Introduction

Historians fashion their centuries not by the calendar but by events, thus the nineteenth century in many history classes begins in 1815 with the Congress of Vienna, and ends in 1914, with the First World War. It may be different with the twenty-first century. It was in 2001, often considered the first year of the new century, that the United States found that it was no longer shielded from foreign attack by its two oceans, but vulnerable to the criminal designs of terrorists in airplanes. The United States, now the most powerful country in the world, responded to the attack by announcing a war against Terror, attacking first far-off Afghanistan, the terrorist base, and then Iraq.

It must really be left to historians in the far future to decide whether these events represent a watershed between two centuries. To an American like myself who lived through them the world seemed a very different place than when as a student it took me more than a week by ship to reach Europe from our shores, when the United States was only one of the powers called Great, when the geographic area known as the Near East was not very near at all, and when there was an association of states called the League of Nations, of which the United States was not even a member.

The events I have lived through in the last few years have had what seemed like world-shaking consequences. The terrorist attack on September 11, 2001 brought expressions of sympathy to the American people sent from all over the world, which demonstrated a sense of common humanity that was most unusual in its extent and depth. I remembered fifty years ago when there was talk of One World, but this world-wide unifying phenomenon was something different. Of course technology has brought the world closer

together, as I realize every day when I sit down at my computer to communicate with the editorial executives in Singapore. When the United States attacked the Talibans and the Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, there was still support and understanding for the United States, but the world wide feeling of unity was dissipated when the United States led a war against the state of Iraq, after attempting, but failing to convince major states on the UN Security Council that Iraq under Saddam Hussein, who was said to have weapons of mass destruction at the ready, actually represented an imminent threat to the United States, no longer invulnerable behind its oceans, and to other countries.

The U.S. war, supported by Great Britain and a number of minor states, led to another mass movement of opinion, this time in opposition to the United States. There was an unprecedented worldwide demonstration for peace; millions of people in many countries marched to protest what they felt was an unjustified war, holding up anti-American signs (but often making clear that they were opposing the government, not the American people). In the United States, however, the majority, with memory still fresh of the attacks that had been made against their country on its own soil, supported the war. After 9/11, public opinion around the world had been pro-American, sharing its grief. Now, however, world public opinion was divided as it had been during the Vietnam War.

It was in this situation that the publishers of World Scientific Publishing Company of Singapore decided to have a book done that would discuss some of the questions arising from the Iraq War. What had been the most important objectives of the United States in going to war? Was the war justified according to the UN and other international agreements? Was the war being conducted with respect to international obligations? What about the opposition to the war? How were human rights affected? What would be the future of the United Nation? Of multilateralism? Was the U.S. on a continuing unilateral course? How would Iraq be reconstructed? What would it cost?

To answer such questions and others they might raise themselves, WSPC appointed two co-editors — Prof. Wang and myself — who

recruited two groups of authors, Nobel peace laureates and eminent scholars in various fields, mainly American and British. We were given the title of "The Iraq War and Its Consequences". The result was a collection of essays on the origins of the war, its conduct, its aftermath, and the future of the UN and human rights. The essays were written at different stages concerning the war, and while some of the pieces are original and written for this volume, others are reprinted from earlier publications.

The international developments up to the present has been left to the authors. At the present writing the United States is considering turning back to the UN for assistance, both for financial aid and to provide adequate security for the Iraqis. This could mean political cooperation once more between the major powers, but to lay the foundations for an enduring peace in the Middle East by developing positive relationships between western and Islamic civilizations, based on respect for human dignity and individual rights, would still be a significant challenge.

Of the peace laureates, those who have held political office, former President F. W. de Klerk of South Africa, José Ramos-Horta, now Foreign Minister of East Timor and David Trimble, leader of the Ulster Unionist Party of Northern Ireland, tend to support U.S. policy. All three are concerned about the Middle East as a whole and see the need to disarm Saddam as a necessary move in stabilizing the region and even in changing its undemocratic ways. Both de Klerk and Ramos-Horta write knowingly about American leadership, its potential and its responsibilities. Ramos-Horta, as befits a new foreign minister, gives us a *tour de monde* of recent international history.

Those active in the organized peace movement, such as Mairead Corrigan Maguire, co-founder of the Community of the Peace People of Northern Ireland, Jody Williams, International Ambassador of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, and Cora Weiss, writing for the International Peace Bureau, are very critical of the United States. Maguire also tells of her personal witness protesting the sanctions against Iraq and demonstrating for peace in the United States. Williams writes a well documented article against the United States policy. She and Maguire recently took part in a peace vigil in

front of the White House and were led away in handcuffs by the police. Weiss, also president of the Hague Appeal, speaks for a large part of the organized peace movement.

