



The University of Chicago Graduate School of Business

■ [About](#) ■ [Contact](#) ■ [Visit](#) ■ [GSB Home](#)

Bridging the Islam-West Chasm

Chicago GSB Pakistan Club

**October 29, 2007: 6:00 PM - 8:15
PM**

The GSB Pakistan Club is very proud to host a talk by Prof. Hoodbhoy, a member of the Permanent Monitoring Panel on Terrorism of the World Federation of Scientists.

Where

Room C25 - Harper Center
5807 South Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, IL

Driving Directions:

<http://maps.uchicago.edu/directions/car.shtml>

Program

6:30 PM - 7:00 PM: Welcome & Speaker Introduction

7:00 PM - 7:45 PM: Presentation

7:45 PM - 8:15 PM: Q & A

Registration

[Register Online](#)

[Register By E-mail](#)

Deadline: 10/28/2007

Questions

[K. Rizwan Kadir](#)

Other Information

The GSB Pakistan Club is very appreciative of the assistance received from the Center for International Studies, and the South Asia Language and Area Center, both at the University of Chicago.

We are also very thankful to the Program in Arms Control, Disarmament, and International Security (ACDIS) at the University of Illinois, Urbana, which is sponsoring Prof. Hoodbhoy's current visit, and kindly included us in his itinerary.

Speaker Profiles

Prof. Pervez Hoodbhoy

Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy is chairman of the department of physics at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad, Pakistan, where has taught for since 1973.

He holds a Ph.D in nuclear physics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and is the recipient of the Abdus Salam Prize for Mathematics, the Baker Award for Electronics, Faiz Ahmad Faiz Prize for contributions to education in Pakistan, and the UNESCO 2003 Kalinga Prize for the popularization of science.

He is a visiting professor at MIT, Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Maryland, Stanford Linear Accelerator.

He is chairman of Mashal, a non-profit organization that publishes books in Urdu on women's rights, education, environmental issues, philosophy, and modern thought.

Dr. Hoodbhoy has written and spoken extensively on topics ranging from science in Islam to education issues in Pakistan and nuclear disarmament. He produced a 13-part documentary series in Urdu for Pakistan Television on critical issues in education, and two other major television series aimed at popularizing science. He is author of *Islam and Science: Religious Orthodoxy and the Battle for Rationality*, now in 5 languages. His writings have appeared in *Dawn*, *The News*, *Frontier Post*, *Muslim*, *Newslines*, *Herald*, *Jang*, and overseas in *Le Monde*, *Japan Times*, *Washington Post*, *Asahi*, *Seattle Times*, *Post-Intelligencer*, *Frontline*, and *Chowk Magazine*.

He has been an engaged speaker at more than 20 US campuses including MIT, Princeton, Univ. of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins

University. He has appeared on several TV and radio networks (BBC, CNN, ABC, NBC, PBS, NPR, Fox) to analyze political developments in South Asia.

Bridging the Islam-West Chasm

Chicago-Pakistan Club, Monday Oct 30

After 911, a steadily widening gulf has come to separate Muslims from the West. If we are to come to grips with this phenomenon then we shall have to be brutally honest to ourselves and question long-held beliefs and assumptions. It is a common refrain in the US that Islam is at the root of global terrorism. Many commentators have gone so far as to say that the US war on terror is not just a war against Al-Qaida, or other jihadist groups of that ilk, but against Islamofascists who are out to destroy the Western world.

Norman Podhoretz, arch-neoconservative, has recently written a book "*World War IV: The Long Struggle Against Islamofascism*". And just who are the Islamofascists? President George W. Bush has an answer: "We have seen their kind before. They're the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the twentieth century.... They follow in the path of fascism, Nazism, and totalitarianism." Following the 2006 plot to blow up transatlantic airliners, Bush described the fight against terrorists as a battle against "Islamic fascists... will use any means to destroy those of us who love freedom".

