

DT

227

.U63

1984



a385949c

Understanding Libya's Role in World Politics



ATE DUE

09/10/08

Southwest Texas State University Library
0101496
0000
1
D 11227 J383496
Understanding Libya's role in
D 11 22 0292864 7

THE LIBRARY
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

DT
221
.U63
1984

Understanding Libya's Role In World Politics



THE LIBRARY
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

**Proceedings of a Symposium
Commemorating the
15th Anniversary of the
Great Al-Fateh Revolution
Held in Washington, D.C.
September 1, 1984**

**Published by the
People's Committee For Students Of
The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya**

PREFACE

"The First of September Revolution — the revolution of the youth — stands by the youth not only in the Arab homeland, but also all over the world. Therefore, we support the Student's movement, the popular movements and the liberation movements as well. For this is the objective of the Revolution."

Col. Muammar Qadhafi

In the observation of progressive political scientists a revolution does not occur in a vacuum; there must be serious causes for it to take place. The history and social conditions of a nation and its people have to be examined in order to be able to find such causes. The story of the Great Al Fatah Revolution of September 1, 1969 is the implementation of what the masses in Libya who constitute the workers, peasantry, women and students had long expected. In this regard, Muammar Qadhafi, the architect of the Revolution, has stressed that the Revolution belongs to the people of Libya and that the military that carried it out was only its vanguard.

Libya gained its independence in December, 1951 after a long struggle with colonialism and imperialism. There was the Spanish occupation of 1510, the Turkish and Italian rule, and finally the British and French occupation which ended in 1951. The average Libyan was most conscious and proud of his independence. Many of them abhorred the mortgaging and subordination of their sovereignty to western capitalist interest by King Idris, through unexplained alliances. Even after independence both Britain and the United States through the military bases they had in Libya, continued to influence the decision-making apparatus of the country. This state of affairs became a constant irritant for Libyans.

The regime of King Idris created no workable political system, nor anything like a political ideology. The King and his clique never even attempted to create a party system through which the country could be governed. As noted by Colonel Qadhafi, "the revolution occurred because of national, popular

and human considerations." In explaining some of the reasons beyond the Revolution, he stated that poverty, injustice, persecution of people, and the lack of proper housing were instrumental in bringing about the Revolution. Qadhafi and his fellow young officers deplored the illiteracy of more than 90 percent of the Libyan people; the lack of medical facilities for the masses, and the helplessness of the many. To Qadhafi and his colleagues, the money of the people was spent on royal palaces, medical treatment for the monarchy and the ruling classes outside Libya, while the Libyan people could not get treatment even at home.

Further, Muammar Qadhafi and the rest of the Free officers, saw Libya's feudal monarchical system, as a system created by the British in 1952, to reward the Emir Idris of Cyrenaica for his support during World War Two against Italian and German fascism. For them Libya's independence was superficial. There was no oil then. The country's ignominious standard of living made it — almost of necessity — dependent on hand-outs both from the British and Americans. With financial dependence went political dependence — a situation that was reinforced by British and American military presence, in a panorama of army and air force bases around Tripoli, Benghazi and Tobruk.

When Muammar Qadhafi and his fellow Free Unionist Officers toppled the (Western capitalist-oriented) regime of King Idris on First-September 1969, their aim was not merely the replacement of one political elite by another. Ever since the Revolution the devolution of political power to the people has been a consistent trend in the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The 1969 Revolution was truly a people's revolution supported by the Army, and led and organized by a group of young army officers who acted for the people.

In order to shed light on the Great September 1, 1969 Revolution and its achievement the People's Committee for Students of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya held a symposium in Washington, D.C., to commemorate the occasion. Various speakers with a knowledge on Libya and world affairs were invited to present papers and give lectures.

Salem Zubeidy, Chairman of the Students Committee made the opening remarks in which he highlighted the accomplishments of the Great Al Fateh Revolution.

SYMPOSIUM

Introduction by Brother Salem Zubeidy

Assalaam Aleikum!

Dear brothers and sisters,

Our honoured guests,

We welcome you today to this programme to commemorate the 15th Anniversary of the Great Al-Fateh Revolution.

History admonishes us that it is failure in understanding more than anything else that causes problems within societies and between nations — the failure to understand the needs of people, the failure to understand why these needs exist, a failure to understand the environment within which these needs, fears and suspicions arise. And it is this problem — lack of understanding — that requires to be addressed most urgently. For in the coming months and years the nations of the world face an increasingly difficult passage in international relations. This is all the more true of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the U.S.A.

A great deal depends on our collective ability to navigate safely towards peace, stability and understanding. The surest course lies in the fuller knowledge of each other for to know each other is to understand each other. It is with this in mind, then, that we have embarked on an effort to present our view of Libyan relations with the U.S. and with the world. To convey to you more about Libya, our relations, our heritage, our aspirations, needs and challenges that we face.

Today we have three eminently qualified scholars who are going to address the above mentioned topics. With this brief introduction we hope that we are going to open a window through which we can look at the Al Fateh Revolution and its accomplishments. We hope to share our findings with the people here, with the peoples in the Arab world, Africa, Latin America and the international community. It is hoped that we will fulfill the goals of the revolution — the goals of Freedom for Libya, the Arabs, the oppressed, Socialism in which people share the goods of life without grave differences between classes of

people, those who have and those who have not — and Unity — unity of the Arab people, unity of aspirations of the African continent and unity of the oppressed against their oppressors.

I have the honour now to introduce to you Dr. William Perdue. He is Professor of Sociology at Eastern Washington University. He is the author of a book on ideology and social problems and is currently completing a manuscript on Critical Sociology. At the same time he is working on projects which include books on the genesis of human society; that is a book on Jamahiriya concept. Another book of his, deals with the ideology of terrorism, and I think it is time we talk about that topic because of the understanding or misunderstanding that exists between us as Libyan students here, or as Libyans in the home country, and the hosts of this country. I mean the book is based on the definition of terrorism. What someone calls terrorists acts — others call freedom-fighting — so I hope that Prof. Perdue — I'm sure that he will present to us an objective view if there is an objective view on terrorism. The next lecture entitled "The Libyan Revolution and its Significance for Africa, southern Africa in particular", will be given by Dr. Alfred Moleah, of the African Studies at Temple University in Philadelphia.

The third lecture is by Dr. Mahmound Ayoub. He will speak to us on Islam and the Third Universal Theory.

So we will have three lectures and each will last for 45 minutes to be followed by a 15 minute discussion. The areas covered will be Terrorism, Arab Unity, Islam, and the Third Universal Theory.

THE IDEOLOGY OF TERRORISM: "Renganspeak" and the Politics of Paramoia

by *William D. Perdue, Ph.D.*

The question of terrorism has ascended to the level of an international obsession in the modern era. In the West, its spectre is raised along a continuum of issues ranging from police security for symbolic events, to the state control of dissident groups; from the safety of citizens traveling abroad to the formulation of foreign policy. Yet, upon considering the nature of the enigma, certain problems emerge. In the context of political philosophy, inquiry into terrorism is wrapped in the eternal questions of power, justice and liberation. And as is always true in human affairs, the appearance of a thing must be distinguished from its reality.

In a narrow sense, terrorism suggests the propagation of an intensive dread or fear. When defined in general political terms, it refers to the utilization of violence and fright to intimidate, subjugate and control. However, such conceptions often assume that the nature of terrorism is self-evident and proceed to focus purely on the behaviors of those involved. But no matter how popular the urge to take terrorism as a given, such a position obscures the range of meaning that may be assigned to human action.

Ultimately, terrorism is a label of discreditiation, a means of excluding those so branded from human standing. When applied to political behavior, it is a means of organizing both the perceptions and reactions of others in the world community. Once so defined, those affected often find themselves fighting the designation of international leper. Hence, the nature of their movement; its objectives, ideology and historical reason for being is dismissed out of hand. Paradoxically then, the very label of terrorism has of itself assumed a terrifying power.

Those ideas which interpret the nature and dimensions of human behavior do not arise in an historical vacuum. They are created, formed and shaped in the minds of people who participate in and respond to the conditions of their age. Yet,

not all people who would define the nature of terrorism exist as equal contributors to the debate. For the construction of this, as all other ideas and ideologies, is a function of power; of the ability to control events and to impose one's ways upon others against their will. It follows therefore that power consists of more than overt force and coercion; that within its nature must be found the ability to define events and to broadly disseminate the official view.

Historically, colonial and then neocolonial powers have plundered the human and natural resources of those called by Franz Fanon, "the wretched of the earth". The great plantations of the new world were built by the Africans, wrested from their native land, stacked like timber in the holds of slave ships, then broken from tribe and family, and sold into a terrible bondage ended only in death. Even with the decline of the slave trade, the nations of the northern hemisphere continued to transform the vast riches of the south into finished products that the original owners could not buy. And the labor in the North was provided by workers who owned neither factory or mill, tool or machine, their time or their job.

No doubt, had they been asked, victims then and now would define such conditions as those of constant terror. However, the ideologies that prevailed proved to be those of the master not the slave, of the colonizer not the colonized, of the owning class not those who sold their labor for a wage. Hence, racism converted the African into property, colonialism the native into primitive, and capitalism the worker into automation. In each case, the dominant ideology sought to legitimize the right of the few to dominate the many.

Ideology Defined

To this point we have employed the concept ideology without formal analytic boundaries. It is now necessary to delineate more clearly its sociological properties and dimensions. To begin, an ideology represents a thought-system. As such, each element of that system cannot be understood in isolation, but is rather interlocked with the other ideas that constitute the whole. More importantly, ideologies do not occur in a vacuum. In the sociological sense of the term, thought systems are fixed in an historical context. They cannot be disassociated from the events and other ideas (both contending and supportive) of their age (Reasons and Perdue, 1981: 29-93). Among liberal philosophers of the French Revolution,

ideology consisted of specific solutions to the problems of society. As a "science of ideas", it was to conform to the scientific knowledge of the day, offering an alternative world view to that advanced by the dominant ideological institution of the age: the Catholic Church (Drucker, 1974: 3-10). However, it was in the work of Karl Marx that the term assumed a certain critical quality and a new meaning. Ideology came to represent a distorted system of economic, political and social thought that reflected the interests of a particular ruling class. Thus, a dominant ideology becomes a means of control for those who own the major means of production and allocate the political resources of the state. And, in the later words of Karl Mannheim in his classic, *Ideology and Utopia*, "ruling groups can in their thinking become so intensively interest-bound to a situation that they are simply no longer able to see certain facts which would undermine their sense of domination" (1936: 40).

Two other points from Mannheim also inform our analysis of ideology. In the first of these he observes that politics is not merely a "struggle for power", but is first and foremost a "political conception of the world" (1936: 36). Put descriptively, it is a struggle for the hearts and minds of human beings. In this sense, ideology becomes a weapon not an academic exercise. In the second case, Mannheim makes a distinction between two conceptions of ideology: the particular and the total (1936: 55-59). These in turn differ on the basis of the level at which analysis is carried out. Those who conceptualize ideology as particular are prone to apply a criterion of factual truth as a method of criticism, seeking to reject those specific views that are demonstrably false. Hence at this purely psychological level, the adversary little more than a deceiver motivated by individual interests.

However, Mannheim's total conception of ideology lifts the analysis to a higher level of abstraction, and in the process raises the political stakes. At this level, those who advance a political conception of the world are challenged not for their specific factual distortions, but rather on the basis of their total world view. In Mannheim's total conception of ideology, the thought system is analyzed not as a problem of psychological motivation, but as an issue of the structural context prevailing at a certain period of history. For within that context, thought systems emerge that represent the contending positions of differing collectives or groups. The differences in these positions give rise not only to distinctive world-views, but to wholly different criteria for judging "truth".

The total conception of ideology transforms the nature of distortion from self-serving falsehood to a politically advantageous collective blindness. It also transforms those individuals who offer up these distortions into something more than concrete personalities who seek to preserve or expand their limited interests. Instead, they become in the words of Antonio Gramsci (1957), a modern Machiavellian prince. It was Gramsci who argued that the prince was not and is not confined to a particular historical figure. In the larger sense the prince is a political myth or an ideology that in turn represents a distinctive vision of world order. And as such, what leaders symbolize is far more important than who they are.

