

Bulletin

Spring 2005

No. 70

Africa and Iraq: Making the Connections

Page

Editorial: Making the Links between Africa and the War in Iraq

Bill Martin and Meredith Turshen _____ 1

From Stealing to Robbing: Globalization and the US War Economy

George Caffentzis _____ 4

On the Roots of War: Theses on The War in Iraq

Silvia Federici _____ 8

Kerr-McGee Corporation in occupied Western Sahara - Oil Blocking Path to Freedom?

Washington Office on Africa _____ 14

Shareholders focus of campaign to end Kerr-McGee's involvement in Occupied Western Sahara

Press Release, Oslo, Norway, Feb 28th 2005 _____ 16

Chad's Oil: Miracle or Mirage? Following the Money in Africa's Newest Petro-State

Ian Gary and Nikki Reisch _____ 18

What Intellectuals Do in Peacetime

Asma Abdel Halim _____ 22

Manufacturing the Homeland Security Campus and Cadre

William G. Martin _____ 27

ACAS Resolution on the Study of Africa After 9/11, 7 November 2004 _____ 33

ASA Reply, 11 February 2005 _____ 34

ACAS Reply to ASA, 10 March 2005 _____ 36

Recent ACAS Alerts

ACAS Alert: Twice a Victim, first in Haiti, then in the US, 19 November 2004 _____ 37

ACAS Alert: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and Njeeri Wa Ngugi, 19 January 2005 _____ 40

ACAS Alert: Defend Academic Freedom in Botswana, 22 February 2005 _____ 43

ACAS Alert: The Story of Aster Yohannes and the Struggle for Democracy in Eritrea,
November 2004 _____ 44

ISSN 1051-08442

Editorial: Making the Links between Africa and the War on Iraq

Bill Martin and Meredith Turshen

This issue of the ACAS Bulletin grows out of a northeast regional conference organized by Educators to Stop the War held in New York City on 5 March 2005, in which a number of us participated under the ACAS banner--literally: the original hand-stitched ACAS banner still lives! The conference was an electrifying event, mobilizing student and teacher activists from grade schools to universities, and from across the region. It seemed to us, meeting together after the conference, that it was imperative to propel this work forward. As a contribution to this effort we present here four workshop presentations by our members, as well as continuing works by ACAS and our broader membership.

The links between Africa and the war in Iraq should not be difficult to draw for readers of the *Bulletin*. ACAS has for years now been tracking the US role in the militarization of Africa (see our website <http://acas.prairienet.org> and the work of our member, Daniel Volman). This extends well beyond the use, for example, of Djibouti as a staging area for the invasion of Iraq, or South Africa's supply of arms to the US and UK militaries. Indeed the militarization of Djibouti is but one small sign of the much greater thrust into the continent by the US military, the growing embrace between the US military and African militaries, and the militarization of the overall relationship between Africa and the US. If we needed any final confirmation of this trend, it is surely provided by Bush's nomination of Paul Wolfowitz, currently

US Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the Presidency of the World Bank.

Militarization for the US state, now under the guise of protecting us from terrorism, is most often about protecting oil fields and pipelines. And oil, most of us agree, is the original reason for this spurious war.(1) As we have detailed in previous issues of the ACAS Bulletin (60/61, Fall 2001, and 64, Winter 2002/2003), Africa has been supplying more and more of US oil requirements, and there is more and more US prospecting for oil in Africa and its surrounding waters. The United States is expected to receive as much as 25 percent of its petroleum imports from Africa within the next ten years, leading to the need to "protect" African states, most often corrupt and militarized ones, and support their own wars on "terrorist" enemies. This has the potential to turn Africa into a new "middle east" for the United States, with all the tragic implications that has for Africans confronting imperial states to the North and increasingly repressive regimes at home.

Our first articles in this issue tackle these long-term trends. In "From Stealing to Robbing: Globalization and the US War Economy," George Caffentzis charts the links between oil and the US military. A distinctive feature of the war economy, he writes, is that it must satisfy demands that are temporally indeterminate and come from a ubiquitous spatial field. This marks a shift from the structural adjustment model of the 1980s and early 1990s to direct military control today.

Unlike the Cold War, which put a limit on the regions where the US military could be deployed, and put a cap on the future investment required to counter the well-defined adversary's investment, the new war economy requires a new military model that dictates the deployment of US troops throughout the planet. "Their job is to occupy an unprecedented multiplicity of new bases controlling strategic areas of wealth (which in this age often is spelled "O-I-L") and pressuring an ever-increasing multitude of recalcitrant states to 'reform,' consequences be damned."

A second general article, "On the Roots of War: Theses on The War in Iraq," by Silvia Federici, examines the social, economic, and political effects of war. "War defeats social movements, expropriates people from their lands, and gives capital control over the planet's natural resources: oil, water, minerals, land, and seeds." It is not surprising, she notes, that the map of military intervention is today, to a large extent, also the map of oil. "One of the main objectives for international capital is the liberalization of the oil industry, oil being the only vital commodity that is not privatized."

These articles are followed by two case studies. We first present two short pieces on oil and the actions of Kerr-McGee Corporation in occupied Western Sahara. The first, "Oil Blocking Path to Freedom?" comes from the Washington Office on Africa; the second, "Shareholders Action" comes from ACAS member Richard Knight. They illustrate the extraordinary US pressure on Africa's oil producing nations, which is part of the same (militarized) energy policy that dictated the invasion of Iraq. Western Sahara is Africa's last colony. Formerly a colony of Spain, the World Court has

ruled that the people of Western Sahara have the right to self-determination. Morocco, which occupies much of the Western Sahara and is seeking to annex it as part of "Greater Morocco," has denied the Sahrawi people this right. The Polisario Front, which was formed in 1973 to fight Spanish colonialism, leads their struggle. The US government, not unexpectedly, is siding with Morocco, its long-time ally.

From the Western Sahara we turn to Chad, which we reported on in 2001 and again in 2002/03 (ACAS Bulletins 60/61 and 64). Ian Gary and Nikki Reisch ask: is oil a miracle or a mirage? Can oil revenues really transform this poverty-stricken land? Chad, described as Africa's newest petro-state, is a central African country marked by corruption, instability, and human rights abuses. Their conclusion is that, despite the support received from the World Bank and other donors, the country remains unprepared to manage the complexities of an economy increasingly dominated by oil, adding to concerns about the stability of African oil-exporting countries. Billions of dollars are falling outside the revenue transparency safeguards, the government has limited capacity to spend the money effectively, and there are ongoing problems with human rights and the rule of law. Gary and Reisch are concerned that poverty reduction objectives may not be achieved. (2)

A third set of articles tackles the impact of the war in Iraq on African studies, Africa scholars and students, and freedom of speech at home. We began to look at these issues in our last Bulletin, "Academic Freedom under Attack" (69, Winter 2004).

Asma Abdel Halim wonders what intellectuals do in peacetime. Recognizing that one must always begin one's resistance at home against powers that as a citizen one can influence, she laments a trend increasingly observed everywhere: "a fluent nationalism, masking itself as patriotism and moral concern, has taken over critical consciousness, which then puts loyalty to one's 'nation' before everything." At that point, she concludes, there is only the treason of the intellectuals and complete moral bankruptcy.

Bill Martin takes a broad look at the impact of the "War on Terror" (sic) on our campuses in his article, "Cloning Condi, or Manufacturing Your Homeland Security Campus and Cadre." He traces the launching of large-scale initiatives to create a cadre and set of institutions that penetrate our campuses and link them to national security, military, and intelligence agencies. "The aim," he writes, "is nothing less, as Congressional hearings show, than to turn back opposition on our campuses to imperial war, and turn campuses into institutions that will, over the next generation, produce scholars and scholarship dedicated to the so-called war on terror."

As these articles chart, a major aim of neo-conservatives and militarists is to definitively roll back the movement gains of the 1970s and 1980s, which led African studies centers and many (but not all) scholars to reject any further CIA/DOD funding, including the NSEP program launched in the early 1990s. In this connection, we publish the ACAS Resolution on the Study of Africa After 9/11 (posted on our website as a petition and signed by 72 people as of 16 March 2005), which sought to reaffirm and

reapply the lessons of past victories. The text of the Resolution is followed by the correspondence we have had with the secretariat of the African Studies Association (ASA) concerning the ACAS Resolution, which was passed at the last ASA membership meeting in New Orleans on 11 November 2004 by a large majority of those in attendance.

ASA, in responding to ACAS three months later, rejected all of our suggestions, including the very specific ones that called for open discussion and debate of the impact of 9/11 on African studies, formal ASA sponsorship of plenary sessions to discuss these matters, and ASA sponsorship of special issues of *African Issues* and the *African Studies Review*. In our reply we requested ASA to conduct a formal poll of the membership on the resolution, to be distributed by secret ballot in a regular mailing of Association materials. We welcome your response to this exchange and are open to suggestions for next steps. ASA has now requested a meeting with the ACAS co-chairs in April, and we will press this issue at the next ASA meeting, so stay tuned.

Finally, we reprint our most recent Action Alerts, which were circulated to the membership by E-mail in the past five months.

Endnotes:

(1) According to Greg Palast, the oil industry prefers state control of Iraq's oil over the neo-cons' proposed sell-off because it fears a repeat of Russia's energy privatization. (In the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union, US oil companies were barred from bidding for the reserves.) It appears the oil industry has won, that Iraq will retain control, and that the neo-cons' plan to use Iraqi oil to

scuttle OPEC has failed. (see "Secret US Plans for Iraq's Oil" 17 March 2005 <http://www.baou.com/newswire/main.php?action=recent&rid=20107>)

(2)ACAS wishes to thank the authors for allowing us to reproduce the executive summary of their recently released report; the full report is available on the website of the Catholic Relief Services (CRS).

From Stealing to Robbing: Globalization and the US War Economy

George Caffentzis, Coordinator of the Committee for Academic Freedom in Africa

Does globalization require the expansion and intensification of the US war economy? Although its supporters claim that globalization provides the economic basis for the liberation of humanity from war, it is now clear that the preservation of globalization will intensify war and stimulate the growth of the US war economy. In order to make my case I will briefly recount some recent history.

Money and "Contras" Rule: from the Mexican Debt Crisis to the Asian Financial Crisis

The process of neoliberal globalization began its remarkable career in 1982, with the Mexican debt crisis and the structural adjustment program that was put in place by Mexico's leaders as a condition for renegotiating the nation's debt with international creditors. By the end of the 1990s this process of avoiding national bankruptcy by imposing the neoliberal "reforms" demanded by the World Bank and IMF had transformed the political economies of more than a hundred countries. It also led to a degree of the homogenization of economic policies worldwide unparalleled in the history of capitalism.

This was a "dark victory" over the achievements of the anti-colonial movement of the 1960s and 1970s, as Waldon Bello called it,¹ but it was also both swift and "pacific." It was apparently

pacific because this expansion of neoliberal policies depended on monetary forces (especially threats to bar nations' access to credit), a class "deal" (where it was implied that roughly the top 20% of the population of Third World nations "going global" were to be participants in the global economy), and, when violence was actually called on--as it often was in Central America, Central Asia, Cambodia, and Africa--"contras" were employed to repress recalcitrant social forces or national movements. The policy of direct deployment of the US military was eschewed.

Implicit however in the IMF's and World Bank's demands that structural adjustment conditionalities be imposed on former colonized countries was the threat of their armed destabilization at the hands of CIA-sponsored "rebels." As I wrote at the time, the US military's strategy in these early globalization struggles was "a combination of buying high-tech, automated death machines and hiring out the 'dirty jobs' to low-waged mercenaries abroad" which echoed the neoliberal, Reaganomic strategy of "automation and computerization of domestic production and the exportation of 'dirty work' to the 'dirt wages' of the 'free trade zones' of the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Mexico and so on." The classic case of this strategy was the Reagan and Bush

Administrations' support of UNITA in Angola.

The process of globalization sped up, of course, with the "collapse" of communist party-led governments in Eastern Europe and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. Neoliberal economists designed "shock therapy" structural adjustment programs that not only destroyed the socialist infrastructure but also, in Russia, led to the premature death of millions of adult men--perhaps as many as would have died in a nuclear exchange! The spread of globalization nevertheless remained relatively irenic from the point of view of the US war economy and, aside from the short civil war in Romania, globalizing capitalism's defeat of communism was accomplished "not with a bang, but a whimper."

The end of the "Cold War," however, was the beginning of what the Zapatistas have called "The Fourth World War," since it pitted, most saliently, indigenous peoples against the forces of globalization enclosing the planet's remaining common land and communal peoples. The initial stage of this war, however, was compatible with the overall contraction of the US war economy.

Indeed, even though there were dozens of insurgencies, civil wars and genocides (often called "complex emergencies") all over the world in the decade after 1990, leading to millions of deaths, the triumph of neoliberal globalization saw one of the great periods of disarmament in history among the "super-powers." According to a reliable 2000 estimate, Soviet military expenditures in constant 2000 dollars went from \$405 billion in 1989 to \$56 billion in Russia in 1999, i.e., a decline of about 85%!³ In the US there was also a

steady relative, and even absolute, decline in military budgets. In real 2004 dollars, US military expenditures went from \$449 billion in 1989 to \$317 billion in 1999, i.e., a decline of about 30%. The US military budget in that decade declined relative to GDP in that decade as well, from 5.6% in 1989 to 3.0% in 1999.² Ideologically, this was the time when the Defense Department began to look desperately for new enemies and a new legitimation for military interventions. They had to settle, rather uncomfortably, with a sorry lot of cocaine capitalists, first in Panama, and then, in Colombia, for enemies and a justificatory doctrine of "humanitarian interventionism."