But "*Islamofascism*" is a historically inaccurate term – rightly protested by Muslim groups – coined to create hysteria and drum up war sentiment. True, the Muslim world is full of military dictators and feudal monarchies. Some oppose the US, others are close allies. But the clan-based, disorganized social and political structure is wholly different from that of the Italy under Mussolini or Germany under Hitler. The closest candidate to fascism was the Baath Party under Saddam Hussein. But it was founded by a socialist, Michel Aflaq, who was a Christian. Saddam, a gangster rather than an ideologue, was certainly not an Islamist and had nothing to do with Al-Qaida. His quarrel with Khomeini was not even about Shia-Sunni rivalry but about regional dominance. The US backed him fully with arms and supplies in a war that he started, and which left a million dead. Some of you may have seen pictures of Donald Rumsfeld extending both hands to Saddam (Saddam extended only one hand) in Baghdad on December 20, 1983.

Fox News has much more to say on Islamic terrorism. But America's conservatives did not always have such harsh words to say about Islamic fighters. My guru and friend, Eqbal Ahmad, Pakistani scholar and activist and peace activist, who died about two years before catastrophic events of 11 September 2001 brought terrorism into such sharp focus, gave a

remarkable lecture in 1998 in Boulder, Colorado, called “Terrorism – Theirs and Ours” . In a little booklet, which originated from this lecture given in 1998 in Boulder, Eqbal reminisces that he first met Osama bin Laden in 1986 on the recommendation of an official at the US embassy in Islamabad. There’s nothing strange in this – those were the days when America was fighting the “Evil Empire” and America’s heroes were the Afghan mujahideen. The front and back covers of this booklet carry a remarkable photograph – President Ronald Reagan in the White House feting various bearded Afghan mujahideen leaders. One can recognize, among others, Gulbaddin Hekmatyar, who began his political career in Kabul University by throwing acid on the face of woman student because she refused the burqa. There are others too, now often described as criminal warlords and terrorists, being entertained by the president of the United States.

DEFINING TERRORISM

Yesterday’s freedom-fighters are today’s terrorists. This begs the question: what is terrorism? Now, one would think that a simple definition should suffice. Indeed, I will venture one: **Terrorism is the deliberate targeting of non-combatant civilians with the intent to kill, harm, or terrify.** Unfortunately this definition is not universally accepted. There are, of course, innumerable instances where non-combatants have been deliberately targeted. But some people vehemently insist these are acts of terrorism whereas others, with equal vehemence, defend these as legitimate. For example:

- The nuking of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the fire-bombing of Dresden, etc.
[Justification: without targeting enemy cities WWII would have gone on longer with more casualties n the Allied side]
- The wholesale slaughter of ordinary Bengalis by the Pakistani Army in 1971.
[Justification: the Bengalis were colluding with the Indians to break up Pakistan and had to be neutralized]
- The targeting of Tel Aviv supermarkets and cafés by Palestinian suicide bombers, and the assassination of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics.
[Justification: All Israeli Jews are occupiers of Palestine and hence enemy combatants]

- The aerial bombardment of occupied apartment buildings in Lebanon by Israeli aircraft in 2006.
[Justification: the Hizbollah was hiding combatants and weapons among a sympathetic population]
- The gassing of 100,000 Kurds in Halabja.
[Justification: ask Chemical Ali before he is hanged.]

Personally I think all of the above constitute crimes against humanity and are, as such, acts of terrorism. But, as we can see, every single one of them can be – and has been – justified by those who committed the acts and by others from the milieu they belong to. What distinguishes a freedom fighter from a terrorist? Nothing – except your personal point of view and the particular moment of history. As just one example: the British call the Irgun and Stern groups in Palestine “terrorists”; the Zionists termed them “freedom fighters”

While no definition of terrorism satisfies all, this does not mean that terrorism does not exist. Try defining a chair. It’s not easy but chairs still exist! Everyone certainly agrees that terrorism, howsoever defined, is a bad thing and must be dealt with. The problem is that in a polarized world, its manifestations and causes are viewed very differently.

TERRORISM AND BIOLOGY

Biology is the mother of all terrorism and all conflicts. At a fundamental level humans are survival machines, built by evolution in a way to guarantee that their genes propagate. The resilience of inherent tribalism, arising from insufficient adaptation of our genes to a technologically transformed world, now threatens the human species.

We are nice to our own kind, but ruthless to others where there is competition. At football or cricket matches, the tribal instinct rushes to the fore. Spectators cheer their own teams and shower abuse upon players from the other side. Or, as another example, CNN broadcast heart-rending stories of survivors and relatives in the Minnesota bridge collapse in August, 2007. But this very channel had, during the Iraq invasion, gloated over the destruction of a bridge over the Tigris. As cars fell into the river, commentators shamelessly prattled over the accuracy of US smart bombs.

