

# Why they hate America in Britain

By JONATHAN DAVID FARLEY

As I write this, I sit only 1 mile from a people who are at war with America.

They are not poor, illiterate, or Muslim. In fact, they are mostly white, Christian, and middle-class. They are students at Oxford University, in England.

Wadham College (which is part of Oxford University) declared war with the United States when America started carpet-bombing Vietnam. The stately, ancient Oxford hall boasts a well-kept, manicured lawn, which the students still call Ho Chi Minh Quad.

Of course, the state of hostilities is mostly facetious (Oxford's Trinity College and Balliol College have also declared war against each other), but not entirely. The English philosopher and mathematician Bertrand Russell, one of the most renowned thinkers of the 20th century, convened a war crimes tribunal in the 1960s, in which he accused the United States of crimes against humanity. They may not be shouting, "Death to America," but Brits have long scoffed at American imperialism.

Since Sept. 11, Americans have asked, "How could anybody hate us so much?" And we've mostly been coming to the wrong conclusions. (Novelist Salman Rushdie recently wrote that Muslim extremists hate America because we eat bacon sandwiches!)

I'm not an eloquent writer like Rushdie; nor am I a vegetarian extremist. But as a

mathematician, I can put two and two together; and, at the risk of inflaming American opinion, I'd like to opine why the British feel "they" hate "us." That reason is state-sponsored terrorism.

America has long accused nations like Iraq, Sudan, and Cuba of sponsoring terrorism. But, according to ABC News, it was the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. military who, in the 1960s, drafted plans to commit terrorist attacks. "We could blow up a U.S. ship in (Cuba's) Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba," read one report, code named Operation Northwoods. The American people would then demand that Castro be deposed. Cold "Worriers" still believe Castro wants to bring Americans to our knees. (I say, Bill Clinton did enough of that already.)

During the 1980s, the U.S. fought a secret war in Central America, supporting murderous regimes in El Salvador and Honduras that used death squads to terrorize civilians, murder priests and rape nuns. Many of the generalists who conducted this reign of terror were trained in the School of the Americas in Georgia. Their training manuals included instructions on how to torture.

Chile's dictator, Pinochet, who specialized in dropping his political opponents out of airplanes, came to power after a CIA-orchestrated coup, during which the democratically elected president, Salvador Allende, was murdered.

The Congo was plunged into 40 years of chaos after the U.S.-backed dictator, Mobutu,

seized power, following the murder of the democratically elected prime minister Patrice Lumumba.

The U.S. government occupied Haiti for decades and, later, supported that country's brutal dictators, the Duvaliers. It sustained the dictator of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos, even after his people overthrew him. The Shah of Iran persecuted his own people with our tax dollars; yet we pretend that Iranian anti-Americanism is unprovoked.

(I do recognize that, despite America's faults, at least we have the freedom to criticize the government. In Iran, peace activists like my hero Martin Luther King Jr. would be shot.)

When the U.S. stops sponsoring terrorism, and starts cracking down on terrorism at home (the KKK and the LAPD), the English may start respecting our moral leadership. As things stand, British newspapers are as likely to call George Bush "the mad bomber" as they are Osama bin Laden. Despite British involvement in the war, 54 percent of Britons think the bombing should be suspended.

It's easy to dismiss anti-American mobs in brown countries. But we'd be fools to dismiss the English, our closest allies; and a significant number of them are saying, America's not at war with terrorism: It's in bed with it.

Dr. Jonathan David Farley is a Fulbright Distinguished Scholar at Oxford University and a Green Party candidate for Congress in Tennessee ([www.GreenTN.org](http://www.GreenTN.org)).



## Readers Respond

### Reviving the Second Amendment

On Oct. 16, in *United States vs. Emerson*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit joined the Bush administration and respected legal scholars across the political spectrum in affirming the right that each of us enjoy, as individuals, to own a gun. Judge William L. Garwood's opinion said that the Constitution protects the right of individuals, including those not then actually a member of any militia or engaged in active military service or training, to privately possess and bear their own firearms — that are suitable as personal individual weapons.

In sustaining the lower court's individual rights model of the Second Amendment, the Fifth Circuit became the only federal appellate court to reject unequivocally two alternative "collective rights" models. One version, the so-called states rights model, holds that the amendment merely recognizes the right of a state to arm its militia. A more sophisticated collective rights model acknowledges an individual right to bear arms, but only as a member of, and when actively participating in, the militia and then only if the government hasn't provided necessary weapons. That also was the position of the Clinton Justice Department.