President Clinton (with all the ambiguities and illusions he evoked) largely defined this period in the political imagination. Clinton-era ideologues presented neoliberal globalization as the realization of the Enlightenment dream of a world market that was fundamentally irenic and civilizing, since it appeals to and develops participants' rational interests while mildly repressing their passions. These interests were continually reinforced by the nature of international trade that, supposedly, leaves everyone better off after the exchange. Under the ideological cover of a "win-win" result, major "trade" (actually "liberation of capital") deals were brokered (NAFTA, the WTO, the formation of the Euro Zone, etc.) in relative peace.

The Crisis of Neoliberalism and the War on Terror

Given that the global expansion of neoliberal policies coincided with a steep drop in worldwide military spending, the Clinton ideologists could claim some empirical support for their thesis: the

more trade, the less guns; the more the interests, the less the passions. However, beginning with the Thai financial crisis in the summer of 1997, continuing with the serial unfolding of financial crises in Asia, Russia, and Brazil, and ending in the official 2001 US recession, a new dynamic emerged. Its most obvious consequence for the antiwar movement was an increase in the US military budget and the seamless merging of the military with domestic policing, so that it was no longer clear where military spending and action ended and "homeland" policing began or, to put it legalistically, when war ended and crime began. These latter developments were, of course, essential to the "war on terrorism" that Clinton first declared in 1998 and that Bush rededicated after September 11, 2001.

The increasing militarization inaugurated by the "war on terrorism" and the crisis of neoliberal globalization are related. For by the late 1990s it began to be clear that the forces of "Money" and "Contras" was not enough to "rule": direct US military interventions were necessary. The depth of this crisis was indicated by the failure of the WTO meetings in Seattle in 1999, not only in the streets of the city, but, more troubling for globalizing capital, within the meetings themselves. For an increasing number of governments were beginning to question the truth of the globalization ideology (given the consequences of the Asian financial crisis) and were threatening to change the rules by themselves. This skepticism was seen again and again in the post-Seattle meetings of the WTO and the inconclusive meetings around FTAA. Globalization was losing its conceptual and ideological hold by the late 1990s. This posed a major challenge to the US, as the hegemon and rule keeper of the

world market, that could only be met by military means.

As in a horror movie, the world market's irenic face morphed in 1999 to show its martial visage. First, there was a major increase in the US military budget. US military spending in constant 2004 dollars went from \$317.1 billion in 1999 to \$475.3 billion in 2004, i.e., an increase of 47%. The US war against Yugoslavia in 1999 was the eventual turning point. The Clinton Administration decided that the Milosevic regime, after first appearing willing to adopt neoliberal policies, was resisting them and needed to be disciplined. Instead of depending on contras like the Kosovo Liberation Army as they might have done before, the Clinton Administration directly intervened in Yugoslavia by bombing Belgrade and occupying Kosovo. Bombing and occupation were to become the typical military policies of the George W. Bush Administration, but we should remember that they were actually anticipated by the late Clinton Administration just as Reagan's typical military policies were initially put into place by Carter. This is what is called "bi-partisan" politics in the US.

Clinton's Yugoslavia in 1999 was followed by Bush's Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003. These nations were on the long list of "rogue" states, "terrorist" states, and "failed" states used in the 1980s and 1990s to pick out recalcitrants, misfits, and "losers" in the neoliberal global order. Bush redefined the list in 2001 with a new taxonomy of states: "the axis of evil" and those "forty or fifty countries" that may harbor terrorists. But many of these anomalies were states for which globalization was evidently not the "win-win" situation that it was claimed to

be. Bush declared a period of endless "war on terrorism" in response to the attacks of 9/11 because the very stability of the world market was increasingly in question, not because the perpetrators of the 9/11 crimes were so powerful, numerous or ubiquitous. As more and more nations could not "play by the rules" of the neoliberal globalization regime, they were registered as specimens of the excluded, i.e., nations to be intimidated, subverted and, if necessary, invaded. Al Qaeda and Afghanistan simply provided the cases to justify the paradigm.

The role the US must play in the functioning of the world market drove the Bush Administration to war in Iraq in the first place. We know that the reasons officially given for this invasion were completely concocted, i.e., the Saddam Hussein regime did not possess "weapons of mass destruction" any longer and it did not do business with Mr. Bin Laden and Co. But there were reasons, particular and general, that necessitated the war, the most prominent being the increasing likelihood that the Hussein regime was, in a Houdini-like way, breaking out of the decade-long sanctions regime set up by and defended by the US. If Hussein's regime did manage to achieve this feat of being able to return to the world commodity and credit market, formally or informally, without the US' approval, it would have been a serious blow to US hegemony over the recalcitrants of the world market. For, after all, the Hussein regime was the classic rule breaker. Instead of seeing the Houdini regime escape, Bush decided to kill it in what has turned out to be a botched execution.

Conclusion: from stealing to robbing

Globalization, therefore, requires the intensification of a war economy in the US, i.e., an economy essentially dependent on a significant amount of resources (at least 3% of GDP, if viewed historically) being invested in the military for its own reproduction. This is not surprising. There has never been a period in US history when it did not have a war economy. In the 19th century this status was often hidden because the "war" was in the "homeland" with the suppression of slave rebellions and the extermination of indigenous peoples' resistance. We should reject the view that somehow such a war economy is exceptional or an interruption of "normal" capitalist economy. But there is not only one kind of war economy. The war economy of WWII was different from that of the 1960s and that differed from the Reagan-Bush 1980s.

What is distinctive about the war economy of the present is that the demands it must satisfy come from a ubiquitous spatial field and they are temporally indeterminate. The Cold War at least put a limit on the regions where the US military could be deployed and it put some cap on the future investment required to counter the well-defined adversary's investment. What is being required now is a new military model that dictates the deployment of US troops throughout the planet. Their job is to occupy an unprecedented multiplicity of new bases controlling strategic areas of wealth (which in this age often is spelled "O-I-L") and pressuring an ever-increasing multitude of recalcitrant states to "reform," consequences be damned. For a nation "reforms," in the Bush Administration's glossary, if it accepts the rules of neoliberal globalization, even though these rules would mean the immiseration of its population, the

stripping of its resources, or the loss of its own autonomy. In other words, reform or die, even if reform means death!

I call this transformation from the earlier phase of globalization to the present one "a movement from stealing to robbing," for while both are forms of theft the former is surreptitious (through debt and credit restrictions) while the latter requires direct violence (invasion and occupation by the US military) or the palpable threat of it for the expropriation of wealth to take place. The first, "stealing" phase of globalization was largely accomplished via the IMF's and World Bank's monetary pressure on governments to make their people and resources directly exploitable by transnational corporations. This phase of globalization was compatible with a dramatic reduction of the US war economy. Clearly the "robbing" phase of globalization will require an ever-expanding war economy. For as globalization fails in region after region and the number of nation-state recalcitrants grows, the hegemon of the market will have to respond to the goad of a potential infinity of threats and demands to exit to the point when, perhaps, the exhausted "robbers" won't even be worth stealing from!

As educators aiming to stop the war, therefore, our first commandment to our students and colleagues should therefore be: "Thou shalt not rob!"

[A talk given at the Educators to Stop the War Conference, March 5, 2005, Hunter College High School, NY.]

Endnotes:

1. See Walden Bello, with Shea Cunningham and Bill Rau, *Dark Victory: the United States, Structural Adjustment, and Global Poverty* (Oakland: Institute for Food and Development Policy, 1994).
2. Soviet and Russian statistics concerning military expenditures are difficult to estimate since they were/are considered state secrets. Consequently, many of the estimates are due to the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. My reading of the "reliability" of these statistics is due to their uncomfortable implications for US military spending. They are to be found online at: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/russia/mo-budget.htm>.
3. The statistics concerning US military spending as percent of GDP come from Office of Management and Budget, *Historical Tables, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2005* (2004), Washington, pp. 45-52. The source for the statistics concerning US military spending in constant 2004 dollars is to be found in the Center for Defense Information *Defense Monitor* November/December 2003.

On the Roots of War: Theses on the War in Iraq

Silvia Federici

If we place the war against Iraq in a historical context, we can see that war is a structural component of capitalist development.

From the "Conquest" that marked the

beginning of the world economy, to the colonization process of the 18th and 19th centuries, which brought the populations and resources of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East under the hegemony of European and American capital, through

WWII which ensured US capital access to the world market, war has constantly been on the agenda. War is a means to acquire economic assets, change class relations, and re-launch the accumulation process. Indeed, in the history of capitalism, war has been economic development by other means, a cost of production, escalating in proportion to the resistance it had to break.

In the case of the United States, since WWII the guarantor of world accumulation, hardly a decade has gone by without a war, whether conducted through the direct involvement of US troops, or under the umbrella of the United Nations, or through proxy armies (as in case of Angola, El Salvador, Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Panama) or, more surreptitiously, through death squads, and the politics of mass torture and assassination, as in the cases of Argentina, Chile, and, prior to that, Brazil (to name the most outstanding cases).

In this context, I argue that war is on the agenda today because of the crisis of the globalization project that was launched in the 1970s and 1980s through the politics of structural adjustment and trade liberalization.

Hailed as the pathway to "economic recovery," twenty years later these policies have shown they cannot deliver. Far from it, in every country in which they have been applied, they have produced unprecedented levels of impoverishment, social protest, and a process of economic and political re-colonization that can no longer be disguised. Thus, the temptations for governments to drop out of the globalization deal has continued to increase and so has the need to use force

to convince them to stay the course. The turning point was the period between 1997 and 2001, which witnessed first the "Asian Crisis" and later the failure of the WTO meeting in Seattle to produce a trade agreement, demonstrating that resistance to the prescriptions of the IMF and the World Bank was building at both the grassroots and governmental levels. Since then, opposition to globalization has continued to intensify. Witness the Hugo Chavez "revolution" in Venezuela, Argentina's President Nestor Kirchner's opposition to the dictates of the IMF in Argentina and his recent decision to pay only 30 cents out of every dollar on Argentina's external debt. Witness also the victory of the left in Uruguay, and the constant mass protests against the privatization of public utilities and the payment of the debt that have taken place in recent years in Bolivia (800 protests since President Carlos Mesa's appointment in the fall of 2003). The resistance to privatization in Peru, and the mass mobilization of indigenous people in Ecuador against Occidental Petroleum are further expressions of the globalization crisis. No wonder these days we are told that Al Qaeda might enter the US through the Mexican border!

Africa, War and Structural Adjustment

In Africa as well we see the coincidence between the implementation of the structural adjustment programs (SAPs), introduced in the 1980s by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the development of a state of constant warfare. The situation in Africa shows that structural adjustment generates war, and war, in turn, completes the work of structural adjustment, as it makes the countries affected dependent on international capital, and the powers that represent it, beginning with the US, the

European Union (EU) and the UN. In other words, to paraphrase Clausewitz, "structural adjustment is war by other means."

There are many ways in which structural adjustment promotes war. This economic restructuring was presumably meant to boost productivity, eliminate inefficiency, and increase Africa's competitive edge in the global market. But the opposite has occurred. More than a decade after its adoption, local economies have collapsed, foreign investment has not materialized, and the only productive activities in place in most African countries are once again, as in the colonial period, mineral extraction and export-oriented agriculture, that contributes to the gluts in the global market, while Africans do not have enough food to eat.

In this context of generalized economic bankruptcy, violent rivalries have exploded everywhere among different factions of the African ruling class, who, unable to enrich themselves through the exploitation of labor, are now fighting for access to state power as the key condition for the accumulation of wealth. State power, in fact, is the key to the appropriation and sale on the international market of either the national assets and resources (land, gold, diamonds, oil, timber), or the assets possessed by rival or weaker groups. Thus, war has become the necessary underbelly of a new mercantile economy, or (according to some) an "economy of plunder" (Bayart *et al.* 1999), thriving with the complicity of foreign companies and international agencies, who (for all their complaints about "corruption") benefit from it.

A further source of warfare in Africa has been the brutal impoverishment into

which structural adjustment has plunged the majority of the population. While intensifying social protest, this, over the years, has torn the social fabric as millions of people have been forced to leave their villages and go abroad in search of new sources of livelihood; and the struggle for survival has laid the ground-work for the fomenting and manipulation of local antagonisms and the recruitment of the unemployed (particularly the youth), by warring parties. Many "tribal" and religious conflicts in Africa (no less than the "ethnic" conflicts in Yugoslavia) have been rooted in these processes. From the mass expulsions of immigrants and religious riots in Nigeria in the early and mid-1980s, to the "clan" wars in Somalia in the early 1990s, to the bloody wars between the state and the fundamentalists in Algeria, in the background of most contemporary African conflicts there have been the World Bank's and the IMF's "conditionalities," that have wrecked peoples' lives and undermined the conditions for social reproduction and social solidarity.

There is no doubt, for instance, that the youths who have been fighting the numerous African wars of recent years are the same who two decades ago could have been in school, and could have hoped to make a living through trade or a job in the public sector, and could have looked at the future with the hope of being able to contribute to their families' well-being. Similarly, the appearance of child-soldiers in the 1980s and 1990s would never have been possible if, in many countries, the extended family had not been undermined by financial hardships, and millions of children were not without a place to go except for the street and had instead someone to provide for their needs.

War has not only been a consequence of economic change; it has also been a means to produce it. Two objectives stand out when we consider the prevailing patterns of war in Africa, and the way in which warfare intersects with globalization. First, war forces people off the land, i.e., it separates the producers from the means of production, a condition for the expansion of the global labor market. War also reclaims the land for capitalist use, boosting the production of cash crops and export-oriented agriculture. Particularly in Africa, where communal land tenure is still widespread, this has been a major goal of the World Bank, whose *raison d'être* as an institution has been the capitalization of agriculture. Thus, it is hard today to see millions of refugees or famine victims fleeing their localities without thinking of the satisfaction this must bring to World Bank officers as well as agribusiness companies, who surely see the hand of progress working through it.