Let's face it: we live in a world that is very much divided into "us" and "them". Each side feels only the suffering and sorrow of their own. The thin veneer of sophistication civilization forces upon us is deceptive; at the very core we remain neo-tribals. We talk of principles but there is a lot of flexibility when it comes to applying them to terrorism. As Groucho Marx quipped: "Those are my principles, and if you don't like them . . . well, I have others."

Anthropology tells us of the origins of tribalism. Early in the history of the human race, homo-sapiens were challenged by basic survival needs. Tribalism helped people survive the jungle and the desert by creating group identity. If you belonged to the group, you were eligible for protection from the other group members and your survival chances were enhanced. But you also had to subscribe to the tribe's weltanschauung; individualism was severely curtailed. As long as various tribes were separated, all this was okay. The problem came when resource sharing required people to live together in close physical proximity. Cultural sharing becomes problematic because tribal identities are threatened. A tribe can opt to quietly die as its identity is weakened – or it can choose to militantly assert itself and preserve its cultural system. This is precisely why in the age of globalization, religious symbols such as the veil or celebrating Yom Kippur have become so important.

Across the world people believe that devotion to essential or core values – such as the welfare of their family and country, or their commitment to religion, honor and justice. These are held sacred. Negotiating with material rewards does not work. Sacred values differ from material or instrumental values by incorporating moral beliefs that may drive action independently, or all out of proportion, from prospects for success. When people are asked to trade sacred values for material rewards they usually react with outrage and anger. This brings me to defining "Sacred Terrorism": it is terrorism in defense of these essential core values.

BLAMING TERRORISM ON COLONIALISM

There's another side to the coin. In the part of the world where I live, the basic premise is that all terrorism – and all the problems in the world for that matter – is Western imperialist domination, both past and present. The premise is that if West accepts guilt for colonialism and mends its ways, the conflict will disappear.

I recently had a televised debate with Imran Khan, politician and cricket hero. Terrorism, he declared, is that which the US perpetrates in Iraq and Iran. But what, I asked, of the Taliban who blow up girls schools and video shops, kill doctors and health workers, refuse to allow women to vote, threaten barbers and tailors with death, and destroy ancient Buddha statues? Khan was dismissive – all this comes because General Musharraf and the Pakistani government is an accomplice to America's war on terror.

There are, of course, many overt supporters of the Taliban. A Pakistani professor at Northeastern University in Massachusetts writes about the “mongrel elites” of Pakistan and has high praise for the Taliban: “Yet, in one corner of Pakistan, resistance comes from the sons and daughters of the mountains, yet uncontaminated by ‘western civilisation’, firm in their faith, clear in their conviction, proud of their heritage, and ready to fight for their dignity. They stood up against the Soviet marauders: and defeated them. Today, they are standing up again, now against the American marauders and their allies.”

While this does reflect the growing support for extremism in Pakistani society, it is relatively rare. But, in a situation where few criticisms of the Taliban are heard, these words ring louder. Even normally vocal Pakistanis – whose lifestyles make them eligible for slaughter if and when the Taliban capture Pakistani cities – say that it is not our war.

A philosopher friend at Columbia University proposes that the reason for this lack of criticism among Pakistanis comes not from any intrinsic commitment to Islamic absolutism but, instead, from a defensive psychology against the West – to criticize the Taliban would be letting one's side down since they are the only ones fighting the US and struggling against centuries of colonial subjugation. Indeed, some on the left in Pakistan celebrate the Islamic resistance in Afghanistan and Iraq as an anti-imperialist struggle.

This is a wholly misguided notion.

The fact is that a good part of the resentment against the West simply does not come from the resentment of having been colonized. Rather, many orthodox Muslims feel that the hellish sinfulness (‘jahiliya’) of the West must be combated by wrath of God. The man on the street is not concerned with romantic abstractions, the decline of indigenist traditions, or with minutiae of history. Rather, the mullah in the neighborhood mosque has

decided for him what is right or wrong. Therefore simple things like women being allowed to walk around bare faced, or the very notion that they could be considered the equal of men, inspires the greatest ire among orthodox Muslims.