Fear and Loathing: On the Nature of Terrorism

The subject at hand is not ideology in general, but a more narrowly drawn thought-system centering on the nature of terrorism. Still, the analysis that follows is informed by the above distinctions. To comprehend the ideology of terrorism is to first understand the differences: between sociological and psychological conceptions of politics, between the world of ideas and that of the behavior defined by ideas, between visions that legitimize the present and those that see new utopian orders, and between the social realities of those who rule and those who are dispossessed.

Given these major points, it follows that the conception of terrorism and the criteria by which it is judged will not conform to some universal standard. Rather those systematic ideas that define the nature of terrorism can be expected to vary along a number of dimensions. These in turn will reflect the structural positions of concrete parties in conflict. And, given the international scope of this issue, it is logical to conceive of structural position in international terms. Although the contending parties will often appear to be specific nation-states or organizations, the analysis that follows is not confined to the narrow conflict of national interests or to the motivations of leaders. For inherent in the opposing conceptions of terror to follow is the clash of world visions, the striking together of incompatible global systems, the mortal struggle between old orders and ascendant societies.

From the vantage point of the Western world, terrorism will conform to certain categorical criteria. First of all, the focus will be on the activities of those movements that represent a danger to established governments, and particularly those within the

Western global system.¹ That system includes not only the centers of transnational corporation capitalism, but those nations of the third world led by an indigenous elite who support the Western model of "modernization". Consistent with this focus, the structural relationships among classes or between elites and the masses, or among nations and global systems will not figure prominently in Western accounts of terrorist activities. When an explanation is attempted it can be expected to assume the nature of international conspiracies directed by shadowy commands, allegedly financed by "madmen", "outlaw nations" or "evil empires".

The Western ideology of terrorism also advances an obsession with violent behavior. However, detached from its political, economic and social context such behavior can only be interpreted as mindless and random. The resulting simplification is evidenced in Claire Sterling's prologue to *The Terror Network*: "My own conclusion was that, Black or Red, right or left, there are no good killers and bad killers — only killers" (1981: 2). This is a part of a three stage process of "psychologizing" the political act. First, the violence of "outsiders" is unilaterally defined as terrorism. (See Dobson and Payne on how democracy strikes back: 137-157). Secondly, those so behaving are labeled as killers or murderers. (As with Sterling's comment above). And finally, the perpetrators of outsider violence are portrayed as irrational or crazed, exercising simply a twisted thirst for blood.

... it is clear that those who attempt bizarre, ostensibly political actions with uncertain or irrational outward motivations do so for what are internal, personal reasons... Those who would act out their fantasies by murdering the mighty are only one variant in the pool of psychotics whose acts can threaten transnational order (Bell, 1975: 10, italics added).

Of course, just whose "transnational order" is assumed, we are not informed.

The argument to this point reflects a consistent process in the Western weltanschauung: the privatization of public events. Here history is reduced to the acts of notorious persons (whether good or evil), movements are transformed into nothing more than the minds of believers, and system-analysis is replaced by psychoanalysis. Such private interpretations coalesce in the

1. See for example the bibliographical entry on Peter Junk's book, *Guerrilla and Terrorist Organizations: A World Directory and Bibliography*.

conception of "rational action", an idea at the center of Western accounts of terrorism.

It was the sociologist Max Weber (1958: 13-26, 76-78, 182-83) who described in length the rationalism of Western culture. For Weber, the rational form of action consisted of goal-directed behavior, the selection of realistic means toward the realization of the goal, and a careful weighing of all possibilities and consequences. However, to these must be added other elements in order to understand what is meant by rational conduct in the West. They are a marketplace conception of human goals, together with a hedonistic interpretation of the means to reach them.

Put succinctly, Western judgments about rational action assume a form of "cost-benefit" analysis in which political or other goals are commodified. Correspondingly, the means to such ends are defined as rational only to the extent that pleasure is maximized and pain is avoided. Thus in the West, political goals "make sense" or become "reasonable" only to the extent that their perceived material gains outweigh the economic loss required to realize them. Movements and leaders who continue to struggle despite the costs, who endure irrespective of the pain, and whose goals cannot be understood in terms of profit and loss stand to be judged by Western ideology as irrational.

Institutional Terrorism

It is only logical that outside the Western global system, terrorism will be defined by different criteria. Rather than a behavioral focus that isolates political violence from its historical context, an alternative vision may be expected to employ a structural analysis to redefine terrorism. What Mannheim described as utopian systems of thought will find injustice, coercion and brutality huilt into the institutional forms that constitute the Western world. Therefore, the state with its monopoly on the legal usage of international deadly force, the economic order that concentrates global wealth and misery, and the ideological forms that seek to legitimize that status quo may be defined as institutions of terror.

From the utopian side, institutional terror offers a sharply different conception. No longer defined as the random action of mindless rebels, terrorism becomes the systematic, organized, and patterned policies of an elite of power who would rule the earth. Hence, the origins of international terrorism are not to be found in a conspiracy of murky organizations or modern

Jacobins, but in a world order that openly and arrogantly dominates the weak. Events come to be interpreted not in the language of individual behavior, but in terms of movements, collective interests and the conflict of whole peoples. And when the term, "irrational" is used, it will be typically applied to global and societal systems, not personalities.

Utopian thought-systems, out of political necessity, move to dispense with Western "cost analysis"; a conception of rationalism that automatically assigns victory to the wealthy, the powerful and the historically dominant. Utopian goals such as independence from colonial or neocolonial rule, self-sufficiency and human dignity do not emerge from a detached calculation of pleasure and pain, but from the fires of oppression and the winds of hope. The utopian may be blind to the power of the adversary, the revolutionary may struggle in the shadow of the colossus, but such "irrational action" finds its legitimacy in history, where the only constant is change.

In the modern context of global political, economic and social conflict, the clash of competing ideologies marks the continuing struggle for human loyalty. Encased within Western ideology, terrorism is the behavior of outcasts, brigands and the deranged who are bent on destruction. From the utopian side, the Western conception distorts the institutional nature of terror and legitimizes the tyranny of the strong. Through defining as terrorist outsider movements for change, insider ideology makes "rational" the use of naked and organized force against them.

"Reaganpeak" and the Politics of Paranoia

In his futuristic political novel, 1984, George Orwell coined the term "newspeak", an "official language" devised to meet ideological needs in a new totalitarian order. Although Orwell was an anti-utopian who feared the left, the point of "newspeak" is certainly applicable to regimes of the radical right. For its purpose was to eliminate modes of thought that represented alternatives to the existing political order. "Heretical" words were suppressed, vocabulary reduced and the range of thought thereby restricted.

Now the analytic value of Orwell's work is minimal, but the suggestion that language may assume a manifestly ideological character is safe enough. And it is in this sense that the subtitle of this paper makes use of the term, "Reaganpeak". However, the ideological analysis of language must go beyond satirical

fantasies of organized thought control. It must rest instead on an understanding of the related ideological devices of symbolism and allegory.

Human beings live in a symbolic universe, and symbols represent the medium of social interaction. The most intricate of symbolic systems is language, and the use of complex and highly expressive languages distinguishes the human species. Of course, all words are symbols, but in considering the ideological properties of language certain words are more equal than others. This is not simply because of the precise definitional content (what the word denotes), but also because of the inherent emotional impact (what the word connotes). As shall be evident soon, ideological symbolism unleashes a powerful imagery with clear societal and intellectual consequences.

Human languages may be understood either figuratively or literally. However, it is in the former sense that one discerns the power of ideology. When Reagan or high ranking members of his administration speak, the language they use cannot be interpreted in terms of real and ordinary definitions. Rather, their view of the world transforms pronouncements on issues into an allegorical tale, in which people, things and happenings have another meaning. This is to say that ideology is superimposed upon reality, so that events, nations and leaders are woven together in a political fable. As with all fables, there will be clear distortions and common untruths. But of much greater significance are the hidden lessons such tales teach about perceived threats to the current centers of power.

At the societal level, symbolism and allegory are ideological devices that intensify what the Arabian social philosopher Ibn Khaldun termed solidarity: a collective sense of oneness or cohesion among the members of a given social order. Through imagery and fables with transcendent meaning, those with alternative visions of society or a changed world order are defined out. At the societal level, the process of uniting against the heretic strengthens the unity of the faithful. At the intellectual level, symbolism and allegory mark the conceptual boundary lines of "rational" argument, while providing a shorthand explanation for problems that closes debate.

There is more to "Reaganspeak" than symbolism and allegory. This particular form of political language exhibits a unique mode or manner of expression here termed "paranoid". Yet it is essential to understand that paranoia is simply a means of characterizing an ideological style. As tempting as it may be to do so, the claim is not being made that Ronald Reagan suffers

from a severe personality disorder. Only his psychiatrist knows for sure.

In the psychological literature, paranoia is used as in element in a number of diagnostic syndromes, the nature of which does not concern us here. However, the term does consistently refer to the manifestation of delusions; false beliefs that do not yield to contradictory evidence or experience. Paranoid delusions are often systematized, rigid and intricate. They evidence several themes, the most common ones being persecution and grandeur. For example, delusions of persecution are often marked by suspicions that plans are in place to dominate the world, or that one is a target of assassination, or that enemies have developed the latest in scientific devices and technological breakthroughs to impose their sinister will. (Appropriately enough, in the United States imaginary persecutors are often described as communists.) As to grandeur, delusional beliefs often include the conviction that one has a divine mission, or that one heads a supremely powerful organization, party, nation or religion, or that the failure of one's forces to overcome a sinister and committed foe will doom civilization.

One psychopathologist has argued that such delusions are often systematized in the form of a paranoid pseudocommunity (Cameron). In such a community dwell all of the imaginary dragons that threaten the kingdom of paradise. In a tightly organized delusional structure, there are real people constantly engaged in plots and conspiracies. In the case of a disintegrating personality, however, the residents of the paranoid pseudocommunity often include dark forces, supernatural demons and persons with transcendent powers.

"Reaganspeak" and the Ideology of Terrorism

Let us pause now to integrate the themes of this paper before testing our analysis in the contemporary arena of global politics. "Reaganspeak" refers to a type of political language in which the ordinary and concrete meanings of words give way to the higher interpretations of symbolism and allegory. The nature of "Reaganspeak" is ideological, a form of thought control intended to create popular support for administrative policies and the interests they serve. In this political language, simplified labels replace complex analysis, and images of danger or mission are evoked to discredit utopians and intensify mass solidarity.

An understanding of "Reaganspeak" goes beyond an analysis

of symbolic content. To comprehend it, one must be sensitive to its particular mode of expression, its unique style of communication that infuses the message. As an ideological description then, paranoia refers to a property of the political language of this administration. And irrespective of the issue, the recurring imagery is one of persecution and grandeur that denies reality and falsifies countervailing evidence. It is this sense of absolute rightness against total evil that marks the "politics of paranoia".

Finally, it should be apparent that "Reaganspeak" is a natural medium for the foreboding and forbidding ideology of terrorism. When terrorism is the subject of this political language, we can expect utopian struggles to be transformed into offensives to dominate the world, utopian leaders to be described as international Godfathers, rival world systems to be portrayed as "evil empires", resistance by the repressed to be dismissed as mindless violence and institutional terrorism presented as outside the jurisdiction of international law. Now with this theoretical argument as a guide, it is possible to consider a clear case history of terror and terrorism under the Reagan administration.

In the Eye of the Firestorm: The Case of Libya

Since the successful Al Fatha revolution of September 1, 1969, the nation of Libya and its revolutionary leader Muammar Qadhafi have become notorious in the United States and the Western World. For reasons that will be explored in due course, they have also been the focus of constant media headlines and broadcast reports. The sources of such reports have often included agencies of other Western governments, or regimes firmly entrenched in the Western world-system. However, it may certainly be said that the governmental agencies of the United States, especially under the Reagan administration, have been the source of much "official information" concerning Libya. Such insider information, together with public pronouncements by prominent members of the current U.S. administration, have with the aid of a vast corporate media network, disseminated an ideology of terrorism in which this North African state plays a leading role.