War also undermines people's opposition to market reforms by reshaping the territory and disrupting the social networks that provide the basis for resistance. Significant here is the correlation--frequent in contemporary Africa--between anti-IMF protest and conflict. This is most visible perhaps in Algeria, when the rise of anti-government Islamic fundamentalism dates from the anti-IMF uprising of 1988, when thousands of young people took over the streets of the capital for several days in the most intense and widespread protest since the heyday of the anti-colonial struggle.

External intervention--often seizing local struggles and turning them into global conflicts--has played a major role in this

context. This can be seen even in the case of military interventions by the US that are usually read through the prism of "geo-politics" and the Cold War, such as the support given by the Reagan Administration to the governments of Sudan and Somalia, and to UNITA in Angola. Both in the Sudan and Somalia SAPs were underway since the early 1980s when both countries were among the major recipients of US military aid. In the Sudan, US military assistance strengthened the hand of the regime of Colonel Jaafar an Nimeiri against the coalition of forces that were opposing the cuts demanded by the IMF; even though, in the end, it could not stem the uprising that in 1985 was to depose him. In Somalia, US military aid helped Siad Barre's attack on the Isaaks, an episode in the ongoing war waged by national and international agencies over the last decade against Africa's pastoralist groups.

In Angola too, US military aid to UNITA served to force the government not just to renounce socialism and the help of Cuban troops, but to negotiate with the IMF, and it undoubtedly strengthened the bargaining power of the oil companies operating in the country.

In Africa too, globalization is in shambles. As timid as it may seem, the growing revival of Pan-Africanism and the move to a West African currency -- the Eco -- spurring regional development and creating alternatives to the dollar, are exemplary in this context (see Koomson 2004).

International Capital's Aims

Through war, international capital aims to regain control over the world economy. It is important to stress here that the war drive began already with the Clinton

Administration, as demonstrated by its attacks on Sudan and Afghanistan in 1998, the war against Yugoslavia in 1999, and the escalation of the military budget in the same year. Notice also that support for a politics of military interventionism grew in US/EU political circles after the collapse of state socialism in 1989, which promised to clear the way to a new imperial drive. "Humanitarian intervention"--the slogan of the 1990s--was the ideological justification for such a move. The number of countries that by means of warfare have been brought under the trusteeship of the UN/US, and the network of military bases by means of which the US has been girdling the planet, are the political and physical manifestation of this project, as is the prospect of an unlimited "war against terror."

War defeats social movements, expropriates people from their lands, gives capital control over the planet's natural resources: oil, water, mineral, land, and seeds. Not surprisingly, the map of military intervention today is, to a large extent, also the map of oil. One of the main objectives for international capital is the liberalization of the oil industry, oil being the only vital commodity that is not privatized. Significantly, the US has invaded Iraq at the very moment when the country was preparing to return to the world oil market and was concluding deals with France and Russia for the development of its oil industry (*ibid.*). Oil is also the reason for the large investment the US has made in the war against the FARC in Colombia; for its renewed military support to Indonesia (under the guise of aid to the populations struck by the tsunami); for its attempted destabilization of Venezuela, which will continue, especially if Venezuela's

negotiations with China for oil exploration result in an agreement. Darfur as well would not elicit much attention were oil not involved.

Not last, war has a terror function: terror plays at the level of international policy the same function that capital punishment plays at the level of domestic policy. It intimidates people and governments into compliance, punishes transgressions, and warns of coming retaliations. In this sense, there is also a connection between the re-launching of war in foreign policy and the renewed use of torture. We can dismiss in fact the idea that torture is a means to acquire essential information. The Italian jurist Cesare Beccaria disposed of that fallacy already in 1764, when he argued that as far as truth-finding is concerned, torture is as good as the medieval ordeal. The function of torture is to terrorize--this much has been learned from the experience of Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s--and so is the function of war, which above all must convince workers across the world that no alternative exists to capitalism.

Given this analysis of roots of war, what should be the strategy of an anti-war movement?

The first caveat is against any personalization of the war policy, of the type that led to the campaign in support of Kerry's election, which was based on the assumption that "everything is better than Bush." We also have to abandon the idea that salvation may come from Europe, presumably the soil where a more enlightened variety of capitalism is flourishing. If Chirac and Schroeder fail to support Bush's war drive more openly, it is because they face a more combative working class; consequently they cannot

divert as much of the surplus to military spending, nor can they cut workers' entitlements as easily as the US government can. In France, Germany, and Italy, workers of all ages and from all sectors (public and private) have gone to the streets over and over again to protest the attacks on pensions, to defend the 35 hours work week, and to demand that bankrupt companies not be allowed to "dump" their workers. This is something we have not seen in the US, which is why the US government can more confidently produce a military budget of \$500 billion dollars and create a devastating hole in public resources through its tax cuts. This is where the anti-war movement in the United States must concentrate its efforts; for the beast of war will not be stopped unless it is denied the resources it feeds upon: money and soldiers. This implies that it is crucial that we see the continuity, in our analyses and strategy, between military and economic policy, both on the domestic and international level.

Thus, the success of the antiwar movement in the United States will depend on its capacity to build a mobilization against the cuts in Social Security, education, medical care and other social entitlements. The same movement must also include among its strategic priorities the reversal of the politics of mass incarceration and the use of the death penalty which, long before September 11 and the Patriot Act, have disenfranchised thousands of African Americans and being instrumental to the maintenance and creation of profound inequalities and divisions within the American working class. At the international level, the antiwar movement must join with the antiglobalization movement in the opposition to the

policies as structural adjustment and economic liberalization. As I have argued, to the extent that these policies are in crisis and resistance to them continues to intensify, their implementation will be premised on a state of permanent warfare.

That war is once again today the handmaid of economic policy is well and provocatively demonstrated by Paul Wolfowitz's appointment as President of the World Bank, as it is by whispers coming from the corridors of power suggesting that the Bush Administration has no need at present for its staff of economists and little interest even in replacing those who retire. Clearly, the Bush Administration's task at the moment is to redraw the map of power relations globally and domestically, and historical record demonstrates that organizing war is a primary step in this direction.

References

Bayart, Jean-Francois *et al.* (1999) *The Criminalization of the State in Africa*, Oxford: The International African Institute, in association with James Curry.

Beccaria, Cesare. 1764. *An Essay on Crimes and Punishments*.

Federici, Silvia. 2000. "War, Globalization, and Reproduction" *Peace & Change* 25(2):153.

Koomson, George. 2004. "West African Eco, slated to be functioning 2007," *African Agenda*, 7 (5&6): 5-6. (Published by the Third World Network, Africa, Accra) See also "Eco is a reality, says treasurer of West African Parliament" and "West Africa's Secret Currency" in the same issue.

**Shareholders focus of campaign to end Kerr-McGee's involvement in
Occupied Western Sahara**

Press Release, Oslo, Norway, Feb 28th 2005

Rotterdam, Netherlands; New York, NY, USA; Seattle, WA, USA; London, England

February 28th 2005

Western Sahara Resource Watch, representing organizations in 20 countries, announced today a campaign against the American energy company Kerr-McGee (KMG). This Oklahoma City-based corporation is involved in the illegal, unethical and politically controversial plundering of hydrocarbons in the Moroccan occupied areas of Western Sahara. Morocco has illegally occupied Western Sahara since 1975 and the people of the territory, led by Polisario, are struggling for self-determination and independence. Kerr-McGee has been exploring for oil and gas in the territorial waters of Western Sahara since 2001 under license from the Moroccan state oil company, ONAREP. Today, the international solidarity movement for Western Sahara started contacting the company's 600 biggest shareholders, demanding that action be taken to prevent the company from renewing the contract that is set to expire May 1st.

Western Sahara is Africa's last colony. Formerly a colony of Spain, in May 1975 a UN mission determined that the people of Western Sahara overwhelmingly supported the liberation movement Polisario and were categorically for independence and against integration of the territory into Morocco. In mid-October of that year the International Court of Justice ruled that the people of

Western Sahara have the right to self-determination including independence. Morocco rejected the Court's ruling and invaded the territory in the first days November, forcing a majority of the population into refugee camps in Algeria. Morocco has refused to implement a 1991 UN peace plan in which a referendum would allow the people of Western Sahara to choose between independence and integration into Morocco. The UN Legal Council says that Western Sahara is a non-self-governing territory and that exploitation of the territory's hydrocarbons would be illegal.

"It is remarkable that Kerr-McGee does still not understand the political, legal and humanitarian dimensions of the catastrophe they are inflicting to the Sahrawi people. For three years, the company has refused to listen to our arguments. Now we hope to get some assistance from their shareholders" said Richard Knight, a member of the Association of Concerned Africa Scholars and spokesperson of Western Sahara Resource Watch.

The campaign requests the shareholders to play a role as active investors, influencing KMG not to renew its contract May 1st. If the constructive shareholder pressure does not succeed in changing the KMG policy, the campaign demands the investors to divest.

So far, a Norwegian and a Dutch seismic survey company have decided to not continue the activities in Western Sahara due to the political implications of the

contracts. This happened as a consequence of active shareholder ownership and dozens of sell-outs over the last years. Also a Danish and a French company have left the area, making Kerr-McGee the only foreign company remaining in the Western Sahara.

One major investor has already divested from Kerr-McGee - the Norwegian fund administrator Skagenfondene has sold its 100.000 shares, taking a two million dollar loss. Due to the massive negative attention on Kerr-McGee's activities in the occupied territories, they regarded the shares as too risky. Now the government-owned Norwegian Petroleum Fund is considering if it should sell its shares, estimated to be worth over \$7 million.

“The campaign against Kerr-McGee has lead to an impressive mobilization worldwide. Today, 19 organizations on four continents have all started contacting their respective Kerr-McGee shareholders simultaneously. Last month, we contacted all screening agencies in the world, explaining them the nature of the contract, urging them to recommend their clients to sell. Now contacting the shareholders is a natural second step in our strategy,” said Liesbeth den Haan of the Netherlands Foundation for the Right to Self-Determination for the Sahrawi People.

No country recognizes Morocco's sovereignty over Western Sahara. The Polisario-formed government in exile, a founding member of the African Union which is recognized by 70 countries including South Africa, has heavily condemned the Kerr-McGee contract.

“Morocco's planned theft of Western Sahara's hydrocarbons is immoral and

illegal. Since Kerr-McGee signed the reconnaissance contract with ONAREP in 2001, Morocco has stalled the UN-supported peace process. Morocco has even rejected a generous plan put forward by former U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. Kerr-McGee's activities have already blocked the peace efforts and contributed to rising tension in the region. If Kerr-McGee continues, there are definitely possibilities of taking legal actions against the company, and we strongly urge Kerr-McGee to not renew their contract. We are very sure that our measures will make Kerr-McGee withdraw, as the last company in the industry still operating in Western Sahara. The question is how and when”, said Jacob Mundy founder of Friends of Western Sahara (www.friendsofwesternsahara.org).

For further information, or to receive a full version of the shareholder letter, please contact Richard Knight (New York, USA) tel (+1) 212-663-5989 rknight1@juno.com, Jacob Mundy (Seattle, USA) tel (+1) 206-329-1341 mundy@u.washington.edu, Tom Marchbanks – Western Sahara Campaign (UK) tel (+44) 794-955-6718 wsc@gn.apc.org or Liesbeth den Haan (Holland), tel (+31) 610858899, e-mail st.zelfbeschikkingwest-ahara@planet.nl.

The campaign is coordinated by the newly founded Western Sahara Resource Watch. WSRW is a network of organizations that work to preserve the natural resources in Western Sahara for the usage of its people, inasmuch as their sovereignty over those resources is a right with erga omnes character enshrined in several UN resolutions and human rights documents.

**Chad's Oil: Miracle or Mirage?
Following the Money in Africa's Newest
Petro-State**

Ian Gary and Nikki Reisch

© Catholic Relief Services and Bank Information Center, February 2005

Chad's Oil: Miracle or Mirage? The Chad-Cameroon Petroleum Development and Pipeline Project, transporting oil from landlocked southern Chad to the Atlantic coast of Cameroon for export, represents the foremost test case of the extent to which oil revenues can be used to alleviate poverty in a challenging developing country context. The most innovative feature of the project is the establishment of a legal framework (Chad's Law 001 and subsequent amendments and decrees) that earmarks money for poverty reduction expenditures and creates an oversight committee to ensure the transparent management of the country's oil wealth. Touting the promise of petrodollars for Chad's poor over public concerns that new revenues would be lost to corruption and mismanagement, the World Bank provided financing that catalyzed the ExxonMobil-led oil development. Given the dismal track record of oil-producing countries around the world and the high stakes in a country as unstable as Chad, this experiment has come into the international limelight. The fate of the \$4-billion plus project is not only of vital importance to the people of Chad, who hope to reap its benefits but risk bearing enormous costs if oil production leads to corruption, conflict and the further concentration of power in the hands of a few. It is also of great interest to other countries facing the challenge of transforming their oil wealth into benefits for their people; to donors attempting to

solve the problem of the "resource curse"; and to energy-hungry industrialized countries searching for new and stable sources of oil.

Poverty, Politics and Petrodollars: Chad is a landlocked country with a long history of civil war, continued political instability, a weak judicial system, widespread corruption and an all-encompassing institutional capacity problem. This is an extremely challenging environment in which to attempt to turn oil revenues into benefits for the poor. And the stakes are high—if Chad's oil money is mismanaged, it could mean increased hardships and conflict for the nearly seven million people in Chad living on less than \$1 per day. Since independence in 1960, Chad has known more years of war than of peace, and rising tensions in the region mean that violence is never far off. A coup attempt in May 2004 reminded observers of the fragile political environment, and tensions have increased over the attempt by President Déby's ruling party to change the constitution to allow him to run for a third term in 2006. The Chadian oil experiment depends largely on the political will of the government to respect the rule of law where there is little history of doing so, to develop accountable institutions, and to encourage democracy. In an environment where the government faces internal and external threats, such political will appears to be in short supply.