In 1939 the Supreme Court looked at that same question — individual right or collective right — in *United States vs. Miller*. The statute in *Miller* was the 1934 National Firearms Act, which required registration of machine guns, sawed off rifles, sawed off shotguns, and silencers. According to the Fifth Circuit, the Supreme Court stated that the weapons at issue were not for war or common defense, but rather for use by criminals. That type of weapon is not constitutionally protected, regardless whether the Second Amendment applies individually or collectively.

From a text-based perspective, the Second Amendment, like the First and Fourth, refers to "the right of the people." No reasonable person can doubt that First Amendment rights — speech, religion, assembly, redress of grievances — belong to us as individuals. Similarly, Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches are individual rights. Moreover, consider the inclusion of the Second Amendment within the Bill of

Rights, the part of the Constitution that deals with rights of individuals, not powers of the state.

Turning to historical analysis, the Fifth Circuit noted that anti-federalists demanded three major changes before ratifying the Constitution: First, they insisted on a Bill of Rights. Second, they wanted to authorize states to arm the militia. Third, they wished to eliminate federal power to maintain a standing army. Federalists agreed only to a Bill of Rights. They countered that federal authority over the militia obviated the need for a standing army. But, more important, armed Americans could resist an oppressive standing army. The federalist position thus depended on the people being armed.

Finally, the Fifth Circuit observed that the Senate, crafting the amendments in 1789, refused to empower states to arm their own militias. Yet that power, expressly rejected, is the foundation of the states rights model. Far from establishing states rights, the Second Amendment's militia clause was the federalists' way of pacifying anti-federalists without either limiting the power of the federal government to maintain a standing army or increasing the states' power over the militia.

The implications of that analysis are important today. On Sept. 11 we learned that the government cannot defend us against all acts of terror. It is imperative, therefore, that we be able to defend ourselves. A disarmed society, because its citizens are defenseless, tends to adopt police state tactics and extinguish civil liberties. Hence, an individual right to bear arms is prophylactic — it reduces the demand for a police state while securing freedom.

To be sure, constitutional rights are not absolute. They do, however, establish a powerful presumption in favor of liberty. Circumstances may justify a limitation on our right to possess a gun. Indeed, the Fifth Circuit held that Mr. Emerson's Second Amendment rights could be temporarily curtailed because there was reason to believe he posed a threat to his estranged wife. Still, the government must demonstrate, in Judge Garwood's words, that its restrictions are "narrowly tailored" and not inconsistent with the right of Americans generally to individually keep and bear their private arms.

Our federal courts now have a unique opportunity to uphold that

principle and reinvigorate the Second Amendment.

Robert A. Levy  
Cato Institute

### High cost of drug war

If you can't see a "light at the end of the tunnel," it's because we're in a tunnel that has no end. That endless tunnel has been built, financed and maintained by the war on drugs, our present health finance program, and some self-defeating attitudes.

The war on drugs expends a lot of energy and treasure on the reduction of supply. If there are no drugs to buy, no one will start to use them and no one will be able to develop or maintain an addiction. Interdiction has not worked because the profits are so great that some individuals are willing to take the risks associated with the "illegal" drug trade and "bribes" are a "reasonable business cost."

What we need to do instead is to take the profit out of selling these mind-altering drugs. If there is no profit, the "professionals" will find something else to do and the drug supply will dry up. There will be no incentive for hooking new users. Some amateurs may continue to produce drugs for "recreational" purposes but that supply will be insignificant compared to the present situation.

Let's assume that all illegal drugs are a public health hazard. Some people disagree. This means we need a program of preventive education, early detection, and proper treatment.

Right now, the public costs are far greater than the costs of proper education, detection, and treatment. We pay the salaries and expenses of all the drug warriors. We pay the cost of crimes committed to purchase drugs. We pay the cost of arresting and prosecuting not only dealers but users. We pay the enormous cost of jailing those who are convicted — some say the annual cost is larger than the annual tuition at Harvard. We pay for the lost productivity of those caught up in the system.

We can avoid most of these costs by making it possible for every "user" to get a legal supply of drugs while participating in an appropriate treatment program and while continuing to be a productive member of society.

John Watkins,  
Executive Director  
The Simple Society

# Afghanistan's Vietnam dilemma

By KWAKU PERSON-LYNN, Ph.D.

My thoughts are haunted. Vietnam. Afghanistan.