Today's world is even more polarized. A majority of Muslims shrugged off 9/11 or 7/7, as well as the atrocities of Al-Qaida and the Taliban. Many still cling to the nonsensical belief of 3000 Jews rushing out of the World Trade Centre just as the planes approached.

At the level of personal observations let me share with you a few among very many. The day after 911, my students were mindlessly rejoicing the attacks across the university. Being very upset, I decided to call off my student seminar with about 60 students present in the class. Some protested. One student said, "You can't call this terrorism." Another said "Are you only worried because it is Americans who have died?" It took two hours of sustained, impassioned, argumentation to convince them that the killing of ordinary people, who had nothing to do with the policies of the United States, was an atrocity. I suppose that millions of Muslim students the world over felt as mine did, but probably heard no counter-arguments.

During our relief efforts after the 2005 earthquake in Pakistan, I encountered people in desperate situations but who refused help because they would be touched by the infidels who eat pork, drink wine, and whose women had uncovered faces. In particular, etched in my memory is the face of the old man who told his son that he would rather die than let his gangrenous leg be amputated by a group of Cuban doctors that had flown in to help. He was eventually taken to an Iranian relief team but it was too late.

This same blindness is to be found on the other side: a majority of Americans uncritically rallied around Bush after 9/11 and then agreed to go to war in Iraq although, 1)The existence of WMD's was a transparent fake that all but American could see, 2)Saddam's involvement in 911 was a concocted lie, but many Americans still like to believe that it is true, 3)The Iraq war was illegal under international law. For a majority of Americans, Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, and the Blackwater murders are just tiny blips on their radar screens. The American media focuses upon the 3500 Americans killed in Iraq but rarely mentions the horrific toll of Iraqis which, by one estimate, exceeds 600,000.

So where lies the hope of surviving in a globalizing world? Do our genes doom us to eternal tribalism?

While humanity's survival is by no means guaranteed, there is a possibility that we can override the hardwiring of our brains by exercising the power to analyze and reason. Genes are just stupid bunches of atoms, devoid of consciousness. But we humans, in contrast, can understand the world and see the arbitrariness of our narrowness. Assuming we can indeed use our brains, how can we intervene in a conflict that threatens to become more severe with every passing year? I have a set of prescriptions – you may have better ones – for dealing with the most dangerous conflict of our times, that between Islam and the West.

WHAT AMERICA MUST DO

First, as demanded by both by Muslims and non-Muslims across the globe, the US needs an attitudinal change. It must repudiate grand imperial designs. According to the Pentagon's "Base Structure Report" for 2004, the U.S. military currently operates more than 900 installations in 46 countries, in addition to over 4600 bases in the U.S. homeland and territories.¹ The notion of total planetary control had guided the Republican administration even before 9/11. The Democrats, many of whom have now publicly turned against the Iraq war, limit their criticisms to the strategy and conduct of the war, the lies and disinformation dispensed by the White House, suspicious deals with defence contractors, and the like. But they share with Republicans the belief that the US possesses the right – and adequate might – to mould the world according to its wishes. The people of the US must somehow convince themselves of the need to obey international laws and etiquettes, and that they do not have some divine mission to fulfil. In the post-Tony Blair period, Britain must also seek a foreign policy independent of the United States, and cultivate independent relations with Muslim countries.

Second, the creation of a Palestinian state must not be further postponed. The dispossession of Palestinians has been appropriated as a Muslim cause with huge symbolic significance. Peace between Islam and the West is impossible without some reasonable resolution of this problem. The US has given Israel carte blanche for military action against the Palestinians, as in the invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and 2006. American officials remain silent about the future of occupied territories. The fact that Hamas and Fatah are at each other's throats does not mean that the Palestinian problem has gone

away. On the contrary, it strengthens extremism and makes everything more difficult. Without a Palestinian state, the Palestinian problem will mutate into a new and still less controllable form.

Third, the US must take seriously the impact of collateral damage on civilian populations. The heavy use of airpower in Iraq and Afghanistan inevitably led to large numbers of non-combatant casualties. Often the 'coalition forces' refuse to acknowledge civilian deaths; when confronted with incontrovertible evidence, they apologise and issue miserably small compensation. Karl Inderfurth, Assistant Secretary of State under Bill Clinton, recently admitted that "military actions [in Afghanistan] ... by US and NATO forces will speak louder than those sincerely expressed words. As the death toll of civilians mounts, Afghan hearts and minds are being lost and, with that, the spectre of losing the war looms." Very sensibly, the goal of "zero innocent civilian casualties" was recommended a year ago by retired General Barry McCaffrey after a trip to Afghanistan.