Chad's Landlocked Treasure: After decades of on-again, off-again exploration and negotiations, in July 2003 Chadian oil began to flow through the 1,050 kilometer pipeline, produced by a consortium comprised of ExxonMobil, ChevronTexaco and Petronas, the Malaysian state oil company. Production from the three active fields in the Doba basin reached its current peak capacity of 225,000 barrels per day in late 2004 and more than 60 tanker shipments have been exported to date. Beyond the 1 billion barrel estimated reserves in these three fields, the presence of the pipeline infrastructure is spurring new oil production and exploration in Chad. ExxonMobil plans to add five new "satellite" fields to its existing production in 2005-2006 and, together with other companies like Canada's EnCana, is exploring other parts of Chad. With these ongoing activities and the government's efforts to attract more investment in the sector, Chad's oil windfall is likely to be much larger than originally predicted.

Oil Revenues – Chad's First Taste of Black Gold: The unprecedented measures put in place to safeguard against misappropriation of oil revenues are now being put to the test. In late 2003, ExxonMobil made its first royalty payment into the government of Chad's escrow account at Citibank in London, and Chad was likely to receive \$140-150 million in oil revenues during 2004 and over \$200 million in 2005. Over their 25-year production span, the first three oil fields in southern Chad may earn the government more than \$5 billion in oil revenues. Just how much more Chad will receive from other oil fields tapped in the future is yet unknown.

In response to pressure from civil society organizations concerned that the benefits of oil development would not reach the poor, the World Bank conditioned its financing for the pipeline project on the establishment of a revenue management plan. Chad's innovative petroleum revenue management law stipulates that the majority of direct revenues from oil production – royalties and dividends – be earmarked and spent on "priority sectors" targeting poverty reduction. In addition, a joint government-civil society petroleum revenue oversight committee (the Collège) has been established to play a "watchdog" role, approving projects and monitoring the quality of their implementation.

While some information on Chad's oil revenues is made public, details regarding the calculation of revenues and many key agreements between the oil companies and the government remain secret. Furthermore, legal safeguards contain notable loopholes. For example, all indirect revenues – including income taxes on the oil companies – will go directly into general government coffers. These indirect revenues may amount to more than \$3 billion over the next 25 years. In addition, the revenue management law does not cover any revenues from oil produced outside the three original Doba fields. These and other weaknesses mean that it is difficult for citizens to verify the accuracy of revenue information disclosed and that much oil revenue will fall outside of the jurisdiction of the law and the control of the Collège.

On the government side, there is a profound lack of capacity to master the technical aspects of monitoring oil production and determining oil revenues.

More than one year into Chad's life as an oil producer, many basic aspects regarding the calculation of oil revenues remain the subject of dispute between the government and the ExxonMobil-led consortium.

“Just Add Oil” – Accountability from Scratch: In a country lacking an effective system of checks and balances, the joint government-civil society revenue oversight committee created by Law 001 is a unique institution, critical to the effort to hold the government accountable for the use of oil money. Experience to date has shown that the Collège has made promising strides to establish itself and exert its authority. At the same time it needs increased access to information, an improved ability to investigate expenditures and the cooperation of government to prosecute any wrongdoing identified. The Collège lacks an independent and steady source of funding, and without support from Chadian civil society will be unable to effectively carry out oversight in a country as large as Chad. Finally, the government has placed trusted allies – such as President Déby's brother-in-law – on the Collège and has interfered with the selection of civil society members. While the Collège can influence the budgeting process, reject ill-founded expenditures and investigate the execution of projects it approves, ultimately its ability to ensure that oil revenues are used for poverty reduction depends on the willingness of the judiciary to prosecute cases of misuse, fraud or corruption that the Collège may uncover.

Budgeting for the Boom – Spending Chad's Oil Revenues: For a \$4 billion-plus investment, the oil industry enclave

in Chad is creating precious few jobs, making the generation of non-oil employment and the careful management and spending of oil revenue paramount. The ultimate success of the Chad experiment will be judged not on barrels of oil produced or revenues generated, but on the successful investment of these revenues in Chad's people through a well-planned and executed budget system. Chad has little record of effectively budgeting and spending government resources, and has a history of corruption and mismanagement in bidding and procurement procedures. The experience of the 2004 budget – the first containing oil revenues – and plans for 2005 show that there are many obstacles standing between transparent budgeting of oil revenues and spending those monies in a way that reduces poverty.

Executive Summary

With increased scrutiny of revenue flows at the macro-level, problems with corruption and mismanagement will likely migrate downstream where they are more hidden from public view. As in other oil rich countries, systems of patronage may develop through the non-transparent awarding of government contracts funded by oil revenues. These tendencies, together with limited government capacity to absorb increased levels of funding, have grave implications for the poverty reduction objectives of a project dependent on the effective use of massive new government revenues. World Bank projects designed to increase capacities in these areas prior to the arrival of first oil have failed to meet their objectives. Despite World Bank promises, the result has been a “two-speed” project whereby the pipeline was completed a year ahead of schedule

but the government remains largely unprepared to manage its oil windfall.

Changing Chad – The Role of External Actors: Ensuring that Chad’s oil boom benefits the poor requires not only building government capacity, but altering policies and, ultimately, changing politics. The experience to date reveals both the limits of external actors’ ability to influence these changes and the urgent need for those actors to use what leverage they do have to support adherence to the rule of law and compliance with the revenue management safeguards. In Chad, where citizens have limited influence on their government, external actors – such as the World Bank, IMF, and the U.S. and French governments – can be important sources of pressure for greater transparency and accountability. The rapid accumulation of petrodollars in Chad confronts the World Bank, IMF and other donors with a choice between using their known leverage today and relying on their uncertain leverage in the future.

A “Model Project” Hanging by a Thread: Many obstacles stand in the way of converting Chad’s oil wealth into concrete improvements in the lives of the country’s poor. While some have prematurely hailed the Chad project as a “new model” for harnessing oil revenues to benefit development, the record of Chad’s first year as a petro-state provides many reasons for concern. Important building blocks for transparent and effective oil revenue management are being developed and need to be nurtured, but limited progress on this front is tempered by worrying trends in the political environment, weaknesses and loopholes in the revenue management system, problems with corruption,

transparency deficits and severe government capacity constraints. The oil experiment hangs by a thread. Chad’s experience shows that transparency is but one essential ingredient in a system of oversight, accountability and sanction. Transparent information can be used for both formal and informal enforcement of the law, but the tools to use it have to be in place. Investigative and judicial arms of the government must be independent and capable of prosecuting wrongdoing. Elections must be free and fair and Chadians must have the ability to change their government through the ballot box if they think it has not managed the oil wealth well. Informal enforcement – through monitoring by civil society and publicizing information on the radio and via other media – must be part of a system of accountability. Transparency is only meaningful if information is understood by the government and the public, and if the findings of oversight bodies lead to action.

It is too early to declare the Chad experiment a failure or a success. Whether or not Chad manages to escape the “paradox of plenty” may not be known for years. There are, though, clear lessons that can be drawn from Chad’s experience to date, which can serve as signposts to correct pressing problems in Chad and to guide efforts to assist other developing countries in managing resource wealth. And one of the most fundamental lessons that Chad offers today is the importance of ensuring that minimum conditions of respect for human rights, fiscal transparency, and demonstrated government capacity to implement pro-poor programs are in place prior to promoting investment in the extractive industries.

What Intellectuals Do in Peacetime¹

Asma Abdel Halim

One must always begin one's resistance at home, against powers that as a citizen one can influence; but alas, a fluent nationalism masking itself as patriotism and moral concern has taken over the critical consciousness, which then puts loyalty to one's "nation" before everything. At that point there is only the treason of the intellectuals, and complete moral bankruptcy.

Edward Said: Al-Ahram Weekly 24 - 30 June 1999

Injustice has become endemic to Africa and fashionable as nationalism in the developed world. However, in some African countries there seems to be a conviction that the only cure to injustice is war. Intellectuals around the world have devoted valuable time to the conceptualization and contextualization, and other difficult to pronounce words, of war and its causes and consequences. In the process they also engage in their own wars that, in my view, have contributed to setting the stage for bloody wars. They contribute in at least two ways: the first is their silence in the face of religious extremism, and their conviction that extremism is a bubble that will soon burst and lose its effect. The second is their participation in the so called civilian branches of militia where they devote their time to justifying war and theorizing solutions through prophecies of new socio-economic relations formulated at the expense of uninformed poor civilians whose lives would be shattered for decades to come. After reading part of this at a recent workshop I think it wise to state the obvious: Not all intellectuals commit reckless acts; however, the sheer fact that

the adjective intellectual applies to them is enough to hold them responsible for how they behave as intellectuals and how their silence or participation makes a difference.

The silence in the face of the extremist intellectuals has taken a heavy toll on the lives of the courageous intellectuals who performed their duty towards their communities and religions. Albagir Mukhtar of Amnesty International, London, recently decried the intellectuals' dire attempts after September 11th to exonerate Islam from sanctioning killing of the innocent. Not that they had not done it before, but then they did it as if it were meant just to sit on shelves and be dug out by wide-eyed graduate students and other scholars. Those who courageously took the responsibility to confront fanaticism and destruction of their communities ended up hanging from gallows or exiled to other countries. One wonders whether it would have been possible for dictators to kill and exile them if all intellectuals stood fast behind the courageous ones, through words and actions. Cases in point are Mahmoud M. Taha of Sudan, Ken Sara Wiwa of Nigeria, and Nasr Hamid Abuzaid of Egypt. Intellectuals around the world were busy trying to agree or disagree with the scholars and publish their opinions rather than take the moral and ethical stand of supporting them, whether they agreed with them or not. For some reason intellectualism seems to be the antithesis of activism. Lack of activism in the anti-extremist camp allowed the extremists' message about injustice to be carried to the grassroots, while the counter-message remained the domain of sympathetic Western and apologetic Muslim scholars.

The civil wars and other upheavals in the Sudan may serve as good examples of how intellectuals have been part and parcel of the wars and other conflict situations. Intellectuals who are participating in the war rhetoric, whether they are from the government side or the rebel side, are engaged in a war of words—words that never reached the more than one million people who have been displaced and the 50,000 killed in Darfur region. The internet revolution has made easy the exchange of insulting partisan or ethnic foul language that may sometimes culminate in intellectual lynching. The formation of troops to attack someone on a list-serve or a discussion board is an amazing daily exercise on those lists, topped only by the formation of long lines to congratulate or pay condolences to a list member for a sad or happy occasion. The keyboard troops lead character assassination expeditions, descriptions of past and future battlefields and exchange of nationalistic jargon that borrows from the heritage of war.

For almost sixteen years Sudan has been under the thumb of Islamist extremists whose cadres spent at least twenty years organizing to take power. Their organization made them the envy of the rest of the political entities. They took over the major financial institutions by initiating their own banks, insurance and other public and private companies. They spread their influence carefully in both military and civilian institutions. They knew that from then on they only had to wake up early enough to overthrow the democratic government.² Despite the fact that their financial institutions were failing, they managed to overthrow the elected government and to threaten all other stronger financial institutions.

Islamist intellectuals were pivotal in turning the war between the government and the Southern Sudanese rebels into a religious one. They carefully chose military chants and used the media especially radio and television to spread ideals that they themselves knew were silly but were effective in playing on the religious passions of Sudanese Muslims. The propaganda ranged from silly stories of monkeys fighting with soldiers and trees chanting Allahu Akbar, to holding wedding parties for the martyrs whom they were sure were being wed to the celestial wide-eyed females in heaven. In their endeavor to Islamize the whole country they sold Islam as a unifying factor that worked against racism and nationalism. They turned the conflict over power into a holy war. Now that the American administration had forced both sides into a peace agreement, the Islamist rhetoric quickly changed into one of ethnicity and a warning that Muslims would be wiped out by the Southern rebels who found their way into the capital city after the peace agreement.

Newspapers are full of stories of how the capital city is now the sight of men in military fatigues carrying machine guns raising havoc whenever it fits their purposes. Whatever the reason that this behavior is allowed in the market areas and neighborhoods of the city, the rhetoric of Islamist intellectuals has seized the chance to turn their position against racism and nationalism into one that is full of prophecies of doom that would befall the Northerners by the trigger happy rebels roaming the streets. They, the Islamists, totally ignore of course the fact that escalating the war and signing a lame, vague peace agreement is their responsibility.

The latest warning came from Mr. Altayeb Mustafa, one of the Islamists' prominent writers. He has been for a while a proponent of the cession of the North from the South. His latest article is posted on the largest Sudanese discussion board *Sudaneseonline.com*; the title may be translated as, "You Will Remember My Words". The arrogance of the rebel leaders and soldiers became the base for fueling resentment against the warriors who seem to have earned some sort of impunity after the peace agreement. Certain facts and truths collected for his article make it difficult to convince his readers that the status quo is part of the poor governance of his party.

