ignorant of what was, and still is, being done in their names, all are likely to pay a steep price – individually and collectively – for their nation’s combined efforts to dominate the global scene. Before the damage of heedless triumphalist acts and the triumphalist rhetoric and propaganda that goes with them become irreversible, it is important to open a new discussion of our global role during and after the cold war.” **(p.33)**

Calling for introspection, Chalmer Johnson reminds:

“American officials and the media talk a great deal about ‘rouge states’ like Iraq and North Korea, but we must ask ourselves whether the United States has itself become a rogue super power.” **(p.216)**

Quoting Tom Plete of the Los Angeles Times, he dubs America as "a muscle-bound crackpot super power with little more than cruise missiles for brains."

He tries to awaken the American people and the leadership:

“We Americans deeply believe that our role in the world is virtuous...that our actions are almost invariably for the good of others as well as ourselves. Even when our country’s actions have led to disaster, we assume that the motives behind them were honorable. But the evidence is building up that the decade following the Cold War, the United States largely abandoned a reliance on diplomacy, economic aid, international law, and multilateral institutions in carrying out its foreign policies and resorted much of the time to bluster, military force and financial manipulation.” **(p. 216-217)**

As a result of these circumstances, not only the oppressed and indigent people and nations of the world are undergoing acute miseries, but the US is also transfiguring into a military-economic complex. Violence is on the rise in the society, the foundations of the economy are becoming shallower, and the nation and the country are striding towards an ultimate catastrophe. In his words:

David Calleo, a professor of international politics, has observed, "international system breaks down not only because of unbalanced and aggressive new powers seek to dominate their neighbors, but also because declining powers, rather than adjusting and accommodating, try to cement their slipping preeminence into an

exploitative hegemony.” (David P. Calleo, *Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of the Western Alliance*, New York, Basic Books, 1987, p.142)

“I believe that the United States at the end of the twentieth century fits this description. The signs of such an exploitative hegemony are already with us: increasing estrangement between population and their governments; a determination of elites to hang on to power despite a loss of moral authority; the appearance of militarism and the separation of the military from the society it is supposed to serve; fierce repression (the huge and still growing American prison population and rising enthusiasm for the death penalty may be symptomatic of this); and an economic crisis that is global in nature. History offers few examples of declining hegemony reversing their decline for giving up power peacefully... One must conclude that blowback will ultimately produce a crisis that suddenly, wrenchingly impairs or ends American hegemonic influence”. (p.224)

Chalmer Johnson holds that this end can still be averted, if American leadership gives up the policy of exploitative hegemony and adopts the way of observing moral and political values, and acts on the policy of ‘live and let live’. He concludes his book with this message:

“The United States should seek to lead through diplomacy and example rather than through military force and economic bullying. Such an agenda is neither unrealistic nor revolutionary. It is appropriate for a post cold war world and for United States that puts welfare of its citizens ahead of the pretensions of its imperialists. Many U.S. leaders seem to have convinced themselves that if so much as one overseas American base is closed or one small country is allowed to manage its own economy, the world will collapse. They might ponder the creativity and growth that would be unleashed if only the United States would relax its suffocating embrace. They should also understand that their efforts to maintain imperial hegemony inequitably generate multiple forms of blowback. Although it is impossible to say when this game will end, there is little doubt about how it will end.

World politics in the twenty-first century will in all likelihood be driven primarily by blowback from the second half of the twentieth century - that is, from the unintended consequences of the Cold War and the crucial American decision to maintain a Cold War posture in a post-Cold War world. The United States likes to think of itself as the winner of the Cold War. In all probability to those looking back a century hence, neither side will appear to have won, particularly if the United States maintains its present imperialist course.” (p.229)

American leadership should realize that domination and colonial hegemony cannot go along with friendly relations with the international community. If it continues to run amok with power plays

the game of domination and hegemony, adopts an arrogant and conceited attitude, if it chooses not to respect the independence, dignity and interests of others, and tries to use other nations for its own aims and entrap them in military and economic snares, then this will certainly have a strong reaction. Not only the world will remain devoid of peace, fraternity, affection and cooperation, but the situation of distrust and dejection will ultimately result in hatred and confrontation. And, history stands witness to the fact that such confrontation does not necessarily end in the victory of the powerful. While the elephant might be bent upon trampling and crushing an ant to death to show off its own power, the beast is simply helpless when the little 'flea', in Johnson's words, gets into its trunk. And this is also how fate and destinies of peoples and nations change.

PROF KHURSHID AHMAD