Joseph Rotblat, nuclear physicist and former president of Pugwash Conferences, and Bernard Lown, writing for International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War as its co-founder, have for many years sought to explain the danger to human life on the planet of nuclear weapons, which they point out is increasing. The Dalai Lama writes clearly and simply about the bases of peace, and Mary Ellen McNish, Executive Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, and Brian Phillips, representing the two Quaker bodies which shared the 1947 prize, also write from their pacifist religious convictions. We also include the Open Letter by Irene Khan, Secretary-General of Amnesty International, sent to the Heads of State on the eve of the war, reminding them of their obligations under the Geneva Conventions, while Christian Dominicé, Secretary-General of the Institute of International Law, discusses the impact of the war on international law. Peter Hansen, Commissioner-General of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, writing in his own name, tells of the unfortunate situation of human rights in a related conflict.

Among the scholars is the Iraqi exile, Faleh A. Jabar, who presents a personal account of how he and others in London welcomed the news of the fall of Saddam Hussein. Other scholars have reservations. In a speech in March, 2003, Frank von Hippel of Princeton says that President Bush who wants to establish democracy in Iraq should reestablish "a democratic process of foreign-policy making in the U.S.". Joseph Stiglitz of Columbia University, Nobel laureate in economics, predicts how a war would have severe effects on the American economy. However, William Hartung (with Ceara Donnelley) of the World Policy Institute, in a hard-hitting factual account, shows how the privatization of Iraq reconstruction means high profits for American corporations.

As might be expected, Noam Chomsky of MIT, the prominent social critic, writes compellingly in disapproval of the United States war policy, while Mahmood Mamdani of Columbia University, critical

from a different angle, describes the American move from alliance with Iraq against Iran to punishment of Iraq for the invasion of Kuwait and to the subsequent punishment "by proxy" through the UN "genocidal" sanctions regime.

Professor Richard Falk of Princeton gives a closely reasoned answer to the question, "Is the UN now irrelevant?" This can be compared with the account of the U.S. and international law by Christian Dominicé in Section I. Professor Robin Lakoff of the University of California, Berkeley, gives a fascinating linguistic analysis of President Bush's rhetoric.

Two archeologists, Lord Renfrew of Cambridge University and Professor Benjamin Foster of Yale tell the sorry tale of the efforts in vain from the beginning to persuade the invading forces to protect the Iraqi museums from the expected looting of precious artifacts. Sir John Daniel of UNESCO, in writing of the reconstruction of education in Iraq, reminds us of the spectacular Arab achievements in scientific and intellectual history long before western Europe even entered its medieval age. Also writing about nation-building, Professor John E. Dower of MIT, a Pulitzer Prize winner, shows how the postwar reconstruction of Iraq would be very different from that in Japan.

Professor Roland Paris of the University of Colorado looks ahead toward the problems of nation-building and also touches upon the Bush administration's preference for unilateral policies to multilateral engagements, while Professor Lisa Martin of Harvard presents a solid discussion of the background of multilateralism in American policy. Eric Stover, Director of Human Rights Center at the University of California, Berkeley, reports on incidents of the violation which he observed on assignment in Iraq; Professor Rosemary Foot of Oxford University discusses human rights as it evolved in American foreign policy and its prospects in three areas in the Pacific; and Helena Cobban, specialist in international relations at the University of Virginia, proposes a way to improve human rights in a state abusing individuals without going to war against that state.

Dr. Svetlana Broz of Sarajevo, from her hopeful research in the Balkan conflicts, reports on evidence of altruistic acts in war time.

Professor Akira Iriye of Harvard sees the conflict between the U.S. and Europe in cultural, rather than political terms, with Europe historically closer to the Middle East and the U.S. motivated more by power. He strongly agrees with the resolution of the UN General Assembly in 2001, calling for "dialogue between civilizations", thinking of the Islamic civilization and the West.

In that hope we end the volume with a special feature, the universalist sermons delivered by Bishop Gunnar Stålsett of Oslo, former deputy chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, one in Oslo on the eve of the Iraq War, the other at the memorial service in Oslo for the victims of the bombing of the UN headquarters in Baghdad in August 2003.

Stålsett spoke of the dying words of Sergio Vieria de Mello, head of that UN unit, then trapped beneath tons of concrete after the bomb blast, "Don't let them pull the mission out!" That message, referring to the mission to bring peace to Iraq after the war, serves to tell all of us not to let war makers like the bombers who wrecked the UN building and murdered many of its staff succeed. Not to let them end the efforts of peacemakers anywhere, those who are working to build an enduring foundation of world peace, based upon human dignity and individual rights for all.

May the essays by our authors play some part in helping us to think through the questions raised by the Iraq War and Its Consequences and to play our own part in the quest for world peace. Perhaps some day that unifying moment of sensing our common humanity after 9/11 can be recaptured and will endure.

Irwin Abrams
Distinguished University Professor Emeritus
Antioch University, Ohio
September 2003