It is easy to implicate the Islamist intellectuals for their blatantly manipulative rhetoric, but the rebels are not exactly free from the same vice. Civilian branches of armed rebellions, known as the "movement," play the role of think tanks for armed rebels. The Sudan Liberation Army is no exception in making sure that it has its "Movement", hence the acronym SPLM/A. The prominent Northern scholar, Dr. Mansur Khalid, who is a law graduate and holder of a Ph.D. in Education and who held positions such as Minister of Foreign Affairs and that of Education led the think tank of the Movement. Dr. Mansur Khalid's two-volume book titled, *The Sudanese Elite and Addiction to Failure*,³ is sitting on the shelves of thousands of intellectuals. I, not counting myself among the intellectuals, have been a devoted fan of Dr. M. Khalid ever since my high school days. His style and his meticulous research are beyond admirable. In his abovementioned book he makes the case for how the Sudanese intellectuals are the source of all the crises that plagued the Sudan. He decries how the intellectuals

have turned into professionals who are constricted by their lack of vision and their content with a salary at the end of the month. Ironically, this widely admired intellectual has joined one of the most devastating wars of the past century. The sheer fact that an intellectual of his caliber has become party to a war, regardless of which side he is on, is an indication of how peace time can be a time for intellectuals to work their way into war rather than become factors in preventing it. His very words against intellectuals mirror his own status in the apparatus of conflicts.

The wars that keep breaking out one after the other in the Sudan seem to be owned by the intelligentsia of the country. Dr. Elizabeth Hodgkin, East Africa researcher for Amnesty International, and a long time Sudanist, told a large group of Sudanese in Iowa City that the people fleeing the war in Darfur kept asking her why they were being shot at and who was shooting at them. She answered, "I don't know." However, not a day passes by without a long article or a pamphlet from the various groups that are fighting the government in the region, with hardly a note on how unwinnable such wars are. A clear indication that the conflict is about competing political interests and that the people are not only uninformed but were not consulted on whether they wanted to trade miserable, deprived lives for the total devastation of war. Long articles from the intellectuals of the rebels about the long suffering of the people, and press releases promising to avenge them, are not in short supply. Fiery lies and irresponsible acts of the government subject the people to one of the greatest humanitarian disasters in Africa if not in the world. Both sides find strength in turning their war into an ethnic conflict that pits ethnicities against each other.

Treason versus patriotism is the government intellectuals' favorite field of writing. In effect Darfur and adjacent regions are now set for some genocidal acts. Granted, the UN could not prove genocide in Darfur; however, there is no lack of evidence that there is a high possibility that it may occur. Each ethnic group has turned genocidal against the other. Intellectuals on all sides hardly address the hard glaring, fact that military presence of any type amongst the disempowered, disenfranchised and dispossessed citizens does nothing but victimize those civilians. Edward Said eloquently makes the point that, "As any displaced and dispossessed person can testify, there is no such thing as a genuine, uncomplicated return to one's home; nor is restitution (other than simple, naked revenge, which sometimes gives an illusory type of satisfaction) ever commensurate with the loss of one's home, society, or environment."⁴ If people could come to terms with the volume of devastation to civilian lives, then forgiveness of excesses in the name of a higher cause or good would be totally unacceptable; impunity of the government for disregarding its responsibility towards citizens would not pass for defending them or for peacekeeping.

The intellectualization of killing and rape takes various shapes and forms. The frightful practice of playing with words and of demonizing the other is chilling. The gender wars are the most disgusting to me. They are a vivid reminder of how intellectuals turn the malignant into benign. A recent article published on *Sudaneseonline.com* by a writer from Western Sudan awakened the humiliations of the 19th century civil wars in the worst way possible. He described the mass rapes by the Mahadiyya army of women of a

certain ethnic group in the North as a "sexual spree" that overwhelmed those women and attracted them to the super sexuality of the men of Western Sudan, who made up the bulk of that army. He ridiculed the impotence of men in the North and praised his kinfolks for satisfying the women through their insatiable sexual desires and abilities. He ignored the fact that the women who were violated by that army, committed group suicides by holding hands and jumping into the Nile to drown, so as to spare their men the indignity and hurt of living with raped women. The most heinous war crime was turned into a sexual competition between the men. This is being said and published at a time when the same crimes are being committed in another civil war, in Darfur, Western Sudan. Could there be a stronger incentive for an ethnic sexual pay back? Not surprisingly the women-members of that board who dared to express their opinions against male aggression and sexual assault were quickly treated to some sexual suggestions that were thought to put them in their place.

The war in Iraq is another example of how intellectuals cannot resist a chance to do some abstract thinking. Case in point is the elections that took place in that country. It is disheartening to listen to analysts articulating how the act of casting a ballot has liberated the Iraqis; never mind that it was under occupation, martial law, and on a ballot that shows no names. Another example is how some terminology is taken for granted and used as basis for theory development. Often one hears intellectuals take the division along ethnic and religious lines without questioning it. Geographically Iraq became the *Sunni* triangle, the *Shi'a* concentrations, and Kurdish areas that dream of independence. The Kurds have been removed as a Sunni

segment of the population and ethnicity has been confused with religion. New expressions are not in short supply; the latest is the "debaathification" of Iraq. Groups, zones and expressions are created and dismantled to fit the "experts'" parameters and imagination.

The *simple* question by the "masses" seems to be, "but what is the difference between Iraq before elections and Iraq after the elections?" The *simple* answer is that the war has turned bloodier after the elections. Attempts to tell the Iraqis to forget about ethnic and religious differences are futile after three years of basing the Iraqi lives on those divisions. News anchors, who are among the media networks intellectuals, paid a solemn gesture to mark the day when the number of dead American soldiers reached 1,500 and the injured more than 11,000. The same anchors continue to count the Iraqi dead by the dozen as if they were things or individuals who "needed killing."

The destruction of infrastructure in big Iraqi cities and heavily populated centers is rarely mentioned. Some intellectuals will quickly thwart any attempt to mention the devastation and displacement of thousands by saying that people who concentrate on destruction were just doomsday advocates, and we would do better if we paid some attention to the positive peaceful life that was going on in some parts of that country. To explain why such a suggestion should insult anyone's intelligence, let us apply it to the USA. Suppose that we embraced the notion of being positive and applied it to the events of September 11th. On that devastating day life was hardly disrupted in most parts of the country. Schools remained open and people expressed their shock and horror while meeting in peaceful places. Even in New York City the news

was not heard in all boroughs at the same time. Would it have been a good argument to tell everyone to remember that it was only two buildings and a couple of thousand people and thank goodness we still had about 300 million alive and a government in place? We may not feel the absurdity of such an argument till we equate the devastation and the inequity of destabilization in both places. It is not far fetched to conclude that flag waving nationalists chanting death to the enemy on all sides emerge from the same devastation, and there is no virtue in branding one group insurgents and another patriots.

There is, more often, a negative tendency in the existing debate; the debaters are excellent at vilifying what they are against rather than speak to what they are for. Not only that but the debate involves anti-government arguments rather than antiwar arguments, to the extent that there is usually a celebration of killing of government soldiers and wailing over human rights when the killing is of the rebels. For me the most disconcerting of all is how intellectuals take for granted the legality of war and concentrate on the illegal acts of the warriors.

¹ This title is taken from the title of a book edited by Meredith Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya titled, *What Women Do in Wartime: Gender and Conflict in Africa*.

² The Sudanese people grew accustomed to waking up in the morning to the tunes of military marches that would be followed by a declaration of a military take over. It became a joke that whoever wakes up the earliest can take over power.

³ Khalid, Mansur. 1993, *The Sudanese Elite and Addiction to Failure*, Cairo, Sijjal Alarab Printers.

⁴ Edward Said. *The Treason of the Intellectuals. In Masters of the universe? : NATO's Balkan crusade* edited by Tariq Ali. London ; New York : Verso, 2000.

Manufacturing the Homeland Security Campus and Cadre

William G. Martin*

Education and Empire

Teachers have always been called to the service of empire. Among today's most prominent illustrations is Condoleeza Rice, previously Stanford's Provost and, more substantively, a product of Cold War Soviet studies--as are most of her older mentors who have recently returned to populate the Pentagon and now the State Department. While the Cold War and Sovietology are gone from the scene, a parallel project is now underway: the launching of large-scale initiatives to create a cadre and set of institutions that penetrate our campuses and link them to national security, military, and intelligence agencies. The aim is nothing less, as Congressional hearings show, than to turn back opposition on our campuses to imperial war, and turn campuses into institutions that will, over the next generation, produce scholars and scholarship dedicated to the so-called war on terror. These programs are part of a broader effort to normalize a constant state of fear, based on the emotion of terror, while criminalizing anti-war and anti-imperial consciousness and action. As in the past, universities, colleges and schools have been targeted precisely because they are charged with both socializing youth and producing knowledge of peoples and cultures beyond the borders of Anglo-America.

For the elders among us this should be familiar ground: in the 1950s and 1960s scores of new programs and hundreds of student grants and fellowships were funded to study the Communist and Third Worlds, while unknown numbers of intelligence officers observed our campuses and sat secretly in our

classrooms and community meetings. Indeed the area studies project, including African studies, was originally founded upon Cold War premises and funding¹--premises which came under attack in the 1970s as secret projects were revealed, resisted, and unraveled. Despite this history, today's new initiatives, from the creation of centers with million dollar grants to hundreds of fellowships requiring service in and reporting to security agencies, remain largely unobserved and uncontested.

HR 3077

The one recent effort that has been extensively discussed is the attack on the roughly \$86 million of Title VI federal funding for the 120 foreign language, area studies, and international National Resource Centers.² Created in the late 1950s, these programs encompass graduate student fellowships, language instruction in more than 200 less commonly taught languages, public outreach, faculty research, and courses in area and international studies. Of the 120 there are only 17 Middle East centers, with around \$4 million in total research and fellowship funding, and only 11 African centers with approximately \$ 4 million in funding.

After 9/11 these programs became, as in the early 1990s, the target of broadsides launched by neo-conservatives in and out of Congress. The attack was led by Stanley Kurtz of the National Review Online and a Research Fellow of the Hoover Institution (like Condoleeza Rice who is simply "on leave" from Hoover). Kurtz has been backed by a right-wing cast including, among others, Martin Kramer, former Director of the Moshe Dayan

Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies at Tel Aviv University and author of Ivory Towers on Sand: the Failure of Middle East Studies in America, and Daniel Pipes of the Middle East Forum and promoter of the notorious Campus Watch website which urges students to send in reports on “anti-American” teachers.³

Following Kurtz’s call hearings were held in June 2003 before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, where Kurtz hyper-ventilated that these programs, particularly those pertaining to the Middle East, “tend to purvey extreme and one-sided criticism of American foreign policy,” infested as they are by the anti-American followers of Edward Said, the man who “equated professors who support American foreign policy with the 19th century European intellectuals who propped up racist colonial empires.”⁴ African studies centers came in for special notice, given their role in rejecting military and intelligence funding for African studies, including that from the National Security Education Program.⁵

The defense of Title VI programs by scholars and professional associations varied widely. Most found common cause in attacking the bill by rallying behind the defense of academic freedom and autonomy.⁶ Some, such as Terry Hartle, Senior Vice President of the American Council on Education, and Gilbert W. Merckx, Vice Provost for International Affairs at Duke University, defended area studies programs in Congressional testimony by arguing their long and valuable contribution to the training of national security officers.⁷ Others were straightforward in denouncing H.R. 3077 as a right-wing attack in the service of military and intelligence agencies.⁸

From these hearings came House bill HR 3077, passed unanimously by a

voice vote of the Subcommittee and the House in October 2003.⁹ Among the bill’s features lifted directly from Kurtz’s testimony was the establishment of an advisory board with broad investigative powers “to study, monitor, apprise, and evaluate” the activities of area and language studies centers. The board was to report not to the U.S. Department of Education, the Title VI administering agency, but to the Congressional majority and minority leaders, and the federal contracts for the investigations could be contracted outside of the federally-mandated competitive bidding processes. The board is intended to make sure that these programs “reflect diverse perspectives and represent the full range of views” on international affairs, forecasting the implementation of David Horowitz’s related campaign in his FrontpageMagazine.com to “Expose the Leftist Campaign to Shape America’s Young Minds” and force the hiring and tenuring of right-wing scholars.¹⁰

The membership of the proposed board reveals the controlling agencies and its lack of institutional diversity: all its members are appointed by and only accountable to the government, including two from national security agencies.¹¹ And it is not only scholars and large academic programs at risk, for the bill calls for the study and observation of “foreign language heritage communities” (presumably Middle Eastern and Islamic communities) across the country. It further requires all Title VI institutions to provide full access to federal government agency recruiters, including military and intelligence agencies. What the *No Child Left Behind Act* provided for high schools—mandatory lists of students’ addresses and home telephone numbers to military recruiters—is now to be visited upon all college campuses.

Centering Homeland Security on Campus

HR 3007 did not pass the Senate last year. HR 3007 has however been resubmitted in early 2005 by House Republicans as part of H.R. 507, and will surely remain the subject of debate given the interests involved. What the attention to HR 3077 obscures, however, is a multifaceted alternative which aims to bypass current area and international studies programs and create a new network that extends across the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.¹²

As Kurtz has argued, the US government's wars demand knowledge of languages and areas tailored to new military and intelligence needs. In the immediate wake of 9/11 \$20 million was quickly added to Title VI funding alone. At the same time, the Department of Defense (DOD), awash with billions in budget, added \$50 million to the program of the Defense Language Institute, almost as much as the entire Title VI program for 226 less commonly taught languages and area studies in the Title VI centers in universities. At the time scholars and universities scrambled after these new opportunities, with the result that courses, individual grant projects, and certificate programs on "terrorism" and "security" began to emerge in ad-hoc fashion all around the country.

Four years later almost all the major research universities have jumped on the wagon, announcing new certificates, programs, and centers from East to West Coast. These range from new certificate programs such as the Terrorism and National Security Management Certificate offered by Kaplan Online University (a division of the Washington Post) and Denver University's Homeland Security Certificate Program, to new research

centers such as Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation (which offers Organizational Learning and Homeland Security Fellowships), Syracuse University's Institute for National Security and Counterterrorism, Ohio State University's International and Homeland Security Program, John Jay's Center on Terrorism, and homeland security programs at Johns Hopkins, MIT, and so on.