In its pronouncements on Libyan affairs, the Reagan administration has employed the distinctive political language analyzed above. It is obvious that what is here termed "Reaganspeak" is not confined to Libyan-U.S. relations. Indeed

the Soviet Union, Cuba and other nations that form the Second World System are frequently the subject of paranoid politics. However, the Libyan case is distinctive primarily because it is not a member of that system. To the contrary, both in terms of its structure and ideology, the modern Libyan Jamahiriya (State of the Masses) is clearly outside the orbit of these contending global orders. And for a superpower to become obsessed with a nation of the Third World of development is in and of itself a puzzle. This is a key point and we shall return to it at a later point.

Ronald Reagan was elected to the Presidency of the United States in November of 1980. His victory was promptly called a "mandate" by the Republican Party because of the decisiveness of his defeat of Jimmy Carter.² By the end of Reagan's first six months in office, Muammar Qadhafi had come to be described in persecutorial terms. He was labeled in the Western press as "the most dangerous man in the world" (Newsweek, July 20, 1981: 28).

An exhaustive review of "Reaganspeak" as it applies to Libya and the ideology of terrorism is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is possible to review certain examples of this political language as it has emerged in the context of crucial episodes during the first Reagan term. We shall begin with the Gulf of Sirte encounter and proceed to examine the "hit team" scenario and finally the mysterious mining of the Red Sea and the Suez. Other random comments on Libya will also be introduced to demonstrate the nature of "Reaganspeak".

It is crucial to remember that this political language is not confined to Reagan personally. To the contrary, other members of his administration as well as unofficial members of the American elite and the media have contributed to transforming Libya into the leading symbol of terrorism. Also recall that the "world view" expressed is not confined to the Reagan Administration. Rather, it is the product of a global system headed by the United States; a system commonly known as the First World of Development. The line of our logic is therefore clear. Initially we must understand the nature of "Reaganspeak". Then, we must place that political language in

2. Actually, Reagan was elected by a vote of some 28 percent of the adult population in the United States. This was due in large measure to the failure of almost half of the potential electorate to vote. Such an example of minority rule would be seen by the utopian, Qadhafi as a confirmation of the "fraud of representative democracy". See Part I of The Green Book.

the broader context of an ideology of terrorism. And finally, we must set this idea-system in its international structural milieu. For the ideology of terrorism is the continuation of war by other means, not merely on Libya but that which this nation symbolizes.

In August of 1981, two Libyan Su-22's were shot down by two U.S. Navy Tomcat fighter aircraft equipped with the most sophisticated weapons computers. Although the specifics of the engagement remain under dispute, it occurred over the Gulf of Sirte, somewhere between twenty-five and sixty miles from the Libyan coast. The Gulf of Sirte forms a deep indentation dividing two major regions of Libya, Tripolitania on the West and Cyrenaica on the East, and is thus of the greatest historical and strategic significance to the North African nation. (Libya had informed the United Nations as early as 1973 that it considered the Gulf of Sirte to be an integral part of its territorial waters).

Despite longstanding Libyan claims, the Reagan administration sent the Sixth Fleet into the Gulf of Sirte to conduct war games. However, naval exercises are not games especially when conducted in disputed waters. From the Libyan side, such a display of sea power could only be considered a provocative example of military intimidation. The political language that followed this encounter appears to confirm that the intimidation was intended.

Two days after the Sirte episode, Reagan declared from aboard the carrier U.S.S. Constellation, "Let friend and foe alike know America has the muscle to back up its words" and further that the action "sent a message to the enemies of freedom" (Newsweek, August 31, 1981). The theme of a justified reliance on military power continued from other quarters. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense and Director of the C.I.A. James R. Schlesinger hailed the "use of force without apology" (Washington Post, August 21, 1981). Reagan ally and syndicated columnist George Will wrote, "when the tail of a stallion whisks away a fly, the fly has a crisis, the stallion does not" (Washington Post, August 23, 1981). And a year after the Sirte air battle, speaking on the broader question of the role of naval power in the Middle East and the Mediterranean, Secretary of the Navy John Lehman employed a similar metaphor: "Friends and enemies alike realize we are in the Middle East to stay, that we have the will to use military force if necessary to defend our interests and that we have the muscle to carry out these commitments" (U.S. News and World Report, August 2, 1982). Before the dust from the Sirte incident had settled, another

incredible scenario unfolded. In the late fall of 1981, the broadcast and printed media in the United States began to circulate tales of a Libyan assassination team that had entered the United States over the November 30 weekend. The team was said to "have plans to kill the President by shooting down Air Force One, the Presidential jet; attacking a Presidential motorcade with rocket fire; or shooting at close range with small arms. If the President could not be attacked, the team reportedly was to strike at other U.S. officials or the President's family" (Copson, 1982: 5). Although one official government brief mentioned only an "unnamed non-American source" (Copson 1982: 4) for substantiation of the report, during the month of December, the "hit team" caper became the subject of a media blitz.

For his part, Muammar Qadhafi called Reagan's reputed belief in the "contract" as "silly" and "ignorant" and asked that the evidence be made public. Reagan responded that "we have the evidence and he knows it". However, no proof was offered, a disconcerting fact that did not dissuade the means of influence in the United States from rushing to judgment.

Other studies have raised serious questions about the wide range of contradictions in the hit squad accounts (Perdue, 1984) and the reliance of the media on U.S. sources, especially the C.I.A., the State Department, the F.B.I., the Secret Service and the Executive office. Of course, Israeli intelligence and the infamous and ubiquitous "unnamed source" were also prominently cited (Coleman, 1984). However, despite Qadhafi's denials, the contradictions in the accounts, and the absence of credible evidence made available to the public, the "hit squad" myth was transformed by the media into a concrete episode in the ideology of terrorism.

The intention of this paper, however, is to examine the political language of "Reaganspeak" in the context of assassination team allegations. Our examples do not exhaust the relevant declarations, nor do they constitute a scientifically drawn sample. However, when combined with other pronouncements cited here, they represent concrete examples that should help to clarify the analytic concepts that are developed in the earlier part of this paper.

On Thanksgiving night, November 26, 1981, Frank Reynolds reported on the A.B.C. evening news that it was known that Libyan agents were "in this country for the purpose of assassinating the highest officials of the U.S. Government". On December 4, 1981, Dan Rather of C.B.S. declared that "a squad of

terrorists infiltrated the United States on a mission to kill the President and his top aids". On December 6, 1981, a State Department spokesperson reacting to Qadhafi's denial of the "hit squad" affair stated: "We certainly hope that Qadhafi's denial means that he will abandon the use of terrorism and assassination as a part of his foreign policy. When he has stopped, we will know it" (Copson, 1982: 18).

On December 9, C.B.S. reporter Phil Jones told viewers that the alleged hit team was sitting in Mexico and that "intelligence reports indicate that the team has been in contact with the Weather Underground terrorist group". On December 9, an editorial in the Washington Post charged that "no one familiar with Col. Muammar Qadhafi's record of murder, subversion and aggression can doubt that it was prudent for American officials to take seriously whatever they may have learned. . . . And on December 10, President Reagan requested Americans in Libya to leave the country while Deputy Secretary of State and Reagan confidant William P. Clark announced that U.S. passports, except for those of journalists, would be declared invalid for travel to Libya. Clark charged that American residents were in "imminent danger" and declared that unspecified legal steps would be taken to force their departure if necessary. (In a U.S. Department of State background report on Libya, it is ominously noted that the misuse of an American passport is a criminal offense).

In the aftermath of this episode, additional bizarre events continued to transpire. On January 5, 1982, "the New York Times reported that editors of a Turkish newspaper and a U.S. citizen believed that photographs of a man seen in St. Peter's square on May 13, 1981, the day of the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II, bore a resemblance to one of the figures in a composite drawing released by U.S. authorities of the alleged Libyan assassination team" (Copson, 1982: 17, italics added). Libya was again implicated, and again without evidence, in the shooting of a military attaché at the U.S. embassy in Paris on January 18, 1982. And on January 21, the New York Times reported a State Department charge that Libya had converted 400 U.S. built trucks sold for agricultural use only into vehicles capable of carrying soviet tanks (italics added).

Finally, on March 10, 1982, an embargo on imports of Libyan oil was announced by the State Department. The rationale was that Libya was continuing to support terrorist and subversive activities. In addition, licenses were to be required for almost all exports to this African state. Simultaneously, the State

Department charged that Libya had unsuccessfully conspired to "bomb a dance attended by hundreds of Americans in Khartoum" (Copson, 1982: 16, italics added).

Although it is impossible to define the intentions of Reagan, his court, and a compliant media in this event, the consequences are matters of fact. Shortly after the hit team scenario unfolded, most American residents were forced out of Libya and economic sanctions were applied. The first of these facts relieved the Reagan Administration from having to explain why so many Americans were content to live in "imminent danger" in a "terrorist" state. The second was an attempt to add economic intimidation to the military muscle symbolized in the State episode.

The most recent event to fix Libya as the symbolic center of terrorism is that of the reported mining of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Suez during the Summer of 1984. Some seventeen ships under the flags of six or so nations have reported damage, though none were sunk. To date, despite extensive minesweeping operations, no mines have been recovered and although at least one group has claimed responsibility, no reliable evidence has been produced as to the identity of the offending party. Quite predictably, however, Libya again was implicated. The wire services reported on August 22, 1984 that General Ibrahim El Orabi, Chief of Staff of the Egyptian armed forces, blamed the Jamahiriyah for the mining on the basis of new evidence that could not be revealed (Spokane Spokesman Review, August 22, 1984:3, italics added). El Orabi's charge followed widely reported earlier "suspicions without proof" by Egypt's Hosne Mubarek that Libya was responsible.

Now, it might be noted that from the viewpoint of Libya and others attached to utopian ideologies, the voice may be Mubarek's but the words come from Washington, D.C. And also from the utopian side, while there is mystery about who mined the Red Sea, there is no doubt about a similar episode. It was the Reagan Administration found to be in violation of international law by the World Court for the illegal mining of a waterway used for international shipping. This was of course for the C.I.A. planned, sponsored and executed mining of three Nicaraguan ports. Predictably enough, despite often critical coverage of this episode, the label "terrorism" was not attached to the Reagan Administration by the Western media.

Of course the litany of allegations and loose characterizations do not always conveniently cluster around major scenarios. There are other relevant examples of "Reaganspeak" that

demonstrate the construction of an ideology of terrorism. Vice President George Bush has said of Qadhafi: "He's the world's principal terrorist and trainer of terrorists" (Time, Oct. 19, 1981: 28). Former Secretary of State and head of Reagan's commission on Central America, Henry Kissinger, declared on national television that had Libya been taken care of, Anwar Sadat of Egypt might have avoided assassination (Ibid). Reagan's Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Chester Crocker, labeled Qadhafi as "probably the most potent and disastrous source of destabilization" on the continent (Newsweek, July 20, 1981: 43). And Reagan's ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, in a nationally televised speech before the Republican Convention on August 20, 1984 set forth a scenario that included Libya as an example of Soviet expansionism.

Kirkpatrick has become a notorious exponent of Reaganspeak both nationally and internationally. However, her contributions to the ideology of terrorism are significant. In a 1979 piece in *Commentary*, she argued that "authoritarian" regimes were less repressive than "totalitarian" ones. This intriguing distinction provides ideological justification for U.S. support of right-wing power structures (such as those of El Salvador, the Philippines, and Chile) and the subversion and destabilization of "unfriendly" governments (such as those of Libya, Cuba, and Nicaragua). In the words of one of her coworkers, Kirkpatrick "believes the U.S. has been kicked around in the world and that its time to negotiate from strength" (Newsweek, July 6, 1981: 21). From the Utopian side, Kirkpatrick's ideological dress is that of a cowboy. In the language of this paper, her pronouncements reveal the delusions of international grandeur that mark the paranoid style of "Reaganspeak".