Fourth, the US must stop threatening Iran with a nuclear holocaust for trying to develop nuclear weapons, while rewarding, to various degrees, other countries – Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea – that have developed such weapons surreptitiously. The Sunday Times in London reports that: "The Pentagon has drawn up plans for massive airstrikes against 1,200 targets in Iran, designed to annihilate the Iranians' military capability in three days." It would, of course, be highly preferable if Iran could be dissuaded by peaceful means, including sanctions, from making a bomb. But there is no strong moral argument available to the US against Iran's nuclear ambitions, given both its own nuclear stance and the fact that Iran's initial nuclear capability was provided by the US during the Shah's rule. The US refuses to work through the United Nations, or to support a nuclear-weapons free zone in West Asia. So far, the US has refused even to hold direct talks with the Iranian leadership to defuse the nuclear crisis. Overtures by Iran, such as were made by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in his letter to President Bush in 2006, were rejected. But North Korea's nuclear test showed that US refusals to hold one-on-one talks have failed miserably. On the other hand, nuclear negotiations in exchange for oil have partially succeeded in halting the North Korean nuclear developments.

Fifth, the US must not exploit the Sunni-Shia schism in the hope of weakening both. Clever as this might seem to be, using religious passions to achieve political ends is dangerous. Moreover, created monsters have a habit

of turning against their masters – some notable examples include the CIA’s Afghan jihad, Israel’s experiment with Hamas, Pakistan’s with jihadist groups, and India’s with Sikh extremists. For US strategists, exploiting sectarianism is a hard temptation to resist: al-Qaeda and parts of the Sunni community in Iraq and Lebanon see Iran and Hizbollah as an even greater threat than the US occupation. They would welcome a US attack on Iran, perhaps even with nuclear weapons, and might even provoke a confrontation to encourage the US to do so.

Sixth, the US must not support dictators and quislings like General Musharraf and Hosni Mubarak while preaching the virtues of democracy. This breeds anger and resentment, and is especially dangerous given that US hypocrisy is so transparent.

Seventh, the West must seize opportunities that project it as generous, rather than aggressive. Providing disaster relief (including following the 2004 Tsunami and the 2005 Kashmir Earthquake) did much to build a positive image. Soft power is critical. Draining the swamps where extremism breeds will require increasing foreign aid to poor Muslim countries, creating economic and employment opportunities there, and desisting from policies that reward only the elites of the recipient societies.

Eighth, the US must accept the legitimacy of the International Criminal Court. Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay have become worldwide symbols of arbitrary torture and imprisonment. They demonstrate that, in dealing with suspected ‘terrorists’, the US has suspended subservience to the rule of law. In doing so, it does only marginally better than the real militants it seeks to combat. Nor should the US outsource the use of torture to repressive regimes like Pakistan, Syria and Egypt. This too can only backfire. For dealing with terrorism suspects, judicial mechanisms based on defensible principles, rather than expediency, must be developed.

Ninth, soldiers and officials must be prevented from desecrating Islamic holy symbols. Numerous such incidents are known to have taken place, exemplified by the flushing of a Koran down a toilet at Guantanamo. Fortunately the US military has officially recognised that this is extremely dangerous due to the boost it provides to extremists. Of course, violation of rules in combat situations may be difficult to prevent. The award of knighthood to Salman Rushdie is another example of unwise provocation: it

may or may not be justified on grounds of literary merit, but it instantly kindled Muslim anger.

Tenth, and finally, discriminating against Muslims living within Western societies is both morally wrong, and will only invite further radicalisation. One sees that Christians, Jews and Hindus are able to freely run private educational institutions in the US, but Muslim schools are viewed with much suspicion. A secular society must have no preferences between religions. Any perceived deviation from this is sufficient to convey to a minority group that it is an object of persecution. Indeed, paranoia is easily detectable in the US Muslim community. Education in the West must therefore be secular in word and spirit, and all schools should be open to all faiths. In other words, no religious schools should be permitted. Unfortunately there is little chance of this at the moment, as US politics have become increasingly captive to the politics of born-again Christians who see the world through a biblical prism. The UK, too, needs to secularise itself, perhaps on the French model. Its multiculturalism is not working. Like Turkey, it should ban the veil in government buildings.