Department of Homeland Security

As the war has hardened into a long-term, militarist rationale to re-plate US hegemony—a failed project to be sure—more comprehensive calculations, planning, and funding have emerged from the heart of the US security, intelligence, and military agencies to shape these initiatives into a solid war and intelligence network.

At the heart of this effort stands of course the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which employs 183,000 people and disburses a \$40 billion budget. Its controlling interests are well represented in its Advisory Council, which is chaired by Joseph Grano, the chairman and CEO of UBS Paine Webber, and is populated with persons who have served in senior posts with the FBI, the CIA, Dow Chemical, Conoco, Eli Lilly, Congress, and Lockheed Martin. The single university officer, the President of Carnegie Mellon University, is offset it seems by the chair of the nation's Ad Council.

DHS at present handles a \$70 million dollar scholarship and research budget, and its initiatives, in alliance with those of military and intelligence agencies, point towards a whole new network of campus-related programs. This follows the pattern of the late 1950s when Cold War programs were created at the nation's

major universities, often with direct and secret CIA funding as at Harvard and MIT among other campuses. Yet there is a difference this time round: in the 1950s and 1960s at least the Soviet Union possessed tanks and nuclear bombs, which could be counterposed to allied US, European and Asian governments supporting liberal decolonization and development around the world. Today Bush's wars proceed unilaterally without any liberal pretenses, and against an enemy inflated by spin doctors and without any weapons of mass destruction.

New centers and programs dedicated to this project are nevertheless now being built across the country with federal funds, weaving together initiatives by campuses themselves. DHS itself has a major program to foster the largest ones. The University of Southern California has created the first "Homeland Security Center of Excellence" with \$12 million grant that brought in multidisciplinary experts from UC Berkeley, NYU, and University of Wisconsin-Madison. Texas A&M and the University of Minnesota won \$33 million to build two new Centers of Excellence in agrosecurity. Smaller grants abound across the nation and flow from other agencies as well, from the National Institutes of Health to the National Science Foundation—although no accurate accounting exists to date. The scale of networked private and public cooperation is indicated by the new National Academic Consortium for Homeland Security led by Ohio State University, which links more than 200 universities and colleges.¹³ The Consortium is the brainchild of General Todd Stewart, retired Air Force major general and executive director of Ohio State's own Program for International and Homeland Security.

Scholarships: Cloning Condi

More immediate and insidious, and funded directly by homeland and national security agencies, is the drive to create a new cadre of intelligence and military officers that rotate between our classrooms and national intelligence agencies. The lure is spectacular and widespread: DHS in September 2003 announced the first 100 winners of a new collegiate fellowship program in the applied social and behavioral sciences; another 105 were announced late last year.¹⁴ Undergraduates receive a stipend of \$9,000 in addition to all tuition and fees for nine months, and \$5,000 summer stipend to work at a DHS-designated agency. Graduate fellowships cover tuition and fees and a \$27,600 per year stipend (including a mandatory summer internship). Needless to say this makes a mockery of the desperate student applications for \$9-12,000 graduate fellowships common across the country.

And DHS fellowships in the hundreds are not alone, for intelligence and military agencies have their own programs in play as well. Not to be left behind, the CIA received four million dollars via the 2004 Intelligence Authorization Act to create a pilot program to train agents in university classrooms. Named after Senator Pat Roberts, chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the Pat Roberts Fellowship Program (PRISP) offers undergraduate or graduate students \$25,000 a year. Fellowship holders are required to meet in closed sessions run by their administering intelligence agency and, upon graduation, accept 18 month's employment for each year of fellowship support. Like all CIA employees, graduate student interns have to pass medical and polygraph tests as well as background investigations.

Scholarship holders as well as the campuses they are on remain a tightly held

secret. As a recent article by David Price reveals, the project has deep roots in the construction of an academic-intelligence marriage reaching back to Vietnam era.¹⁵ The DOD also partners with the Association for the Advancement of American Science to offer Defense Policy Fellowships, which places new doctoral-level degree students directly into the Department of Defense. The fellowship stipend is \$62,000-81,000 per year; needless to say “The fellowship is contingent upon the recipient obtaining a security clearance.”¹⁶

The inspiration for many of these programs—now across all the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities—is clearly the narrower National Security Education Program established in 1992, which was designed to provide an increased number of U.S. students with language and area experience for the DOD, CIA, and other federal agencies. Under NSEP students study both in the US and overseas, on fellowships awarded under the direct administration of the DOD and under an oversight board which includes the director of Central Intelligence; fellowship holders are required to seek employment in “national security” agencies.

All signs point to the proliferation of these programs, extending into more scholarly fields and levels of education. In 2005 the DOD will unveil a new national initiative in foreign languages, signed and supported by most other federal agencies and seeking to introduce more language instruction in the K-12 system, colleges, and universities with a variety of support programs in order to increase “homeland security.”

Who is the Enemy?

What these programs signal is thus not simply an attack on academic freedom

or even the diversion of education funding into secret intelligence projects. For students and scholars alike these new programs threaten to solidify dangerous institutional changes. Secret military and intelligence agencies will increasingly dictate which languages, religions, and peoples—both beyond and within our borders—will be studied and by whom. New networked centers and programs, created by and tied to federal security funding, will form an academic homeland security complex destined to implement the fear of “un-American others,” all in pursuit of an increasingly profitable and increasingly illusory “war on terror.” Meanwhile, hidden behind these facades, marches the development of security and intelligence student trainees who report to security agencies and move back and forth, unknown and unobserved, from our classrooms to security agencies.

The forgotten exposes of the 1970s demonstrate what these kinds of programs produce: an academy not simply comprised and at risk, but riddled with secret military and intelligence projects, slowly spreading all over the world in service of misguided imperial ambitions. Yet there are positive lessons from the past as well, for despite the best scholarship and harshest military and intelligence efforts, France could not maintain its hold over Indochina and Algeria, Britain over Kenya and southern Africa, Portugal over Guinea-Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique, and the US over Vietnam. Indeed, in all these cases US and European leaders and governments fell due to resistance to occupation and militarism, with no small part played by the young and the old, by teachers and students. And therein lies a lesson for scholars: which side are we on?

*This essay was first presented at a workshop on “Stopping Military Research & Homeland Security Programs on Campus” at the Educators to Stop the

War Conference, Hunter College High School, New York, March 5, 2005. Comments and inspiration from attending students and teachers are gratefully acknowledged.

1. As I have argued elsewhere with Michael O. West in *Out of One, Many Africas* (Urbana IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999).
2. See for example the list compiled by the Social Science Research Council, "A Sampling of Opinion on Title VI, H.R. 3077 and Middle East Studies" <http://www.ssrc.org/programs/mena/MES.Opinions/index.page>, accessed March 4, 2005.
3. <http://www.campus-watch.org/>; see Kristine McNeil, "The War on Academic Freedom," *The Nation*, November 11, 2002, <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20021125&c=1&s=mcneil>, accessed March 15, 2005.
4. Kurtz's testimony is online: <http://edworkforce.house.gov/hearings/108th/sed/itilevi61903/kurtz.htm>, accessed March 4, 2005.
5. See Kurtz "Ivory Scam" May 29, 2002, *National Review Online*, <http://www.nationalreview.com/kurtz/kurtz052902.asp>, accessed March 4, 2005.
6. See for example the Task Force on Middle East Anthropology, "Action Alert: HR 3077 Talking Points," December 2003, <http://ga.berkeley.edu/academics/hr3077.html>, accessed March 4, 2005, or the AAUP's own "Legislative Alert," September 23, 2003, <http://www.aaup.org/govrel/hea/2003/9-23alert.htm>, accessed March 4, 2004.
7. As Hartle argued in Congressional testimony, "We believe that most of the career security foreign language and area specialists in agencies such as the Central Intelligence and Defense Intelligence Agency were trained at institutions with Title VI-funded centers" (online at <http://edworkforce.house.gov/hearings/108th/sed/itilevi61903/hartle.htm>). Merkx's Congressional testimony centered on how his international and area centers at both Duke and New Mexico served military and intelligence agencies. As Merkx testified himself, he does "not claim to be typical of all foreign area specialists," since he knows quite well of the vigorous opposition to working with military and intelligence agencies. Merkx by contrast was a founding member of and chaired the Group of Advisors of the National Security Education Program of the Department of Defense; his June 19, 2003 Congressional testimony is online at <http://edworkforce.house.gov/hearings/108th/sed/itilevi61903/merkz.htm>, accessed March 4, 2005.
8. See for example David Brodsky, "HR 3077 - The Education for Empire Act," *The Faculty Advocate*, 4,

- 1-2, December 2003, <http://iml.umkc.edu/aaup/facadv13.htm#HR%203077>, accessed March 4, 2005, and Vijay Prashad, "Confronting Evangelical Imperialists: Mr. Kurtz: The Horror, the Horror," *Counterpunch*, November 13, 2003, <http://www.counterpunch.org/prashad11132003.html>, accessed March 5, 2005, as well as the articles in the *ACAS Bulletin*, special issue on "Academic Freedom Under Attack," 69, Winter 2004.
9. The longer history of NSEP and background to HR 3077 as it relates to African studies may be found in David Wiley, "Scholars of Africa and Middle East under Right-Wing Attack," in the valuable special issue of the *ACAS Bulletin* on "Academic Freedom Under Attack," 69, Winter 2004, 4-9. Wiley was been especially targeted by Kurtz, as in Kurtz "Ivory Scam." ACAS led opposition to NSEP (originally known as the Boren Bill); see ACAS' 1997 "The Case Against DOD and CIA Involvement in Funding the Study of Africa," <http://acas.prairienet.org/pubs/nsep97.html>, accessed March 12, 2005.
10. See Horwitz's website <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Content/read.asp?ID=10>.
11. Three members are to be appointed by the Secretary of Education, of whom two must come from government agencies with national security responsibilities; the House of representatives and the Senate would each appoint two more.
12. For the rare, usually online, exceptions see for example Steven Mikulan, "University of Fear," *LA Weekly*, April 2-04, 2004, <http://www.laweekly.com/ink/04/19/features-mikulan.php>, accessed March 4, 2005, and, especially and just recently, Dave H. Price, "The CIA's Campus Spies," *Counterpunch*, March 12/13, 2005, <http://www.counterpunch.org/price03122005.html>, accessed March 15, 2005.
13. "Current Member List," <http://homelandsecurity.osu.edu/NACHS/members.html>, accessed March 4, 2005.
14. See U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Science and Technology Directorate, Office of Research and Development, University Programs, Undergraduate Scholarships and Graduate Fellowships, <http://www.orau.gov/dhsed/>, accessed March 4, 2005.
15. See Price, "The CIA's Campus Spies."
16. AAAS Defense Policy Fellowships, <http://fellowships.aaas.org/defense/>, accessed March 14, 2005.

Resolution on the Study of Africa After 9/11

Association of Concerned Africa Scholars, 2004

Whereas we live in a period of increasing conflict and war affecting Americans, Africans and peoples world-wide,

Whereas the defense of democratic freedoms requires the free flow of information, free speech, and open debate,

Whereas we are daily engaged in the discussion and exchange of ideas and scholarship in pursuit of these freedoms,

Whereas recent U.S. government laws and executive policies, most notably the USA Patriot Act and Homeland Security Act, have operated to restrict basic civil liberties and freedom of expression,

Whereas more than 300 U.S. cities and counties and 3 states have passed resolutions opposing the USA Patriot Act,

Whereas laws and policies such as the USA Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act interfere with academic freedom and contribute to a climate of intolerance on our campuses and in our communities,

Whereas there is increasing pressure to align the study of Africa, its peoples and languages with the narrow priorities of military and intelligence operations,

Whereas new security and visa policies based on religious and racial profiling are subverting the free exchange of knowledge with and visits by African scholars, Whereas increasing numbers of Africans and others, most notably legitimate refugees, are being detained without representation or hearings for long periods of time, and thus are being denied basic constitutional and

international human rights; therefore be it

Resolved that we reaffirm our commitment to academic freedom, and call upon scholars as well as college and university administrations to safeguard free speech;

Resolved that we call for the repeal of all recent government laws and actions that restrict civil liberties, free speech, and free association, including the USA Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act;

Resolved that we reaffirm the African Studies Association's long-standing policy of support for the open and transparent determination of research priorities and awards, and against research determined by the priorities of military and intelligence agencies,

Resolved that we call for a visa policy free of racial and religious profiling,

Resolved that we call for expedited hearings for all refugees, an end to indeterminate detention, and the implementation of basic human rights for refugees,

Resolved that the Board of Directors of the African Studies Association implement the above actions by acting without delay to:

- (1) Actively pursue these issues with members of Congress,
- (2) Re-confirm past resolutions on the independence of scholarly work from military and intelligence agencies, most notably the NSEP program and more recent, related initiatives,
- (3) Dedicate plenary session(s) to this subject at the our annual meetings,
- (4) Request the Editors of African Issues and

the African Studies Review to prepare special issues on these matters, and
(5) Form an Executive Commission with adequate resources to compile data and investigate trends on emerging threats to academic freedom, which will make regular reports to the Board and membership, and

Resolved that this resolution be sent without delay to the U.S. President, all members of the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Chairperson of the African Union, representative African scholarly associations, and the academic press.