One other instance of the Reagan administration's war of images is worthy of note. On May 29, 1981, before the Sirte incident, former Reagan Secretary of State Alexander Haig charged that Libya's oil revenues "are almost exclusively diverted to the purchase of armaments, the training of international terrorists, and the conduct of direct interventionism in the neighboring states of Northern Africa" (italics added). Although much of the political language on terrorism is confined to murky declarations based on shadowy sources, this particular statement lends itself to empirical test. In the 1984 Europa Yearbook, we find that in 1982 Libyan oil revenues amounted to some ten billion dollars. In the same year, defense expenditures were approximately 210 million dinars or

709 million dollars (p. 1946). In other words, defense spending amounted to some seven percent of total petroleum revenues. Stated another way, Libyan defense spending calculated on a per capita population base of 3.2 million, amounted to \$222.00.

Let us compare such expenditures with the military budget of the United States. In 1983, the government claimed defense expenditures of some 212 billion dollars. On a population base of 233.7 million, this amounts to a per capita sum of \$906.00, over four times the Libyan figure (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1984: 322, 6).

A more accurate statement by Haig would have centered on the massive Libyan growth in public education, social welfare, agriculture, industry, transportation and communications. In 1981/82 for example, the Jamahiriya had 4,286 primary, preparatory, secondary, teacher training and technical schools with 1,049,000 enrolled, almost 1/3 of the total population (Europa, 1984: 1950). One of the most striking and expensive undertakings is the current 3.3 billion dollar project to lay 2,000 km of pipe to carry 5 million cubic meters of water per day from beneath the Sahara to agricultural projects and population centers on the Mediterranean coast (Europa, 1984: 1946).

It is clear that the Reagan administration's allegations concerning Libya are unproven. However, taken together they represent a case study in ideological warfare. As argued earlier, the political language of Reaganspeak is a medium through which the ideology of terrorism is constructed and disseminated. In the case of Libya, we can discern the allegorical and symbolic dimensions of that language, as well as the paranoid nature of Reagan politics.

To be precise, it appears that Reaganspeak has transformed Libya and Qadhafi into an allegorical tale in which the forces of absolute good seek to vanquish absolute evil. The portrait of the desert mystic, leading a backward people toward the destruction of Western civilization is more than a matter of particular ideology. It goes beyond intentional fraud and deceit, ignorance and racism. Furthermore, the total ideology of international terrorism, whether those in the Reagan court realize it or not, eclipses both personalities and the conflict of specific nations. This ideology, and the language by which it is formed, is an historical reaction by the custodians of a global system struggling to retain dominance through all available means. Hence, in a symbolic sense, the combatants are not Libya and the United States or Qadhafi and Reagan. They are rather two tomorrows, two seasons, two worlds. Thus, in dialectical fashion,

the dawn of a new day struggles to break free from the power of the night, the Spring of rebirth contends with the Winter of death and a universe of humanity seeks to rise from the graveyard of the elite.

The metaphors of Reaganspeak betray the gravity of this political, economic and social struggle to the death. From the utopian view, this is the language of the cowboy with its imagery of force, coercion and intimidation. In Reaganspeak, the operational terms are "muscle", "position of strength", "stallion" and the old imperialist phrase, "sphere of influence". The enemies are "international terrorists", "communist conspiracies" and "Marxist Revolutionaries". This is the language of distrust and suspicion, arrogance and vanity, splendor and privilege. It bristles with the political delusions of persecution and grandeur, and it finds rationalizations for policy in imaginary alliances, secret communities and shadowy plots. It masks a government that confuses tyranny for strength, wealth for worth and chauvinism with diplomacy.

The Third Force

Earlier in this paper we argued that the siege of Libya was something more than a narrowly drawn demonstration of the arrogance of power. Far behind the paranoid politics of the Reagan administration and the Western version of the ideology of terrorism looms a new stage in the historical process of change. That which has emerged in Libya in fifteen short years is new and symbolic, both in terms of its political, economic and social structures and the sweep of its ideology. Because of the rapid transformation of this nation along a path that is clearly independent of both the first and second global systems, modern Libya can be described as the Genesis Society.

That which is new in Libya includes the political organization of the Janahiriya, an intricate structure of popular congresses, people's committees, trade unions, vocational syndicates and a 1,112 member General People's Congress with its General People's Committee. Democracy is here conceived as direct and participatory, and state power vested in the masses. In the economic structure of the Genesis Society, what is new is the attempt to implement a human philosophy of labor expressed by the Leader of the Revolution in the phrase "worker partnership".

In its institutionalized form, the worker partnership seeks to avoid the historical dilemmas of both the capitalist system with

its unemployment, worker alienation, concentration of wealth and expandable labor; and the state socialist system with its managerial elite and bureaucratic inertia. In practical terms, this means that the people have the right to meaningful and productive work and to a voice in the organization of the workplace. A wide range of free public services, including education and health care, are also provided (Perdue, 1984).

Despite the need to transform the material basis of a land plundered for 2500 years by colonial and neocolonial forces, the Libyan vision has not turned inward. That vision, articulated well by Muammar Qaddafi in *The Green Book*, calls for the unification of the repressed people of the world into what can be called a Third Force. It is the utopian ideology and revolutionary action designed to build the Third Force that has catapulted Libya, its people and leaders into the flashpoint of modern history.

It is commonplace today to speak of three worlds of development, with the first global system representing the West headed by the United States. The economic basis of the first global system is founded in transnational corporation capitalism, with its imperatives of growth and profit. It is increasingly dependent on the exploitation of both human and natural resources in the developing and underdeveloped world. The second system represents those societies organized under site socialism, symbolically headed by the U.S.S.R.

Now the third world generally refers to those societies of Africa, Asia, South and Central America who despite often rich human and natural resources have been historically exploited by external powers, often aided by an indigenous elite. From the vantage point of utopian ideology, Qaddafi and the Libyan people foresee the emergence of an independent third system capable of protecting its members from foreign domination. Such a development, especially among third world nations on the periphery of the capitalist core, would clearly produce an historic upheaval. The stakes are high as the following comment makes clear.

The overriding goal of American policy has been to construct a system of societies that are open to free economic intervention by private enterprise (which in many ways is publicly subsidized). The goal was formulated clearly by George Ball (a State Department official) who "urged a greater unification of the world economy to give full play to the benefits of multinational corporations,"

which are "a distinctly American development". Through such corporations, he observed, "it has become possible for the first time to use the world's resources with maximum efficiency" — for the benefit of whom he does not reveal (Chomsky, in Chambliss, 1973: 95).

The thought of Muammar Qadhafi, as expressed in both *The Green Book* and his public declarations provide us not only with an example of utopian ideology of the total form, but enables us to understand in part why Libya today is in the eye of the firestorm. For if a third global system is to rise from the ashes and chaos of a colonial past, if a third force is to sweep the developing and underdeveloped world, there must be unity. And Qadhafi's vision advances four interrelated levels of unity.

At the national level, Qadhafi grapples with the historical problem of factionalism and tribalism rooted not only in the colonial past of Libya, but in many nations of the Third World. He writes:

The nation is the individual's national umbrella and it is wider than the social umbrella provided by the tribes to its members... if the tribes of a nation quarrel and seek their own interests, that nation is threatened... The national political structure is damaged when it secedes to the lower social level, namely the family and the tribe, and attempts to act in their manner and to adopt their views (Qadhafi, 1976: 96-97).

Qadhafi is quick, however, to reject the chauvinism that threatens his utopian vision. He continues: "National fanaticism, the use of national force against weak nations, or the national progress which is the outcome of plundering from other nations, are evil and harmful to humanity" (Ibid: 97).

National unity is only the first level. The utopian argues that a larger nation, an Arab nation, must be forged from divided Arab states. In a conference in Madrid in December of 1980, Qadhafi noted "Arab unity is a goal which can only be achieved through people's revolution, when the revolutionary committees are formed everywhere in the Arab world, this will enable the Arab masses to take power. Once this happens, all existing borders between the Arab countries will automatically cease to exist" (1982: 9)

The third level is Pan-Africanism. At the second Pan-African Youth Festival in Tripoli in August of 1983, the Utopian leader spoke to the issue of continental solidarity captured in the phrase **AFRICA FOR AFRICANS**.

The establishment of the African youth movement deserves all my respect and appreciation. It is an indication and proof of the progress and awakening of our Continent. When the African youth from different states meet in one place, speaking different languages and are of different colors and different parts of the African Continent, they meet and speak one language, the language of determination to liberate this continent, the language of African resurrection and awakening (1983: 17).

The Green Book is humanity's guide through the journey of And finally, the fourth level of unity.

The *Green Book* is humanity's guide through the journey of the final emancipation. It does not concern the Arabs only. They are a nation amongst nations which will be guided by *The Green Book*. . . The *Green Book's* explanations contribute to drawing the present and future portrait of international unity, whether Arab or any other nation (1980b: 21).

Although the utopian vision calls first for third world liberation, it is also clear that Muammar El-Qadhafi is an internationalist and universalist. Ultimately, he calls for a new world order in which "the house is for its occupant, the land is for everyone and workers are partners and not wage-earners" (1980: 22).

The Utopian Conception of Terrorism

The resources of Libya, the dramatic improvement in the lives of ordinary people, the cultivation of broad based political activity, the incessant attempts at mergers and alliance with other states, the support of various mass based people's movements; all of these are material facts. When combined with a new universalist ideology that departs radically from both capitalism and communism, the new Jamahiriyian society does indeed threaten to "destabilize" the existing world order and its present beneficiaries. But from the utopian side, destabilization is instead a necessary and dynamic struggle for freedom. And those who wage that struggle are vulnerable to the charge of "terrorism".

Now we come full circle. What then, is the utopian conception of terrorism? At the onset, we must remember that utopians interpret fear and loathing at a higher level of analysis: in such

arrangements as the structural relationships among nations, the institutionalization of deadly force in the organs of the state, and the maintenance of order in a world yearning for change. Again in the words of Qadhafi, "Israel is terrorizing the Arabs with its nuclear program. The West German people are terrorized because the United States is putting its missiles there. We in Libya are terrorized by the presence of the American fleet in the Mediterranean. This is real terrorism" (Newsweek, July 20, 1981: 40).

The Terrorism of Imperialism

Continuing this new definition, a place of prominence in utopian thought would logically be given to the terrorism of imperialism. With the advent of the Reagan Administration, the world has witnessed a revitalization of the Monroe Doctrine, an early nineteenth century declaration of U.S. hegemony in the Western Hemisphere. In El Salvador, it has taken the form of massive U.S. support³ for the shadow government of death squads, landowners and a military that represses its own people. Utopians consider the Duarte regime a front, legitimized in the United States by a demonstration election; that provides the imagery but not the substance of democracy (Herman and Brodhead, 1984).

The Reagan regime has sought to gain public support for its policies through popularizing the expression "our backyard" in reference to Central America, a label applied earlier to Cuba in the wake of its revolution. Again from the utopian side, such a description blatantly degrades the sovereignty of indigenous peoples, rendering their self-determination a secondary concern. It flows from the conviction that what is good for the United States is good for the Hemisphere. Hence "our backyard" joins such phrases as "spheres of influence" and "vital interests" in the lexicon of imperialism.

The Terrorism of Internal Colonialism

Also consistent with the utopian conceptualization is the terrorism of internal colonialism. Internal colonialism retains all the crucial properties of colonialism, save that of rule by a foreign, geographically separate nation. Here the state

3. In May of 1984, the U.S. House of Representatives capitulated to the Reagan administration a request for aid to El Salvador with an appropriation of 100 million dollars.

represents the interests of a dominant class, race or political elite. Large, indigenous populations face political disenfranchisement, economic exploitation and cultural extinction through the ordinary workings of major social institutions. Although these are a part of the national fabric, they confront subjugated peoples as alien forces of coercion. And as with historical colonialism, the internal variety often seeks legitimacy in racism.

Racism, which at base teaches the genetic superiority of politically dominant groups, underlies many varieties of internal colonialism. Only a partial list of forms of internal colonialism founded on racism would include apartheid in South Africa, zionism in modern Israel and the subjugation of Native American tribes in the United States. Under apartheid, a white tribal minority has institutionalized a system of racial segregation in which the black majority finds its labor exploited, its political rights negated and its humanity denied.