I was on the front lines in Vietnam as a medic with the U.S. Navy/Marines. I saw in 1968 the big attack on U.S. soldiers known as the Tet offensive. I saw how the American press reported that decisive battle. It would make anyone skeptical of American war reports today.

Back then, with the media reporting "U.S. casualties light, fatalities moderate" in Vietnam, those of us in the trenches got angry because we knew the horror was just the opposite. We wondered how the military and the media could lie to the American people so blatantly.

As the Afghanistan campaign extends into weeks, we are constantly hearing reports of how long the military campaign will take and for Americans to be patient. At least we know that the administration has learned a lesson, but to what end?

America went to Vietnam with the best and latest technology imaginable for human destruction. Everything outside of nuclear warfare was used against the Vietnamese people, who did not have a quarter of the technology America enjoyed.

The Vietnamese fighter fought back by digging pits with bamboo spears pointed upwards, then camouflaging the pit beyond detection — anyone who fell into it was killed. The American press would quote, "They do not fight fairly." When a Vietnamese boy would casually walk up to a group of American military personnel and detonate himself, killing everyone around him, the American press would say, "They fight like barbarians."

What the American press, the military, the politicians and

most of the public did not realize is that the Vietnamese had hearts large as Mount Kilimanjaro, an unyielding determination, and a resolve to fight no matter what it took or how long. These were human factors the American military strategists did not calculate.

The film "The Godfather" gave us a glimpse of that, when the Don went to Cuba (before Castro) and saw a revolutionary jumping in a military vehicle killing a Cuban officer, and himself. This gave the Don doubt that the business he intended to conduct there would succeed, because people that determined are very hard to defeat. His caution turned out to be correct in the film, and in real life.

Ironically, we are witnessing the same kind of resolve in Afghanistan.

The tone of the news reports is very slowly becoming less optimistic. Just like in Vietnam. Hearing Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld saying that they "may not be able to catch Osama bin Laden," is very discouraging for those expecting quick results, as in the Gulf War. If this proves true, how would America justify the massive destruction Afghanistan is suffering?

The Taliban's policies, especially against women, are not endorsed here. But its members are hardened war veterans, having fought incursions into their land for decades, just like the Vietnamese did. In addition, the American military has limited experience fighting in the harsh terrain of Afghanistan. When you are a foreigner in someone else's land, you are immediately at a disadvantage, no matter how advanced the technology, as America also learned in Vietnam.

Many people these days feel that America is in a no-win

situation. Why?

One, a handful of people has America's economy in almost total disarray, compounded with a collective anthrax paranoia across the country. No one would have ever thought that was possible.

Second, no matter whether bin Laden is captured or killed, he is considered a hero in much of the Arab/Islamic world.

Like it or not, young recruits are joining his cause. It's like a spiraling circle that has no end. Third, the continuous bombing of an impoverished people and their land, no matter the reason or justification, is not endearing America to some of its closest friends and allies. Global calls and demonstrations against the bombing grow constantly.

If America does not change its Middle Eastern policy toward fairness rather than the one-sidedness it now practices, the nucleus of the problem will remain.

Russia learned this lesson when it lost 15,000 soldiers in Afghanistan, which contributed to the breakup of the Soviet Union.

This so-called war is not going to solve the problem, but inflate it.

Consistent development, elimination of hunger, medical assistance, educational growth, as unattractive as those may sound to some, are really the remedies that will deflate most of the hostility.

Those are the real human factors American strategists must factor in, or who knows what is next?

Kwaku Person-Lynn is author of *First Word: Black Scholars, Thinkers, Warriors*. E-mail: [DrKwaku@hotmail.com](mailto:DrKwaku@hotmail.com).

## Your Voice

### Since the attack on the United States, do you feel Americans should take more of an interest in foreign policy?

"Americans should have always been interested in all aspects of the government. The knowledge is available to us; we just have to take advantage of it. Ignorance goes as far as one lets it."  
Christopher Jones

"I think the September 11th incident gives us a good reason to be more involved and conscious of foreign policy. In the past, I think

this has been something that we've kept in the back of our minds. Many people felt that the President and congress could handle it, but now we really need to know more about it. These are very serious times."  
Marilyn El-Saddiq

"We should know more about foreign policy. I've always had an interest in it, but now it is certainly a priority. I'm really going to be

interested in what future candidates think about foreign policy as well as domestic affairs."  
Darlene Gross

"I don't think we need to know more about foreign policy because we aren't going to be making major decisions about it. If we have a general understanding, I think that will suffice."  
Lamont Carter