 **AFRICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION**

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

Douglass Campus

132 George Street

New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1400

Tel: 732-932-8173 /Fax: 732-932-3394

Web Site: www.africanstudies.org

February 11, 2005

Professor Meredith Turshen
Co-Chair, Association of Concerned Africa Scholars
Department of Urban Studies
Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy
Rutgers University
33 Livingston Avenue
New Brunswick NJ 08901

Professor Michael O. West
Co-Chair, Association of Concerned Africa Scholars
Department of Sociology
PO Box 6000
Binghamton University
Binghamton, NY 13902-6000

Dear Meredith Turshen and Michael West:

I am writing in reference to the Resolution on the Study of Africa After 9/11 that the Association of Concerned Africa Scholars introduced at the African Studies Association Business Meeting during the 47th Annual Meeting in New Orleans. The resolution was discussed during the Board of Directors Fall General Board Meeting and the Board subsequently has exchanged emails and phone calls concerning the resolution.

The consensus of the Board is that, for several reasons, it would be inappropriate for the Board to pass such a resolution on behalf of the Association as a whole. First, the ASA is a scholarly and

professional society dedicated to the promotion of teaching and research on Africa, with the widest possible freedom of enquiry and dissemination of findings in both academe and to the wider public in the United States and abroad. Defending intellectual freedom and the professional interests of our members, both individual and institutional, is a fundamental role of the Association. The ASA must be prepared to act, and it has acted recently, to defend those interests in the political arena. During the past year, the ASA joined the Coalition for International Education to support its efforts and the efforts of the directors of the Title VI area studies centers in protesting against inserting a political review board into the re-authorization legislation for the Title VI programs. The ASA also joined the protests against the Treasury Department's attempt to impose a ban on the publication of material by authors from U.S. trade-embargoed countries like Cuba, Sudan, Iran and North Korea, a ban that threatened the integrity of scholarly publishing. The ASA's efforts included writing letters to members of the House and the Senate on these issues. The efforts of senators who similarly rejected the idea of a political review board resulted in the legislation dying in committee in face of election year politics. The Title VI legislation, however, will be up for renewal once again this year and the ASA plans to continue its involvement in this process. Meanwhile, the cumulative and vigorous protests against the publication ban led the Treasury to relax the restrictions late last year.

Second, the ACAS resolution touches on crucial and more general political issues that go well beyond the core academic and professional interests of the ASA to the fundamental rights of American citizens, the character of American democratic institutions, and the conduct of American foreign policy. While ACAS is constituted to address such issues, and it is appropriate and essential for it to do so, the ASA is not. Rather, the ASA mission as a non-profit organization is to bring together individuals and institutions, domestic and international, who are interested in African affairs, to provide information and support services to the Africanist community, and to defend the scholarly and professional interests of the members of the Association as a whole.

Third, the Board felt that considering any general resolution would require polling the ASA's individual members and ensuring that the outcome of any such poll would constitute a position that was fully warranted for a scholarly and professional association committed to the widest possible expression of opinion on the issues. The Association exists as a forum, and not as a platform for particular partisan positions. The ASA serves fundamentally to defend freedom and democracy in the academy and related professional arenas. ACAS, however, can address wider political issues and solicit support from Africanist scholars and others.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bruce J. Berman". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "B".

Bruce J. Berman
President

ASSOCIATION OF CONCERNED AFRICA SCHOLARS (ACAS)

10 March 2005

Bruce J. Berman, President
African Studies Association
Rutgers University
132 George Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1400

Dear President Berman,

We write in reference to your letter of February 11, 2005, written in response to our sponsorship of the “Resolution on the Study of Africa after 9/11.”

We find common ground in your statement that the Association must support the “widest possible freedom of enquiry and dissemination of findings in both academe and to the wider public in the United States and abroad,” and that “defending intellectual freedom and the professional interests of our members, both individual and institutional, is a fundamental role of the Association.” These were precisely the principles behind the resolution.

What we find surprising is that the ASA Board not only rejected the resolution tout court, but rejected every single item in a resolution passed by its own membership at the last annual Membership meeting on 11 November 2005 in New Orleans. None of these items involved partisan support for any political party or program as the Board seems to allege; all were directly related to pressing issues among the Africanist community. In our view, and we believe in the membership’s view, even racial profiling and visa policies for visiting scholars and the indeterminant detention of African refugees are of proper concern to scholars of Africa and their organizations.

Even more surprising was the rejection of the very specific suggestions made in the resolution that called for open discussion and debate over the impact of 9/11 on African studies, as in the call for formal ASA sponsorship of plenary sessions to discuss these matters, or in the call for the sponsorship of special issues of African Issues and African Studies Review. As press reports and meetings of African studies programs reveal, African and international studies are being re-forged by state, military, and intelligence priorities, and we need more light and discussion of these dangerous trends.

For these reasons we request that the ASA conduct what your letter suggested: a formal poll of the membership on the resolution, to be distributed by secret ballot in a regular mailing of Association materials. ACAS would be willing to pay the cost of printing the ballot.

Many thanks for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Meredeth Turshen Michael O. West
Co-Chairs

ACAS Alert: Twice a Victim, first in Haiti, then in the US

19 November, 2004

Dear ACAS members and friends,
We are forwarding this message because ACAS has been following events in Haiti and because of our actions on the Homeland Security Act (see our resolution on the ACAS website--and please sign on!).

Meredeth Turshen, Michael O. West,
ACAS Co-Chairs

The uncle of Edwidge Danticat, the Haitian writer, who raised her while her parents were in the US, died last week while in the custody of Homeland Security. He was 81 years old, he had a valid visa to the US, he was a church pastor, and he was forced to flee Haiti after the UN used his church to stage an 'operation,' killing several civilians in the process.

Upon arriving in the US he requested asylum - as he had a visa and a family willing to take him in, this should have been a straightforward process but instead he was taken into custody, refused his blood pressure medication and his family was not allowed to visit him. He died 5 days later.

There was no reason to detain him in this manner, no reason to deny him his medication, no reason to refuse his family the right to visit him.

Edwidge Danticat is the author of *Krik Krak!*, *Breath, Eyes, Memory*, *The Farming of Bones* and *The Dew Breaker*. She taught writing at NYU when I was there, and was a very supportive and giving teacher. I'm passing on the following news report, in the hope that you can help me spread the word about this terrible tragedy, and, as a community of writers, find ways to respond and make people aware of

how the office of Homeland Security is abusing its power. Please let the magazines, newspapers and blogs that you write for know about this story.

Sunday, November 14, 2004

Twice a victim: first in Haiti, then in the U.S., by Jim Defede, Miami Herald Columnist

The gun battle started around 5 a.m. with Haitian police and U.N. troops entering the slum neighborhood of Bel Air, a stronghold for those still loyal to former President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. Using bulldozers, the police broke through barricades of burned-out cars.

But unlike previous raids into Bel Air that lasted less than an hour, this one, on Sunday, Oct. 24, would persist for the better part of the day.

Soon after the fighting started, Joseph Dantica, 81, took refuge with a handful of people inside the Church of the Redeemer. Dantica had founded the Baptist church more than 25 years ago and was its senior pastor. He had spent the better part of his life in Bel Air, and although his family had begged him to move somewhere safer, he always refused.

"He was a very good man and extremely loyal to the neighborhood where he lived," said his niece, acclaimed Haitian author Edwidge Danticat. "Even when things got very rough and difficult in Bel Air, he stayed. He stayed through all the different regimes, serving the people of his neighborhood. He was, in his own quiet way, trying to make a difference."

By 9:30 a.m., police and U.N. troops using armored cars with mounted machine guns, approached Dantica's church. The police wanted to go inside. Dantica let them in.

They then took up combat positions on the upper floors of the church, as well as an adjoining school the church operates. The new vantage point allowed police to ambush a group of gang members in an alley below.

"A lot of them must have died," said Dantica's son, Maxo. "The shooting went on for a long time."

A government spokesman said one police officer died in the day's fighting and at least two "bandits" were killed. An unknown number of civilians were wounded.

By early afternoon, the police began to withdraw, calling the operation a success. A government spokesman told The Associated Press that Haitian police would establish a permanent presence in the area to protect residents.

Maxo didn't believe them. No sooner had the police left than he heard there was a group of gunmen looking for him and his father. "I told my father we must go," he said. "And my father said no. He would stay and talk to them. He knew many of them since they were little boys."

The next day, gang leaders came knocking on Dantica's door. They were angry, accusing him of cooperating with the police and setting up the roof-top ambush. According to Maxo, the gang members claimed 15 people died in the alley and Dantica was going to have to pay for their funerals.

When the gang members left, Dantica knew he could no longer stay. For three days he hid in a

neighbor's house. "When the gangs couldn't find him," Maxo said, "they went into the church and took the altar out into the street and burned it."

On Thursday, Oct. 28, friends smuggled Dantica out of Bel Air and the next day, Dantica and Maxo boarded a plane for Miami.

Although he provided immigration officials in Miami a passport with a valid visa, he told the immigration official that he wanted to seek asylum in the United States.

"The official told him, 'Well, if that's the case, then you have to go into the system,'" Maxo recalled. "I begged them, 'Please, do not hold my father, because he will not survive.'"

Homeland Security officials sent Dantica to the Krome detention center along with Maxo.

"I couldn't imagine why they would put someone his age in prison," said Edwidge, who rushed to the airport hoping to retrieve Dantica. "Especially since we were here ready to be responsible for him."

According to Maxo, when Dantica arrived at Krome, his high-blood-pressure medication was taken away from him. Maxo and his father were placed in separate housing units.

Edwidge hired immigration attorney John Pratt, who tried Monday to convince immigration officers to release Dantica on humanitarian grounds. He did arrange for a "credible fear interview" Tuesday morning.

Sitting in the waiting room before Tuesday's hearing, Dantica, according to Pratt, said: "They didn't give me my medicine."

Before Pratt could find out more, they were called before the hearing officer. Five minutes into the hearing, Dantica leaned forward and threw up. "All of a sudden he started vomiting," Pratt said. "He had some kind of an attack. He fell back against the wall. He looked like he had passed out."

A medic from the detention center was summoned but suggested Dantica was faking his illness. "He's not cooperating," the medic said, according to Pratt. After a few minutes, the medic agreed to take Dantica to the detention center clinic.

"The medic was very insensitive," Pratt said. "His whole attitude was wrong."

Tuesday afternoon, Dantica was taken to Jackson Memorial Hospital. Pratt was told Dantica would be held overnight for observation.

"I asked the officials at Krome, could a family member go and visit him in the hospital, and they said no, for security reasons," Pratt said. "I kept trying to tell them that having family members around him would be reassuring for him, especially if his condition was serious. They kept saying no."

On Wednesday, Pratt was told that Dantica would remain at the hospital for at least another day. Officials again refused to let the family visit Dantica.

At 11 p.m. Wednesday, Pratt was notified that Dantica had died. "I don't know what he died of. But once they realized it was serious they should have let this man see his family."

The Department of Homeland Security issued a statement saying Dantica "died of pancreatitis while in Homeland Security

custody, which an autopsy by the Miami-Dade County medical examiner's office revealed as a preexisting and fatal condition."

"It is unfortunate that Mr. Dantica died during the benefits application process, and we understand his family's grief, but there is no connection between the preexisting terminal medical condition he had and the process through which he entered the country."

Homeland Security would not explain why Dantica was taken into custody if he had a valid visa, nor would the agency address claims that he had been deprived of his medication.

Maxo said he knew nothing of his father's illness. "All I know is that he wasn't sick when we left Haiti," Maxo said.

Even in death Dantica is unable to return home.

Amid the escalating violence in Haiti, Maxo is afraid to take his father there for a funeral. Instead, Maxo plans to bury him on Saturday in New York, where they have relatives.

The final weeks of Dantica's life is the story of Haiti today, where good people find themselves vulnerable and alone and easily forgotten.

"He was one of those people caught in the crossfire," Edwidge said of her uncle. "And that's true for the majority of people in Haiti; they are now in the crossfire and they have nowhere to go."

C 2004 Herald.com and wire service sources. All Rights Reserved.
<<http://www.miami.com/>>
<http://www.miami.com>

ACAS Alert: Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and Njeeri Wa Ngugi, 19 January 2005

Dear ACAS Members,
Some of you may have attended the ACAS session on the attacks on academic freedom at which Kassahun Checole spoke so movingly about the attacks on Ngugi and Njeeri Wa Thiongo Wa Ngugi. We have received a request to support them and are forwarding it to you for action.

Best wishes for 2005,
Meredeth Turshen and Michael O. West
ACAS Co-Chairs

January 14, 2005
Dear Friends,

As you may already know, world renowned Kenyan playwright, novelist and social critic Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and his wife Njeeri Wa Ngugi were brutally attacked on August 11, 2003 in an apartment in Nairobi, Kenya. Ngugi was severely beaten and burned with cigarettes, and his wife, Njeeri, was raped in the ordeal.

Subsequently, several people were arrested in conjunction with the attack, and it is becoming increasingly clear that this was a politically motivated assault on a leading international intellectual and his wife. It was the first time that Ngugi had returned to his home country after 22 years of political exile.

We are writing to ask you to take a few minutes of your time to send a letter to the addresses appended below to encourage the Kenyan courts and government to take this attack seriously, and to prosecute not only the direct attackers, but all those involved in the attack. This is not only an issue of paramount importance for political liberties and the rights of intellectuals. It is also a critical test case for overcoming a culture of silence and impunity

surrounding violence against women in Kenya (and, in many ways, the world at large).