The ideology that legitimizes apartheid includes a racially based interpretation of Calvinism and African identity. Under the former, Dutch and other European settlers considered themselves the elect of God on a holy mission to civilize a heathen land. The settlers came to call themselves "Afrikaners" ("African" in Dutch), taking unto themselves the identity of original inhabitants. As the Dutch East India Trading Company did not send the first Europeans into Southern Africa until the middle of the Seventeenth Century, the Dutch claim to native status appears a bit late. However, what could not be achieved by birth became twisted by Afrikaner ideology which in effect denied human standing to the indigenous population. They became in the eyes of the Afrikaner, non-entities.

Zionism stands as a second variety of internal colonialism, and from the utopian conception of the third world an example of institutionalized terrorism. In a material sense, zionism is a movement for the advancement of the Jewish national state of Israel. As a political ideology, zionism is a system of thought that seeks to legitimize Israeli nationalism in the holy land. However, as in the case of South Africa, the Middle East was already inhabited before the coming of a trickle of Jewish settlers in the Nineteenth Century changed to a flood after the issuance of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 by the British government, and the rise of Nazi power in the subsequent decades. And as with apartheid, zionism was imposed by European settlers on a native population, in this case the Palestinian Arab (Moleah, 1984).

Zionist ideology denies the historical relationship between Palestinian Arabs and their land. Zionists who seek religious vindication for Israeli nationalism claim they are the chosen of God, descended from Abraham to whom Jehovah gave the promised land. Those of a more secular view claim that the historical absence of an independent nation-state based on some centralized political organization means that Palestinians as such have never existed. Hence, the land conveniently reverts to the Jews whose progenitors are claimed by Zionists to have established first a monarchy, and later a "Jewish Commonwealth" that dated from 142 B.C. to 70 A.D. (Company, 1976: 7-9).⁴

From such premises logically flow the political, economic, cultural and psychological dilemmas of modern Palestinian Arabs in Israel: the absence of important political power, the seizure of land, settlements on the West Bank, political imprisonment and torture, the demolition of homes, and the loss of identity (Said, 1979). Today's Palestinians must also contend with something new: the virulent Zionism of Meir Kahane, newly elected to the Israeli Knesset on a pledge to remove all Arabs from Israel. Given the historical and ideological nature of Zionism, those on the utopian side would be prone to confirm United Nations Resolution 3379 (Nov. 10, 1975) which concluded "that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination". Such a judgment stands as a supreme irony for a people who experienced the horrors of Hitler's final solution.

The conditions of the Arabs in Palestine and the indigenous Africans in Southern Africa are paralleled in some important ways in the lives of the Native Americans in the United States. A lost Italian explorer who thought he had reached the West Indies "discovered" the new world in 1492, labeling the indigenous peoples "Indians". The voyage of Columbus presaged the coming of other European explorers who claimed various parts of the entire Western Hemisphere for their respective monarchs. But once again, the land was already

occupied. In what is now the continental United States, new settlements were established by European outcasts: religious zealots, fortune hunters and those with nothing left to lose made the perilous journey. In what may now be viewed as one of the great historical errors, indigenous peoples quite frequently extended the hand of friendship.

In the three centuries subsequent to the establishment of the first British colonial settlement at Jamestown in 1607, the native population of what is now the continental United States was decimated. Lacking immunity to the diseases brought by European settlers, enduring starvation due to the white slaughter of game, facing sophisticated weapons that replaced the courage of the warrior with the technical proficiency of kill ratios, the indigenous people suffered a population decline of over ninety percent. By 1910, before the demographic spiral began to climb upward, the true native population in the United States had declined to slightly over 200,000, a figure some view as somewhat optimistic. Thus, at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, native tribes in the United States were labeled "the vanishing Americans".

The history of internal colonialism for Native Americans reflects a common colonial ideology. Here the native was described as "savage", their victories as "massacres" and their culture as backward. Such premises contributed to self-hatred and cultural disavowal while legitimizing the loss of land and resources. The total land area once home to native tribes amounted to some 2.3 billion acres. Today, the amount of Indian trust land is some 50 million acres, or 2 percent of the total. Native Americans were forced onto these reservations through massive population transfers ordered by the state primarily during the 19th century. At the time of their establishment, reservation lands were undesirable and located far from the ancestral homes of the indigenous tribes.

Ironically, beneath these often barren lands resides an abundance of coal, uranium and other minerals, the value of which was not understood by the white elite of earlier eras. However, despite such riches the first Americans remain for the most part an impoverished people. Their mineral and other natural wealth has been exploited by giant energy corporations, who pay little for the right to such resources. Those seeking the use of reservation wealth have often been aided by the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs. The B.I.A. oversees and often negotiates contracts for resource exploitation as these lands are held in trust for their native "owners". Ownership in this case is

4. This claim appears to overlook the fact that the "Commonwealth" was a subject state of the Roman Empire from approximately 63 B.C., the time of Pompey's Syrian campaign. Hence, any claim to significant political independence for a Jewish nation must be traced to the monarchal era beginning with Saul in the Eleventh Century B.C. and ending with the Babylonian conquest in 587 B.C. One wonders at the nature of the modern world should it conform to the political reality of twenty-six centuries past.

qualified therefore by paternalism, a common property of colonial relationships (Raines, 1979).

The problems do not end here. The exploitation of native resources have proceeded with little respect for the traditional lifestyle or culture of the original Americans. For example, on the Navajo reservation near Fruitland, New Mexico the Four Corners Power Plant belches pollution that spoils the grass and water, thus endangering the health of both Indian and the sheep on which they depend. The Bureau of Indian Affairs negotiated a coal contract with General Electric and Utah International Corporations who own the power plant. The Navajos were paid a royalty of 15 cents a ton, ten percent of what white landowners could command. Once again, the B.I.A. had protected the native population from making a bad business deal (Ibid). Once again, it was the Wasi'chu who prospered.

Wasi'chu is the Lakota (Sioux) word that roughly translates: "the greedy one who takes the fat" (Redhouse, in Johansen and Maestas, 1979: 11). It was used by the Lakota to characterize the white race. It can also be used to describe a form of internal colonialism marked by the theft of resources, population. Wasi'chu is the Lakota (Sioux) word that roughly translates: "the greedy one who takes the fat" (Redhouse, in Johansen and Maestas, 1979: 11). It was used by the Lakota to characterize the white race. It can also be used to describe a form of internal colonialism marked by the theft of resources, population transfer, historical genocide, cultural imperialism and the ideology of white supremacy.

The Terrorism of Military Intimidation

From the utopian side, the spectrum of institutional terrorism includes military intimidation, which in turn runs the gamut from invasion to war games, from an arms spiral to the nuclear death race and the militarization of space. Here the problem of definition is more tangled because the employment of armed forces by western powers and their client states is described by a different vocabulary. For example, whereas the Palestinian resistance is typically labeled terrorism, the invaders of Lebanon were and are commonly termed in the Western media, Israeli defense forces. In the utopian view, it was these "defense forces" who conducted a Clauswitzian war against a civilian population and presided over the Phalange slaughter at the Sabra and Shatila camps outside Beirut.

In October of 1983, a superpower invaded one of the world's

smallest and weakest island nations. Claiming a threat to the safety of U.S. citizens living in Grenada and citing an urgent request on the part of the Organization of East Caribbean States that the United States participate in an invasion of that beleaguered island, Ronald Reagan resorted in full fury to the U.S. "special relationship" with the Caribbean (Waters, 1982). And consistently, his administration continued to charge that Grenada had been readied as a Cuban/Soviet base for the export of terror.

From the utopian side the assault on Grenada is a clear manifestation of the structural form of terrorism rooted in the subjugation of weaker states by the more powerful. And although the precipitating event was the callous assassination of the revolutionary leader, Maurice Bishop, this murder simply created a pretext for an illegal military intervention. (Bishop himself believed that his nation was marked for such an incursion.) It is of course factual that the Reagan administration had for at least a year prior to the invasion, openly marked Grenada as a threat to U.S. interests (Sono, 1984: 13).

Given the utopian conception, the terrorism of military intimidation need not be limited to outright invasions. War games, exercises and manoeuvres by the military forces of superpowers and their client states are instruments of fear and loathing. Although examples are plentiful, two will suffice. To begin, the naval exercises of the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, including the Libyan gulf of Sirte, feature the carrier Nimitz. The Nimitz is estimated to have over 100 nuclear bombs aboard, approximately 30 of which are in the one to two megaton range. Such weapons are known as "city-busters".

Secondly, on November 9, 1981, the U.S. conducted a large military training exercise known as Bright Star. The exercise included paratroop drops in Western Egypt, a landing in Oman, the dispatch of a small force to Somalia, and flights by B-52 bombers from the U.S. to a bombing range in Egypt. Operation Bright Star was initiated one day after the Washington Post reported that the Reagan Administration had assured the Egyptian government of protection against the Soviet Union should Egypt decide to attack Libya.

Nuclear Terrorism

From the Western side, nuclear terrorism fits one of two scenarios. The most common portrayal is one of a shadowy and ill-defined organization that seeks to advance its ends through

the actual detonation of a nuclear device, or using such a weapon as an instrument of blackmail. The second raises the spectre of nuclear proliferation into states outside the Western orbit of control or influence. In Western ideology, nuclear weapons are dangerous only if they belong to somebody else. Perhaps we can test that conviction.

Six time Pulitzer Prize nominee Robert Scheer begins a recent book on the Reagan Administration's conception of nuclear war thusly:

President Ronald Reagan had been in office less than a year when he approved a secret plan for the United States to prevail in a protracted nuclear war. This secret plan, outlined in a so-called National Security Decision Document, committed the United States for the first time to the idea that a global nuclear war can be won (1982: 3).

The quotations assembled by Mr. Scheer from many members of the administration offer a penetrating look at Reagan'speak.

1. Louis O. Giuffrida, head of the Federal Emergency Management Agency: "It (nuclear war) would be a terrible mess, but it wouldn't be unmanageable" (1982: 3).
2. William Chipman, F.E.M.A., responding to a question on whether American institutions would survive an all-out nuclear exchange with the U.S.S.R.: "I think they would eventually, yeah. As I say, the ants eventually build another anthill" (Ibid: 3).
3. James B. Edwards, former Secretary of the Department of Energy: "I want to come out of it number one, not number two" (Ibid: 4).
4. Charles Kupperman, a Reagan appointee to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: "it is possible for any society to survive. . . nuclear war is a destructive thing, but still in large part a physics problem" (Ibid: 6).
5. T.K. Jones, Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces: "Dig a hole, cover it with a couple of doors and then throw three feet of dirt on top. . . it's the dirt that does it. . . if there are enough shovels to go around everybody's going to make it" (Ibid: 18).
6. George Bush, Vice President of the United States: "You have a survivability of command and control, survivability of industrial potential, protection of a percentage of your citizens, and you have a capability that inflicts more damage on the opposition than it can inflict upon you. That's the way you have a

winner, and the Soviets' planning is based on the ugly concept of a winner in a nuclear exchange" (Ibid: 29).

Now the Bush remark is crucial as it implies that the Soviet Union is responsible for administration's "cost-benefit" analysis of thermonuclear war. In pursuing the same theme, administration officials in 1982 frequently cited massive civil defense programs in the U.S.S.R. in order to build support for a U.S. nuclear build-up and a bizarre program of urban evacuation into outlying areas. In an editorial in the New York Times on April 3 of that year, it was written: "Those who aim to upset it (nuclear balance) encourage the idea that it is feasible to fight a general nuclear war and to "survive". That idea is not merely irresponsible; it is mad. . . Who is the mastermind who thinks this could never work?" Robert Scheer answered the question: "the man whom the Times called "mad" and said should be fired, was none other than Ronald Reagan himself" (1982: 108).

From the utopian view, the Reagan Administration's nuclear rhetoric and buildup has succeeded in terrorizing the world. And there are still other dimensions to the issue. The problem of nuclear terrorism may be viewed through other than the eyes of the superpowers. First of all, a nuclear weapons spiral (which must include the placing of missiles in client states) on the part of those states already heavily nuclearized is the real nuclear proliferation. Secondly, the power of nuclearized states to terrorize and threaten the security of states with little or nuclear capability is the real nuclear blackmail. It therefore follows that any real non-proliferation treaty must call for a systematic reduction of the nuclear arsenals of present nuclear superpowers.