WHAT MUSLIMS MUST DO

But blaming individual states and political leaders does not make for a satisfactory explanation of the huge rise in global Islamic militancy. One must seek reasons at a broader level. It is a sad truth that Muslims have little presence in today's world affairs, in science or in culture. This has led to diminished self-esteem, as well as increasing recourse to political Islam. Some dream of a new global caliphate. But the premises of this politics are false. Each blow inflicted by America after 9/11 has led Islamists to predict that the pain and humiliation will force all Muslims to close ranks, forget old grudges, purge traitors and renegades from their ranks, and generate a collective rage great enough to take on the power of today's governing civilisation. Each time, they have been dead wrong.

So what do Muslims need to do?

A paradigm shift is essential. Muslims must realise that the awesome strength of Western civilisation – which also made possible its predatory imperialism – springs from accepting the premises of science and logic, respecting democratic institutions (at least within national borders), allowing value systems to evolve, and boldly challenging dogma without being condemned for blasphemy. They must connect the West's success with

personal freedom and liberty, superior work ethics, artistic and scientific creativity, and the compulsive urge to innovate and experiment.

Muslims, if they are to be a part of mainstream civilisation, will have to adapt to a new universal cultural climate, one that accepts human rights as defined by the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including the equality of men and women. On the part of Muslim minorities and immigrants to non-Muslim countries, this means acceptance of different behavioural norms, and a move away from the current tendency of ghettoisation and towards greater integration into the larger society.

Meanwhile, Muslims themselves must stop believing convoluted conspiracy theories that purport to explain their states of weakness. For example, it is widely held that today's sectarian warfare is a consequence of some cunningly remote manipulations by enemies of Islam. But, in fact, the Shia-Sunni schism, and the first related bloodbath, followed almost immediately after the death of the Prophet Mohammad.

Muslims must also stop dreaming of theocracy and sharia law as solutions to their predicaments. This means acknowledging the sovereignty of the people rather than the rule of Allah, the latter by way of a self-appointed priesthood, such as *vilayat-e-faqih* and *khilafat-e-arz*. These are essentially prescriptions for a theocracy run by mullahs. It is simply impossible to run modern states while remaining shackled to medieval religious laws. Economic development, an expansion of individual liberties, democracy, an explosive growth in scientific knowledge and technological capabilities – these and a host of other benefits will forever remain distant dreams without the modernisation of thought. The only way by which Muslim societies can become democratic, pluralistic and free from violent extremism is by going through their own internal struggles. Indigenous reform is difficult but possible. Islam is certainly as immutable as the Koran, but values held by Muslims have changed over the centuries.

CONCLUSION

Looking at planet Earth from above, one would see a bloody battlefield, where imperial might and religious fundamentalism are locked in bitter struggle. Whose victory or defeat should one wish for? There cannot be an unequivocal preference; each dispute must be looked at separately.

Extremists on both sides of the present divide have moved to centre stage. Even after the end of George W Bush's presidency, the Americans are bound to continue to bomb Muslim lands. They think they can win. But their power, though large, is limited. Iraq has proven the point. On the other side, Islamist groups will continue to recruit successfully, so long as a large number of Muslims feel that they are being unfairly targeted, and that justice has ceased to matter in world affairs. America cannot win. Nor can the Islamists.

One must navigate a course safely away from the xenophobes of the US and Europe – who see Islam as an evil to be suppressed or conquered – and also away from the large number of Muslims across the world who justify acts of terrorism and violence as part of asymmetric warfare. The hope for a happier and more humane world lies in reason, education and economic justice. Secularism, universalistic ideas of human rights, and freedom of belief are non-negotiable and we must struggle for them. Biology may be the problem but biology may also be the solution because it has also given us the human mind – the ultimate tool of survival.

ⁱ *Base Structure Report Fiscal year 2004*, U.S. Department of Defense, Washington, DC, September 2004; available at <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/dod33/>. This represents a net reduction of more than 100 domestic bases and a net increase of over 200 foreign bases from the previous year.