We have included a letter, both in the body of this mail and as an attachment, that exemplifies the spirit of the pressure that we believe it is necessary to put on the Kenyan government to insure that these attacks are treated in the most appropriate and deliberate matter. We fear that without this pressure, the political forces behind this attack may go unpunished, and the issue of rape glossed over. A letter of any length, either in your own words or borrowing from the language of the one included here, would make an immense difference. Please send your letters to as many of the appended addresses as you wish and also forward our call to others who might want to join our efforts. If the Kenyan government is compelled to see the overall importance of this trial, we will win an overwhelming victory in our struggle against violence against women and for the rights of public intellectuals. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Gabriele Schwab
On behalf of The Ngugi and Njeeri Solidarity Committee

Board Members:
Gabriele Schwab, Chair
Chancellor's Professor of English and Comparative Literature
University of California-Irvine

E. Ann Kaplan, Professor of English and Comparative Literature and Director of the Humanities Center at SUNY Stony-Brook

Simon J. Ortiz, Poet and Writer, Professor of Native American

Studies and Creative Writing,
University of Toronto

Manuel Schwab, Writer

Gayatri Spivak, Avalon Foundation
Professor in the Humanities
Director, Center for Comparative
Literature and Society, Columbia

Please forward additional copies
of the letters you send to
nugisolidarity@gmail.com for our
records.

Please write to one or more of the
following contacts:

1. Kiraitu Murungi
Ministry of Justice and
Constitutional Affairs
State Law Office, Harambee Ave.
P.O. Box 40112, Nairobi
Tel: +254 20 227461
Minister's email: minister-
justice@skyweb.co.ke

Dorothy Angote
Permanent Secretary, PS Justice
& Constitutional Affairs,
Please use fax: 254 20 316317;
email: psjustice@Africa
online.co.ke

2. Attorney General
State Law Office
P O Box 40112-00100, Nairobi
Tel: 254 20 227411
no email address. Please use
fax: 254 20 315105

3. First Lady Lucy Kibaki
State House
P.O. Box 40530-00100, Nairobi
Tel: +254 20 227436
email: oafla@statehousekenya.co.ke

4. John Githongo
State House
P.O. Box 40530-00100, Nairobi
Tel: +254 20 227436
email: contact@statehousekenya.
co.ke

5. Office of President
State House
P.O. Box 30510-00200, Nairobi

Tel: +254 20 227411
email: pps@statehousekenya.
co.ke

6. Hon. Ayang Nyong'o, Minister
Ministry of Planning &
National Development
Treasury Building
P.O. Box 30007-00100, Nairobi
Tel: +254 20 252299
email: mopnd@treasury.go.ke

7. Phillip Murgor
Director of Public Prosecution
State Law Office
P O Box 40112-00100, Nairobi
Tel: 254 20 227411
no official email address at
DPP but personal email through
His law firm, murgor@nbi.
ispkenya.com

Please forward a copy of all
letters you send to the following
addresses as well:

1. Federation of Women Lawyers of
Kenya
Amboseli Road off Gitanga Rd.
P.O. Box 46324 Nairobi, Kenya
email: info@fida.co.ke

Jane Onyango, Executive
Director:
email: jonyango@fida.co.ke

Hellen Kwamboka
email: hellen@fida.co.ke

2. The Ngugi and Njeeri
Solidarity Committee
email: ngugisolidarity@gmail
.com

3. Kenya Human Rights Commission
P.O. Box 41079-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
email: admin@khrc.or.ke

-Thank You
The Ngugi and Njeeri Solidarity
Committee.

January 14, 2005
To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing to appeal to the Kenyan government to react appropriately and with all deliberate speed to the brutal attack on Ngugi Wa Thiong'o and Njeeri Wa Ngugi and the rape of Njeeri. We write to stress the urgency of an appropriate response that will hold accountable not only the direct attackers, but all those responsible for what we see as a politically motivated attack by enemies of what Professor Ngugi Wa Thiong'o stands for in Kenya, Africa and the world.

The world community continues to watch this case closely, first and foremost because we are shocked by the brutality of this attack and rape, but also because of the grave implications impunity for the perpetrators would have. International organizations, including women's groups, civil liberties organizations, and organizations of writers and intellectuals are but a few of the members of the international community deeply invested in how the present administration will respond to this attack.

It is critical for the Kenyan government to rebuff this grave attack against an internationally celebrated public intellectual whose commitment to his country and the empowerment of ordinary people has been unwavering. If this attack on the occasion of his first return to his home country, after 22 years in forced exile, is not condemned, and all those responsible pursued for their crimes, a chilling blow to intellectual liberty will have been dealt. Such blows have impact the world over. This one, in particular, would send a sad message regarding Kenya's capacity to overcome its political past. This government must respond firmly to demonstrate a commitment to the political future of the country.

It is equally critical to demonstrate a willingness on the government's part to respond to the full gravity of the rape of Njeeri Wa Ngugi. The culture of silence around violence against women in Kenya fosters repeated and widespread abuses against the human rights of women. A full length Amnesty International report on violence against women in Kenya (March 8, 2002) cites several national and international instruments that hold governments responsible for failures to prosecute with "due diligence" any violence against women. We want to express our unconditional solidarity with Njeeri Wa Ngugi in her ongoing struggle to stand publicly against the epidemic of violence against women. We believe that the government of Kenya has both the opportunity and the responsibility to meet the challenge of supporting her. This challenge consists in bringing all those responsible for this attack on Njeeri Wa Ngugi and Ngugi Wa Thiong'o to justice. But steps must also be taken to end the conditions that foster this culture of silence. Systems must be put in place, as in other countries, for women to anonymously identify their attackers. Every form of sexual violence against women must be treated as a crime of the gravest consequence. The victims cannot be left to fight alone. To that end, we hope that this administration will not set the precedent of allowing Njeeri Wa Ngugi to stand alone.

At a time like this, when we are seeing political violence erode so many countries in Europe, North America, Africa, and indeed on every continent, it is doubly important for people in positions of power to stand against the impunity of perpetrators. We hope that with your actions, you will set an example for Kenya and the world.

ACAS Alert: Defend Academic Freedom in Botswana, 22 February 2005

Dear ACAS Members and friends,

From time to time we send out alerts on issues of importance to our community. Here is one on academic freedom, an issue we have been following for many years; suggested action appears at the end.

Meredeth Turshen and Michael O. West,
ACAS Co Chairs

Professor Kenneth Good (of the Department of Political and Administrative Studies, University of Botswana) and I have co-authored an academic paper "Presidential Succession in Botswana - No Model for Africa". It was due to be presented to a departmental seminar this week.

The paper is a critique of what we both see as growing autocracy in the so-called "model of Africa" - which many of you may be familiar with through the idyllic portrayal in the Mma Ramotswa books by Alexander McCall Smith.

On Friday evening (18th) around 5 three men arrived at Ken's house, did not identify themselves, were carrying handcuffs, and told Ken that he had a message from the President - Ken was now a Prohibited Immigrant and was given 48 hours to leave the country. Someone had presumably leaked the paper before it could be presented.

If you don't know Ken, he is 72 and has a young daughter who is still at school. They live alone together.

The only other time when has been deported was by Ian Smith in Rhodesia. Smith gave him longer to leave than government of Botswana did.

Ken has prepared an urgent submission to the High Court. The judge has ordered Immigration not to harass Ken and his daughter in the interim, and that the government must appear on 7 March to consider all this.

PLEASE publicise this as much as possible in the interests of free speech and academic integrity. This is an attack on scholarship and liberty - and it is being done by the so-called "shining beacon of African democracy". ANY publicity you can get for this would be very helpful. A letter, e-mail, etc. to the papers, etc.

These two addresses might be good to start at:

Office of the President
P/Bag 001 Gaborone
op.registry@gov.bw
Tel+267 3950800
Fax+267 3950858

Mr. R.O. Sekgororoane
(Chief Immigration Officer)
P. O. Box 942
Gaborone
rsekgororoane@gov.bw
Tel+267 361-1301
Fax+267 314-286

Many thanks for your time.

Best,
Ian

Dr Ian Taylor
School of International Relations
University of St. Andrews
St. Andrews
Fife
Scotland KY16 9AL
United Kingdom

Tel+44 (0)1334 472926
Fax+44 (0)1334 462937
E-mail:ict@st-and.ac.uk

**ACAS Alert: The Story of Aster Yohannes and the Struggle for Democracy in
Eritrea , November 2004**

Nunu Kidane
Berkeley, CA

We will not forget.....we will keep fighting for those who cannot be heard.

In 2000 a young Eritrean woman named Aster Yohannes arrived in Phoenix, AZ with a dream of completing her college education

so she could return home to her husband and four young children. She was the recipient of a UN-funded scholarship for college bound individuals in her homeland Eritrea. In September of 2001, Aster's husband, the former Minister Petros Solomon was arrested, along with 10 other high-ranking members of the government for demanding democratic reform. When the Government of Eritrea refused to allow Aster to bring her children to the US, she felt she had to return to Eritrea.

On December 11, 2003, as her children waited in the Asmara airport to greet their mother whom they had not seen in almost four years, Eritrean security took Aster away as she stepped off the plane. She has not been seen since. When Aster disappeared she was recognized by Amnesty International as a prisoner of conscience, defined as someone who has been detained for the peaceful expression of his/her views.

Aster and her husband are not the only political prisoners in Eritrea. Through this effort, we also hope to publicize the repressive and undemocratic government of Eritrea which has not ratified the

Constitution and refused to open up democratic space for its citizens. Friends of Aster (FOA) is made up of Aster's American and Eritrean friends who believe in the fundamentals of human rights of all people. We came together to inform the public of the human rights abuses in Eritrea. Through grassroots advocacy, working with human rights organizations and supportive congressional members we campaign for Aster's safety and release.

For more information, visit the Friends of Aster web site.

WHAT WE'RE ASKING OF YOU:

- Contact your congressional representative. Ask them to sign the "dear colleague" letter supporting this campaign. We have already gained the signatures of 20 members of The House of Representatives and hope to get many more. For more information, contact FOA through our web address.
- Join the Friends of Aster campaign. You can contact us through our web address, make a financial donation, or purchase a special bracelet. All contributions go directly towards gaining the release of Aster and the other political prisoners in Eritrea.
- Spread the word. It is through personal convictions that we individually inspire ourselves and others to take action towards positive change. Please lend us your voice and spread the word about Aster Yohannes, her husband Petros Solomon, and the many political prisoners in Eritrea who cannot be heard.

ACAS Executive Committee*

Co-Chairs

Meredeth Turhen
School of Planning & Public Policy
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903 USA
E-mail: turshen@rci.rutgers.edu

Michael O. West
Department of Sociology
Binghamton University
Binghamton, NY 13902 USA
E-mail: mwest@mail.binghamton.edu

Political Action Committee

Al Kagan
Africana Unit, Room 328
University of Illinois Library
1408 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL 61801 USA
E-mail: akagan@uiuc.edu

Research Committee

Imani Countess
1921 Featherwood Street
Silver Spring, MD 20904 USA
E-mail: icountess@adf.gov

Carol Thompson
Political Science Department
Box 15036
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5306 USA
E-mail: carol.thompson@nau.edu

ACAS Bulletin Editor

Jesse Benjamin
Human Relations and Multicultural Education
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498
Email: jjbenjamin@stcloudstate.edu

Treasurer

Kristin Peterson
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
Email : krisap@umich.edu

Webmaster

Noah Zerbe
Humboldt State University
Arcata, CA 95521
E-mail: noah.zerbe@humboldt.edu

Website: <http://acas.prairienet.org>

ACAS Board of Directors*

Adotei Akwei (Amnesty International)
Ousseina Alidou (Rutgers University)
Salih Booker (Africa Action)
Merle Bowen (University of Illinois)
Joye Bowman (U. of Massachusetts, Amherst)
Horace Campbell (Syracuse University)
Carole Collins
Jennifer Davis
Asma Abdel Halim (U. Toledo)
Frank Holmquist (Hampshire College)
Gerald Horne (University of Houston)
Willard R. Johnson (MIT)

Sidney Lemelle (Pomona College)
William Martin (Binghamton University)
Bill Minter (AfricaFocus)
James Mittelman (American University)
Prexy Nesbitt
Joel Samoff (Stanford University)
Betsy Schmidt (Loyola University)
Ann Seidman (Clark University)
Immanuel Wallerstein (Binghamton University)
David Wiley (Michigan State University)
Fanon Che Wilkins (U. of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)

*Affiliation for identification purposes only

**ASSOCIATION OF CONCERNED AFRICA SCHOLARS
2005 Calendar Year Membership Form**

Special Offer: As part of our continuing effort to enhance member benefits, we have arranged for a special offer that includes reduced membership costs for ACAS (and thus issues of the ACAS Bulletin) and a discounted one-year subscription to the Review of African Political Economy (normally \$60/year). This offer is valid only for individual memberships and not institutional or overseas memberships/gifts. *Please be sure to include your e-mail address if possible for electronic action alerts.*

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Affiliation _____

Phone: Office _____ Home _____ Fax: _____

E-mail (print carefully please) _____

Interests:

Region _____

Country/Area _____

Topic _____

I am willing to participate in ACAS in the following ways:

- Political Action Committee
- Bulletin articles
- A specific campaign or issue: _____

Annual Membership/Subscription Dues

Please indicate if you are choosing:

- ACAS only renewal.
- ACAS and ROAPE renewal.(for individual members only)

	<u>ACAS Only</u>	<u>SPECIAL: ACAS & ROAPE</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Annual Income to \$10,000 -----	\$10	\$35
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to \$25,000 -----	\$25	\$50
<input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000 to \$50,000 -----	\$35	\$60
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$50,000 -----	\$45	\$70
<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainer -----	\$80	\$105
<input type="checkbox"/> Institutions (ROAPE offer does <i>not</i> apply) -----	\$60	

We will forward subscriptions to the Review of African Political Economy. Please send this page and checks payable to "ACAS" in U.S. \$ to:

Kristin Peterson
Center for Afroamerican and African Studies
University of Michigan
505 South State Street, 4700 Haven Hall #4663
Ann Arbor, MI 48103 USA
E-mail: Krisap@umich.edu