Terrorism and International Law: A Conclusion

From the utopian vantage point, certain actions of established members of the state system may be defined as terrorist and redress sought through international law. Such redress in turn rests on two fundamental assumptions. First of all, the judicial basis for the state system is that of sovereign equality. Thus, the interests of one independent state shall not take precedence over the interests of another. Otherwise, international law will be shaped or ignored by the powerful.

However, sovereignty is more than the recognition of the independence of a nation state by others in a global order. Sovereignty is also a matter of the internal relationships

between the agencies of state power and the people of a given society. The social history of sovereignty within the state marks a process whereby the absolute power of rulers comes to be constrained by commonly acknowledged human rights, the most basic of which is self-determination. Self-determination is therefore the social basis of sovereignty. It follows that states that deny full political, economic and social participation to groups on the basis of racial, ethnic, religious, class, gender or other grounds fail to meet the requirement of self-determination and bring their sovereignty into question.

By this logic, forms of terrorism between nations such as imperialism, military intimidation and nuclear discrimination violate the principle of state equality. Further, internal colonialism is by definition a denial of self-determination and an abrogation of the social basis of sovereignty. States that fail to recognize and actively combat forms of internal colonialism raise questions about the legitimacy of their claims to sovereignty.

At a global level, both structural terrorism and the limited efficacy of international law in controlling it originate in a tripartite global inequality. Such includes a concentration of economic resources, an imbalance in the political power of sovereign states and the hegemony of the ideological systems of richer nations. To the extent that these forms of inequality are resolved, to that extent international terror will subside and international law develop. In the hope that law may do more than simply reflect structural change, the following observations are offered.

Economic inequality may be addressed through colonial reparations that carry the force of law. From the utopian vantage point, a just portion of the plundered wealth of third world nations should be returned by colonial and neocolonial powers. Political inequality, in the sense of unfair and discriminatory relations between sovereign states of differential power, presupposes that each be subjugated to an explicit system of binding international law to which all nations contribute. One possible way to implement this objective is for an organization such as the United Nations General Assembly to acquire the standing of an international legislature, acquire the standing of an international legislature.

A suggestion on the issue of ideological hegemony follows most clearly the logic of this paper. Questions of sovereignty and its compromise by the structural forms of terrorism should be raised with frequency and intensity in international tribunals

and forums. It would be naive to believe that this or the preceding tactics will prevail merely because of their moral or legal force. For its part, the Reagan administration will continue to raise questions of standing and jurisdiction as it did before the World Court on the question of the mining of Nicaraguan harbors. It will continue to offer complaints about the proliferation of small states in order to thwart the forging of a new internationalism. It will claim that U.N. treaties and resolutions represent a threat to U.S. sovereignty. And it will continue to offer paranoid accounts of terrorism that seek to advance the dominance of the first world system. However, the utopian view on the structural nature of terrorism is a part of the ideological struggle that drives the forces of change. And those committed to this struggle remain convinced that humane revolutions do not end merely because of the superiority of arms, the vastness of military force or the imperial might of nation-states. Victory instead is to be found in the hearts and minds of ordinary people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, J. Bowyer. 1975, *Transnational Terror*. Washington, D.C.: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace.
- Carneron, Norman. 1963, "Paranoid Reactions," pp. 486-488 in *Personality Development and Psychopathology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Chomsky, Noam, 1973, "At War with Asia", pp. 95-111 in William Chambliss, ed. *Problems of Industrial Society*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Coleman, Marsha, 1984, "A Quantitative Analysis of U.S. Press Coverage of Libyan Leader Muammar Qadhafi". *The International Journal of World Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Spring): 198-216.
- Cornay, Michael. 1976, *Zionism and Israel*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.
- Copson, Raymond, 1982, "Libya: U.S. Relations". Issue Brief Number IB81125. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress Congressional Research Services.
- Dobson, Christopher and Ronald Payne. 1979, *The Terrorists*. New York: Facts on file.
- Drucker, Henry M., 1974, *The Political Uses of Ideology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- The Europa Yearbook. Vol. II, 1984, "Libya". London: Europa Publications Limited, pp. 1945-54.
- Gramsci, Antonio, 1957, *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*. New York: International Publishers.
- Herman, Edward S. and Frank Brodhead, 1984, *Demonstration Elections: U.S.-Staged Elections in the Dominican Republic, Vietnam and El Salvador*. Boston: South End Press.
- Janke, Peter, 1983, *Guerrilla and Terrorist Organizations: A World Directory and Bibliography*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- Johansen, Bruce and Roberto Maestos, 1979, *Wasichu: The Continuing Indian Wars*. Intro. by John Redhouse. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Joll, James, 1977, *Antonio Gramsci*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Mannheim, Karl, 1930, *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Marx, Karl, 1964, *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Psychology*. Edited with an Introduction by T.B. Bottomore and Maxmillian Rubel. Translated by T.B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Moleah, Alfred T., 1984, *Zionism and Apartheid: The Negation of Human Rights*. *The International Journal of World Studies* (Winter): 67-88.
- Orwell, George, 1949, *Nineteen Eighty-four*. New York: Harcourt, Bruce and World.
- Perdue, William D., 1984, "Ideology and the Third Universal Theory: An Inquiry in the Sociology of Knowledge". *The International Journal of World Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1. (Winter): 89-104.
- Qadhafi, Muammar, 1976, *The Green Book*. London: Martin, Brian and O'Keefe.
- 1980, 1982, Qadhafi's Thesis. Third Edition. Ottawa, Ont., Canada: Jerusalem International Publishing House.
- 1983, *Africa for Africans*. August. Tripoli, Jamahiriyah: Ministry of Information.
- Raines, Howell, 1979, "American Indians: Struggling for Power and Identity". *The New York Times Magazine* (Feb. 11).
- Reasons, Charles E. and William D. Perdue, 1981, *The Ideology of Social Problems*. Palo Alto, Cal.: Mayfield.
- Said, Edward W., 1979, *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Times Books.
- Scheer, Robert, 1982, *With Enough Shovels: Reagan, Bush and Nuclear War*. New York: Random House.
- Sono, Thembu, 1984, "Grenada, Grenadians, Grenadas — A Profile of Reagan's Imperialist Militarism". *The International Journal of World Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter): 7-44.
- Sterling, Claire, 1981, *The Terror Network*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1984, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. (104th edition). Washington, D.C.
- Waters, Cheryl, 1982, "The U.S. Special Relationship with the Caribbean: An Interventionist Past and Future?" *Trans African forum*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall): 3-10.
- Weber, Max, 1958, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Libyan Revolution and its Significance for Africa, Southern Africa in particular

by Alfred Moleah, Ph.D.*

One of the most important revolutionary developments in Africa, if not in the Third World, was the Libyan Revolution of September 1, 1969. It is an event that was to have profound and significant implications for all peoples struggling against colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. The overthrow of the reactionary regime of King Idris Al-Sanusi created a revolutionary base and a steadfast ally for those struggling against imperialist injustice.

The Libyan Revolution was in the safe hands of a group of revolutionary (12) young officers who constituted the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC); who were propelled by a sense of mission and were guided by a deeply felt sense of national pride, strength from unity, and deeply committed to social uplift and justice. These commitments went beyond Libya, to the Arab Nation, Africa and all those struggling against injustice. The RCC was infused with idealism, not the Western prosaic abstract philosophical kind, but idealism as a spirit of challenge: A defiance of the conventional — the status quo if you may, built by colonialists and imperialists — and refused to accept injustice as pre-ordained.

The embodiment of the movement and spirit was and is Brother Muammar Qadafi, Leader of the Revolution. He embodied and symbolized its essence; its quintessential spirit which is a burning and deep-rooted commitment to the ordinary man and woman: the toilers and producers of all wealth, of life itself and its continuity. A commitment also to justice, not as the Western and bourgeois abstraction, but as relating to spiritual and material existence. Simply put, a commitment to ways and

*Professor Moleah is Associate Professor of Political Science, Department of Pan African Studies, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Executive Council Member; EAFORD and Chairman of Editorial Board, the *International Journal of World Studies*.

means whereby human beings realize their highest humanity, their dignity; eat, work, and have decent shelter — live with personal and national integrity and pride.

The Revolution immediately embarked upon the task of abolishing the reactionary policies of the previous regime which had mainly served the interests of imperialism. The new Libyan Arab-Republic dedicated itself to the Arab cause, the African cause, the cause of all struggling humanity. The Revolution acknowledged its Arab and African character obligation.

The Revolution took a strong anti-imperialist stand by immediately moving to annul the agreements of 1953 and 1954 which gave Britain and the United States military bases in Libya; and moved to remove colonial and imperial dominance of the country. The Revolution dedicated itself to prosecution of the Palestinian struggle and declared itself an implacable enemy of Zionism as the regional variant of Western capitalist colonialism and imperialism.

Such a principled and determined revolutionary stand was received with imperialist hostility, especially of the United States, the leading imperialist power. What scared the imperialists most was that this was not a knee-jerk, ephemeral and rhetorical revolutionism, but a well thought out and deeply committed design and plan to change the colonial and imperial status quo; to determinantly confront and challenge imperialist hegemony.

Consistent with its universal perspective the Libyan Revolution proclaimed itself in support of all liberation movements and revolutions throughout the world and declared a sacred duty towards all revolutions.

Libya since the Revolution has been in the forefront of efforts to bring about Arab unity. In spite of insinuations and betrayals by others, this has remained a constant and consistent Libyan goal. Real Arab unity is perceived as an absolute necessity and an absolute pre-condition for defeating Zionism and its state of Israel, and thereby regain Palestine. No Arab state has pursued unity with a greater singleness of purpose, a greater willingness to forgo and subordinate all else, than Libya. Unlike others, Libya does not only preach unity, it relentlessly works for unity.

In keeping with universal perspective of the Libyan Revolution it seeks not only Arab unity, but also African Unity and ultimately the unity of all suffering and struggling humanity. This is a revolutionary unity, a unity of the struggling masses so as to wrest control over their lives and create a better humanity.



Libya has been a staunch supporter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and has exerted every effort to make it more unified as a revolutionary vehicle. It was because of this that the Reagan Administration spared no effort or resources to make sure that Libya did not host the OAU summit in Tripoli and thereby have its Leader of the Revolution, Brother Muammar Qadafi, assume chairmanship of the OAU. It rightfully feared that this would result in the radical and revolutionary transformation of the OAU in its role and perspective.

Opposition to Zionism as settler colonialism logically leads to opposition to Apartheid. In fact, the two are geographical antipodes of the same phenomenon. Let us take a brief but deeper look at the similarities, if not identity between Zionism and Apartheid. We shall do so by examining these two twin ideologies and noting their identical impact on their dispossessed and repressed victim peoples; and the total denial of their human rights.

The issue of human rights is basic to human existence. All the elements that describe man's eternal struggle can be reduced to the issue of human rights. The most basic and, therefore, the most fundamental of human rights is the right to self-determination. The right to self-determination is the necessary precondition for the attainment of all other human rights because all other human rights are attainable and derive meaning only within the context of a sovereign peoplehood with its own territorial base or state. Therefore, denial of the right to self-determination, with its attendant subjection to alien and discriminatory rule, is the most fundamental violation of human rights. This denial is, unfortunately, the lot of Palestinians and Africans in South Africa.

Central to this human tragedy is racism embodied in the ideologies of Zionism and Apartheid. Israel, as a Zionist entity, and South Africa, as an Apartheid entity, constitute the most complete denial and negation of the human rights of their subject peoples. The Zionist entity and the Apartheid entity are an idea — an idea that has become a material force. They are an idea that is racist, an idea that is anti-human, an idea that is the total negation of the humanity of its victims so that the question of their human rights hardly arises. This constitutes not only a tragedy to the victim peoples, but also constitutes a danger to the world at large and to all humanity, whose only antecedent was the danger posed by Hitlerite Nazism.

