

UN Strikes Back

by cleaves *Saturday, Mar 12 2005, 5:32am*

international / social/political / opinion/analysis

(Kofi and semiotics)

Kofi Annan recently announced the UN is attempting to define "terrorism" in a universal sense; he hopes that a 'new' definition would apply both to States and groups. In view of the flagrant disregard for international law and convention by the US, one wonders whether this is a flight of fancy or a feeble attempt to regain some relevance for the UN. This new definition largely hinges on 'civilian' attacks. Analysts would view this as a purely ideological manoeuvre. The definition of "civilian" is no longer clear.

Warring factions attack the enemy, pure and simple - and what constitutes an enemy in a democracy (for example) where the people take responsibility for their government's actions, the people of course (civilians.) By definition, 'democratic' governments represent the people. However, we all know there is no democracy on the planet; slave populations are given a vote to choose between one prospective ruling group or another. The US 'democracy' is a good example. Ask yourself if anyone you know has the support of Corporate funds to the sum of approximately three hundred million dollars, which is required to cover the overall expenses of a reasonably competitive campaign. Who rules the US democracy? We need not wonder. For the rest of us who are constantly told we are 'free' and live in a democracy our defined status to those who are at war with the US would be targets. It may be advisable to implement real democracy if we are likely to die for an imitation.

Conversely, if we cite Iraq prior to its recent occupation and utilise the popular US definition of its leader as tyrant, despot, dictator etc; by implication the Iraqi population was oppressed and not responsible for their ruler. As a result the oppressed civilian population would not be considered targets. Nonetheless, thousands of civilians have been killed by US forces, which would according to the UN's 'new' definition, brand the US a terrorist State. Wouldn't we all love to ask Kofi how he would deal with the terrorist state of America? [We can almost hear the hysterical laughter coming from Perle, Wolfowitz, Rumsfeld, Kissinger and the rest.] It is little wonder the UN has earned the status of irrelevant in today's world.

It may be time for the pastures of Ghana - but let's not end it just yet - this is too absurd. Perhaps we should redefine "collateral damage" or "friendly fire" and just call it plain murder. Maybe the geniuses at the UN could understand why. We all hope their next 'brilliant' strategy is an improvement.

Who are you really attempting to deceive Kofi? It is obvious your feeble attempt at word-games is a means to regain relevance, but careful you do not define yourself as subservient to the 'might is right' ideology. For the rest of us however, we are left with a very clear understanding of the word WAR - the filthiest word in any language. There is no way to cleanse this word by oblique methods. Let's not miss the point, the assault on language is a precursor for action - beware, it's dictionary time for all us.

It seems obvious there is a rogue nation 'out there' disregarding international law and conventions and imposing its will on weaker nations, might I suggest forcing that nation to conform to international law. The "United Nations" has glorious meaning and by definition could stop any single

nation in its tracks. If you seek relevance, find it in your Charters and simply do your job.

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-68.html>