The tragedy of the Palestinians and that of Africans in South

Africa is the same, but with a difference in manifestation and, therefore, also in world perception. Apartheid is clearly racist in its postulates and premises; whereas, Zionism has no such clear racist postulates and premises. The problem with the perception of Zionism racism is due, first, to adroit dissimulation and obfuscation of its true nature and ends and, second, to the awesome power and influence of Zionism. Zionism has, through skillful manipulation, managed to parlay the tragedy of Jews, particularly the Holocaust, into a position of unassailability and immunity for its world-view. Consequently, the world knows the Palestinians through the Zionists, even more tragically, any other differing information is received through a Zionist filter — a result of unprecedented and unparalleled world brainwashing.

The Apartheid South African state is clearly a settler-colony of a minority of Europeans who dispossessed the African majority of their land and goods and even usurped their identity by appropriating to themselves the identity of the land by calling themselves Afrikaners. The racism and inhumanity of Apartheid is too well known to be elaborated upon here.

Zionist Israel is equally a settler state spawned by political Zionism. Political Zionism is a nineteenth century colonial movement of some European Jews to found an exclusive Jewish colony, preferably in Palestine. This was to be European settler colonialism with the outlook and objectives reflective of other European colonial and imperialist ventures of the period. Zionist founders were quite unabashed in spelling out their settler colonial scheme and intentions, Jabotinsky, for example, wrote of this in an essay entitled *The Iron Law* (1925):

If you wish to colonize a land in which people are already living, you must provide a garrison for the land, or find a benefactor who will maintain the garrison on your behalf. . . . Zionism is a colonizing adventure and, therefore, it stands or falls on the question of armed force.

All colonialisms have a racist predicate but settler colonialism has a virulent racist predicate. The natives, to enable their ruthless exploitation. Brutal repression, extermination or expulsion, have their humanity denied by the simple act of negation. The settler colonialist declares, one way or another, that "the native is not human" or worse, "the native does not exist". It is this mind-set that prompted Levi Eshkol, a former Israeli Prime Minister, to ask: "What are Palestinians?" and for Golda Meir, another former Israeli Prime Minister, to declare:

"There is no such thing as Palestinians. . . they do not exist", and for the first Israeli Prime Minister, Ben Gurion, to elaborate: "In a 'historical and moral sense' Palestine, the Holy Land, is a country 'without inhabitants' ". Neither do Africans exist in South Africa. Denying the humanity of the natives is the *sine qua non* of settler-colonialism. Yet, an equally important aspect is the assertion of a special superiority over the native. The most pernicious claim to specialness is the one that invokes God. This invocation is the total and ultimate justification. People become agents of God's will; human acts are transmuted into a divine calling and responsibility is avoided. Actions and the consequences of those actions become unquestionable and unassailable. This is the claim of Zionists and that of Afrikaner Nationalists: they claim to be chosen peoples, the elect of God put in this world to fulfill a divine mission. These claims also have a virulent racist component.

Whilst there is something unwholesome about comparing oppression, exploitation and denial or violations of human rights, a casual acquaintance with the South African situation will suggest close parallels, if not an actual identity of condition, between Palestinians under Zionist rule and Africans under Afrikaner Nationalist rule. Both peoples are victims of racial discrimination; both peoples have been robbed of their land; both peoples have their labor ruthlessly exploited and both peoples have been denied the most fundamental of all human rights—the right to self-determination.

Whereas South Africa has laws clearly identifiable as racist, Zionist racism is informal, de facto and deceptive. Whereas, the victims of Apartheid enjoy international sympathy and support, the victims of Zionism are viewed with suspicion, if not outright condemnation. Whereas, South Africa receives general opprobrium and is fast becoming a pariah in the community of nations, Israel continues to bask in international respectability and is touted as an outpost of civilization and democracy. The international power and influence of Zionism remains undiminished allowing Begin to blackmail the world with the absurd assertion that "there is no difference between anti-Israelism, anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism."

Central to the denial and negation of the human rights of Palestinians and Africans in South Africa are the ideologies of Zionism and Apartheid. These ideologies postulate an inherent inferiority of their victims which invites and justifies their inhuman treatment. As ideologies of settler colonialism, they justify discrimination, expropriation and repression. The logic

of these racist ideologies extends to the possibility, if not the probability, of extermination and annihilation. It is this logic which allows Israel and South Africa to place themselves above all customs and laws and to declare the primacy of their self-defined survival. It is this psychoite mindset that renders these two entities ultimately a danger to world peace and a threat to humanity.

Libya's stand against Apartheid is consistent with its stand against Zionism. In their heroic struggle against Portuguese fascist colonialism and Apartheid settler colonialism the people of Southern Africa have found a staunch ally in the Libyan Revolution. This solidarity manifests in the strongly supportive role that Libya plays within the OAU. Even more importantly, Libya has acted concretely giving the South African liberation material support in terms of funds, material and facilities. I am assured that Libya's support in all forms and levels is second to none.

These abiding revolutionary principles are now enshrined in the *Third Universal Theory* or *Green Book*, thus attesting to their continuity and centrality. All struggling humanity salutes the Great Al-Fateh Revolution on its Fifteenth Anniversary.

ISLAM AND THE THIRD UNIVERSAL THEORY

by
Dr. Mahmoud Ayoub*

Human history can be viewed as the human search for a self-understanding and identity and for a better society. It is a search for human dignity and the understanding of the purpose of our being here on earth.

Admittedly, this may be called in modern jargon, as we saw this afternoon, as being metaphysical and philosophical, but I see nothing wrong with metaphysics and philosophy, if they relate to the human situation.

Islam begins from this status, and at once encompasses it in its broadest possible historical understanding or view of human life here on earth.

It begins with the vital assertion that the universe and humankind did not come out of a confluence of events, blindly coming together to produce such impressive and rather stupendous order in the universe, but that rather it was purposely created by God in order to fulfill his will, in his creation.

And then for the basic Islamic proclamation, which has and which will continue to have a tremendous bearing on human history—the declaration was the oneness of God.

In the Islamic philosophy of tawhid or God's oneness lies the philosophical and the practical basis for the organization of the human society, and if I may say so, Islamic and non-Islamic.

If God is one, and he is the Creator of all beings and things, and if God demands of all things to pay homage and worship him, it follows that God is the leader. God is the leader to a series of revelations that began with Adam and ended with Mohammad. (Safalahu alaihi Wasalaam. Peace be upon him).

In this structure of Divine Leadership, then, according to Islam, all human beings become equal and the basic standard of judgment becomes not tribal origins, ethnic identity, wealth or

*Mahmoud Ayoub, Ph.D., Research Associates, Center for Religious Studies, University of Toronto, Canada.

prestige, but rather moral righteousness and piety, for as stated in the Qur'an, the most noble of you in the sight of God, is he who is most righteous.

In this equality of human beings on an earth created by God, it also follows, according to Islam that God is not only the Creator of things and the leader of human societies, but he is literally the Owner of his Creation. Thus the Koran declares: "God shall inherit the earth and all that is on it."

Also the Koran declares: "The earth shall be inherited by the earth's righteous servants."

These moral principles of lawhid, of human equality and of moral righteousness lay the foundation of human society in its Islamic form for the questions of authority, the question — and that will be political question — the question of identity and that would be the social question, and the question of economic distribution which will be question of the economic aspects of society.

It is with these three questions that, in the end, the Holy Book deals with.

Let me parenthetically say, when I spoke to Brother Ageli Elmeri this morning, I said I would talk about Islam and political ideologies. When I was introduced this morning, I was introduced as one who would talk about Islam and the Third Universal Theory. So I would like to talk a little bit about both, but since we are today celebrating the revolution, I will concentrate more on the Third Universal Theory and its relationship to Islam.

Back to my talk.

The question of authority for the role of the leader and the led, was a question with which Islam struggled from the beginning and which, in the end, divided the Muslim society into its present divisions of Shi'ite, Sunni, Hanafi, whatever, and many other divisions that have since appeared.

This is to state that the basic problems which the Muslim community had to face from the beginning and which led in the end to the divisions within that society, were not theological but rather political questions, precisely who is qualified to assume authority?

For us today, fourteen centuries later, the question is, what does the Koran say about the question of authority accepting the basic principles which The Green Book contains. The Koran must be, in the final analysis, the constitution of society.

The Koran declares clearly that God is the source of all authority, but God being transcendent and not like his creatures

must communicate in special ways and thus work through the angels and the prophets, hence the Islamic injunction — "You who have faith, obey God and obey the apostles and those who are in — it's not authority, but rather "those who are in the position of executors among you."

Obedience to God comes through worship and through translating that faith or worship in social and individual action. Obedience to the Prophet must, in the final analysis, depend upon the Koran and the acceptance that the Koran is the authentic Divine revelation to him.

The question as to what extent we can trust the Hadith literature, that contains in a sense, our basis for the understanding of the Sunna, is a complex question into which we cannot enter here.

Only let me again, parenthetically, add that it is on this question that Brother Mummam Qadafi has been most misunderstood.

My understanding, after reading much of what he has said is that he does not reject the Sunna. In fact, he is on record. God declared anyone who rejects the Sunna is a Kafir. But he also cautions that not everything we read in the Hadith books must be accepted unequivocally. Without the Sunna, we have only a skeleton, which is the Koran, that is the most broad principles which then the Sunna puts into application. Hence it is the Sunna, really, that provides for us the way to implement and apply in our lives the basic principles of the Koran.

Thus following the light of the Sunna of the Prophet is obedience to the Prophet.

Then comes the question which is perhaps the most important and difficult question for the Muslim community throughout its history, and that is, who are the Amirs? They are not the absolute despotic rulers who arrest people, exploit their talents and their wealth, stifle their plans and creativity and silence their voices when they are criticized.

Why do we say in Islam that the Golden Period for Muslims to follow and learn from is the period of the first four rightly guided caliphs.

They were human beings like us. They were not infallible, let their lives, nourished by the prophetic vision of society continue to live and to reflect that spiritual basis that remains for us a goal and an example to follow.

There would be many examples to give of the exemplary leadership in Islam. That was not taken to be an absolutist leadership but rather the leader was only the executor of the will

of his people. And that started even from the beginning in the time of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) himself, where the Koran enjoins upon him "to consult with them whenever you want to do something. Believent, be kind, be open to disussion. And we have many examples in the Shura of this kind of consultation.

But in the Koran the perfect society of people is called a brotherhood of man, the true servants or slaves of God. Those who walk on the earth reverently, who, when the foolish speak to them, they say, "Peace to you," who solve their problems through consultations among themselves,

This problem or this principle, rather, of Shura, must constitute in the end, the basic principle of leadership in Islam.

The leadership must be a participatory leadership. One of the basic problems in our society today is that we cannot free ourselves from important ideas and principles. When we speak of our democracy as though it is a religion, actually, we are dealing with a Western society that is not Christian, but it is a society that translates the Greek ideas into a religious principle.

Let me remind you of the two greatest ancient Greek thinkers, Plato and Aristotle. Neither of them had much use for democracy as it was practiced there and as it may be practiced now, because the democracy there was only for the few and the free men, not for women and not for slaves. Democracy now is a democracy that, in the end, reflects not so much the will of the people but the polls of the pollster and the advertising techniques on television and in the media.

So what Islam is calling for is an authority that basically resides in God and is shared equally among all his creatures and the leader, as such, is one or a group of people freely chosen to execute their affairs, but not to rule over them and to trample them with their feet and fill their pockets at their expense.

This is what Islam is calling for, and this is, in my opinion, what in the final analysis, The Green Book explains in the first chapter, that expresses the problem of democracy today as being a democracy basically of the few, a democracy of the political parties and a democracy of the rulers, where the people do not have much say, even where elections, and so on, are involved.

The alternative is admittedly difficult. It can be at times cumbersome, but in the end, if and when it is perfected and applied in larger societies, that is, societies with diverse economic and political means, it will be then tested, and I am confident that it will be far better than the so-called democracies that we have today.

The second chapter of The Green Book deals with society, and it asserts that even society must have two identities, one religious and the other a kind of national or custom basis for society or what The Green Book calls religion and custom.

Within this structure of society, there has to be a common framework of linguistic and culture cohesiveness, in order for the society to grow. There has to be a common heritage, a common culture, structure and there must be, in the end, also a religious basis that covers that dimension of human society and individual human life so much neglected today.

What would happen in a society, if the place of the spiritual dimensions is neglected?

We have seen the examples in totalitarian communist countries, where, in the name of humanism, we found totalitarian ruthlessness, where it is not the people who decide but a huge bureaucracy that sits on the people and stifles them. This is only one kind.

On the other, in the Western model of free enterprise capitalism, religion begins to play a secondary role. It becomes subordinate to the economic interests of the few and the many become poor and are given a religious ideology to console them while others use them and eat out of their sweat.

This Islam rejects in both of these alternatives, whether it be the socialist or the capitalist dimensions or structures in the world.

The Koran speaks of the Muslims as the community of the middle course, neither extreme in their materialistic concerns nor are they extreme in rejecting them. They are not extreme in spending all their days and nights in worship nor should they neglect worship, but rather, in all things, they take a middle course. And to then accept religion as the basic framework within which cultural and ethnic groups can cooperate is, in itself, a phenomenon which Islam has from the beginning recognized. In what way? It will mean that there has not been a nation, but that a guide has been sent to it by God, a guide speaking its language, participating in its heritage, and in the end addressing their problems and conditions.

The last of these messages from God was the Koran revealing in Arabic, in Arabic at its best. Thus it became a model for Arabic literary creativity ever since.

It is addressed first and foremost to an Arabic-speaking society but also in its universal principles to humanity at large.

Thus, to recognize the importance of the Arabs as the bearers of that message, in the sense that they understand its language, is

not an un-Islamic idea. Yet this has dangers, and they are dangers that any one of us could fall into, including the Libyan Revolution.

If we begin to put the Arab identity as our basic and first concern and subordinate Islam to it, then we are committing socially a most unforgivable sin, according to Islam.

I can see Arab nationalism within Islam, but I cannot see Islam within Arab nationalism.

The third chapter of The Green Book deals with the economic problems of human society today.

I have said earlier that according to Islam, there is not any human being, but God is the owner of all things.

In fact, the Koran calls God as "Malik". He is the owner or malik, the king. And both of these occur in more than simply the opening sura of the Koran.

Hence, the basic resources of wealth also belong to God, and it is the will of God, according to Islam, that these resources be shared among his creatures in an equal and equitable manner.

If the earth belongs to God, then it does not belong to any particular individual or group of individuals, but rather every human being must, in the end, help to make the earth productive and to acquire his or her own needs from the earth and share the rest with people.

In a broad way, Islam deals with the economic problems of society in three important ways.

The first and most important is that compulsory religious task which is designed to purify the rich from that attachment to their wealth and to ask them to share their wealth with others and also to take care of the poor: the students, the orphans, and so on.

The other important principle which fits within the principle of Zakat or free will giving is giving for the sake of God, and in order to share what you have with others.

God has demands on us, and in his demand that we be good and not be bound by a principle that will be reduced to an empty expression of giving the extra penny, God demanded that we give not Zakat not Sadaka.

The next important principle, in which Islam deals with is the economic problem, and that is, it prohibits the unlawful profit by the few from the many at the expense of their lives.

This translates itself into the well-known Islamic prohibition of riba or interest and of hoarding, and Islam calls for what we may call a lawful profit, which means a merchant must buy his goods and sell them at a reasonable profit, in order to earn his

own living, but also not to oppress with his wealth, the rest of society.

It is this that The Green Book translates in the final analysis into what is translated as socialism, but I think it really has a different meaning. The Arabic word "sharikah" that is the root word for the word "shar'iah," means to share equally, to be partners in one thing. And I mention that the greatest unforgivable sin in Islam is the sin of "shik", that is, to make, to assume for God an equal partner, hence "shar'iah," really, we ought to translate it correctly into English. It must be "equitable partnership rather than socialism", whatever the word means.

In this sense, then, whether a person works in a factory or on a farm, he or she must have a stake in the business in which this person is engaged. This alone would, in the end, secure or insure the fair distribution of social work among all the members of society.

Islam cannot accept communism which denies property ownership of the individual and puts everything in the hands of a bureaucracy called the state, rather, according to the Islamic principle, whoever revives a piece of land, makes it productive, then it becomes his, so long as he lives on it, but must pass on to the hands of someone else after who would continue its productivity.

Therefore, it's not the state that owns everything, but that God owns everything which must be equally distributed among his creatures for whom he cares equally. Islam also rejects capitalism, which basically, as we see in the world today is based on exorbitant interest and hoarding, and it's not the need nor demand that determines what a country produces and sells but rather advertising and supply. It is, as many scientists here in the United States are recognizing, the most wasteful system on earth, and it is depleting the resources of the earth quickly, that within perhaps the next generation people will have to live with far less than we are living today, because we have lost that religious reverence for God and his creation, and we have misused our trusteeship of God's creation.

In Islam, basically human beings are not the owners of the earth, but they are its trustees. They are basically the representatives or trustees appointed by God on earth.

How is all this to apply? One of the principles and jargon that we have inherited, and unfortunately so, and I know this will lead to all kinds of discussion, is the notion of revolution.

We do not have this notion in the early Islam. Islam came as a revolution against all evil and corruption. And

especially the earlier suras of the Koran are very clear expressions of this, but it was not a revolution that is to turn things upside down and change them in any way. Rather, Islam is basically an educational system. It is a system that is designed to discipline human beings and to guide them, to lead to the fulfillment of the highest purposes of their lives.

If we take the history of modern revolution, whether it's the Americans, the French, the Bolsheviks, the Chinese, and whatever, we see that they were revolutions aimed at correcting the political evils of society but often destroying much that is good.

Islam was not that way. Islam called on us to seek the truth, whatever it may be, and it was with this in mind that the first Muslim servants, philosophers, theologians and scientists roamed the earth from Greece to China, in order to look for the truth, and when they recognized it, they accepted it.

So Islam then is a system, is a religion that provides both the ideology and its moral principles, the ideology and the means of its implementation.

The greatest danger to any revolution, any movement today is that they may become worshippers of the revolution instead of God.

Islam, I would like also to say, is not something that we like to proudly say, we are Muslims and keep it as an identity which means nothing more than glorying in a glorious past. Islam is a way of life, and for us to call ourselves Muslims, we have to bound by the principles of Islam, its worship, its social demands and its moral principles.

To implement, to apply all this, we must engage in a continuous principle, in a continuous pattern that Islam calls "jihad" may at times include warfare, but it is not limited to it. Every good that is achieved in society becomes an act of jihad and every act of jihad is an act of worship and the struggle that is so misunderstood in the West by the people of the Jamahiriya, with its leader, is for us Muslim a jihad, in the way of God and for the good of all.

Let me finally, in case there are any people who are taking notes for the State Department, since we live in the States say that if we are to speak about a cultural and spiritual heritage, we have much in common with the heritage that is behind Western society and history. We believe, as Muslims, that God chose his prophets to carry out his will to human society, and among them that the Koran mentions clearly are Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and finally, Mohammad, peace be among them. All those

prophets that are responsible for the basic philosophy on which Western civilization, as well as Islamic civilization are built.

We are not, as Muslims, an atheist society, nor are we totalitarians. Qadafi is not a communist, but he's also not a capitalist.

And I believe that, given a choice, the Muslim countries everywhere would have more in common, would be happier dealing with a West that is bound even by its own Christian principles than with the Marxist world. And if the State Department people were only wiser, they would realize this fact and encourage our development in ways that are only designed to bring prosperity and comfort to all societies and to the world.

Our basic principle, and which is dictated by the principle of divine oneness or qahad is this, that God created all human beings and made them different in order that they may know one another and as a trial to see who will be better in the performance of righteous deeds. But it is a principle that necessitates on all Muslims to come to the help of those who are oppressed in the world and to make sure they are relieved, otherwise, we have to pray, as the Prophet Moses did, that God may believe him, may save him from his town, whose people are oppressed for wrongdoing.

And so Islam, then, is not a revolution in the modern sense, but it is a total and continuous revolution, a revolution against oppression, against wrong, against exploitation, and for the good of all God's creatures.

It is for this that Qadafi and Libya have been ostracized and misunderstood, but there is more that is sinister and malicious behind it, which lies outside the scope of my talk.

And let, finally, our Islam — whether we are basically Muslims or Christians, let our Islam, our submission be to God and not to an identity, not to an ideology, for we are not called upon to worship and idea, but to worship the eternal and living God.

Thank you very much.
(Applause.)

BASIC FACTS

Name:

"The official name of Libya shall be the *Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*."

Law:

The *Holy Qur'an* is the law of society in the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

Language:

The official language of the Jamahiriya is *Arabic*.

The Flag:

The flag of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is a deep unified green. This is associated with Islam. The unified color represents unity, prosperity and growth.

Location:

The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya lies between latitude 20 and latitude 23 North and between longitude 9 and longitude 25 East.

To the North it is bounded by the Mediterranean Sea; to the East by Egypt and a small corner of Sudan; to the South and West West it borders on Niger and Chad. On its West it touches Algeria and in the Northwest it borders with Tunisia.

It has a Mediterranean coastline of 1900 kilometres.

Geography:

The area of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is 1,759,040 square kilometres or 1679,358 square miles.

It is seven times the size of Britain, two and a half times the size of the American state of Texas or the size of Germany, France and Holland together.

It is the fourth largest country in Africa.

Physical Features:

The whole of Libya may be said to form part of the vast North African plateau extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea.

To the west along the Mediterranean Sea coast with its sparkling beaches there is a low lying fertile plain. This is the Jafara plain.

South of the Jafara plain the land rises to an upland plateau of sand and mounds of rock. Still further south, after hundreds of miles, the plateau gives place to a series of East-West depressions where oasis and artesian wells abound.

Beyond these, to the South again, the land rises to form the mountains of the Central Sahara. Some peaks here rise to 12,000 feet.

The Eastern part of Libya has different geographical features. Along the Mediterranean Sea coast, to the North there is a plateau which rises to two thousand feet in two narrow strips, a few miles wide. This is the Jebel Akhdar or the Green Mountains. To the West these mountains fall sharply to the Gulf of Sidra; to the East they run in low ridges parallel to the coast. These ridges slope gradually down to the Egyptian border.

To the South of the Jebel Akhdar, after a small fertile strip of land, there is a low-lying desert area interspersed with oases. This area finally merges into the mountains of the Central Sahara. Here they are called the Tibesti Mountains.

Population:

The total population of the Jamahiriya is 3,411,200. Fifty-seven percent of the population lives in the towns of Tripoli, Benghazi and Zawia distributed as follows: 31.4% in Tripoli, 14.5% in Benghazi and 11.5% in Zawia.

Climate:

Briefly, the climate is temperate in the coastal plain; warm in winter and tending to be hot in summer. Inland it is continental—cold in winter and hot in summer. Winters in the North of Libya can be rough and cold with sleet and sometimes snow flurries in the hills. In summer, temperatures in the Jefara plain sometimes reach 105-115° F.

In the South of Libya where desert conditions prevail temperatures rise even higher during the day in summer; yet in winter there can be a little snow in these regions.

In the Eastern plateau region the summer is cooler (80°-90°) than in the Jefara but with high humidity.

Across this Eastern plateau region, usually in spring and autumn, a hot dry storm wind called the 'ghihili' blows at times. When it does, it can rise temperatures almost 30 to 40 degrees in a few hours.

Rainfall in the hills is annually about 15 to 20 inches. In the rest of the country it is 8 inches or less.

Currency:

The Libyan *Dinar* is the currency of the Jamahiriya. One Libyan Dinar is valued at three dollars.

Principal Cities:

Tripoli, Benghazi, and Tobruk. Other important centres are

Sebha, Kufra, Misurata, Derna and Al-Zawia.

Principal Seaports:

Tripoli, Zuearah, Tobruk, Derna, Benghazi.

Airports:

Tripoli Universal Airport, Chadames; Bonaina International-Benghazi Kufra Sebha International, Chat.

Roads:

By the end of 1985, the Jamahiriya will have 23,926 kilometers of roads.

Principal Export:

Oil

Principal Industries:

Food processing, textile, spinning and weaving, clothing, leather, wood, petro-chemical, building material, cement, glassware, metal production, aluminum, iron sheets.

Principal Crops:

Barley, wheat, maize, olives, citrus fruits, peanuts, almonds, tomatoes, dates and potatoes.