

Conferência – 01 de novembro de 2003

*This transcription was made by Record Editora and may still be reviewed and modified by the author..*

TARIQ ALI

I was very touched and honored to be invited by psychoanalysts. I don't think I've ever spoken to a conference of psychoanalysts before, so I hope you will be kind to me afterwards.

Essentially, what I want to do in this talk is to open up some concepts for you, to discuss them and then I would be very happy to answer questions on any of the themes I've discussed or many I've not had time to raise from the floor, for as long as we have a time.

Let's start by discussing the word which is becoming extremely overused over the last few years: Fundamentalism, word that begins with F and let us link it to another word, which is also used or has been used over the centuries and which is also linked to Fundamentalism, and that's the word fanatic, fanaticism. The word fanatic, the origin of this word goes back to ancient Greece and later Rome, derived from the word fano. Fano was related to shrine or temple. So the word fanatic automatically has a religious meaning. That this is someone who is a religious extremist. And this word fanatic was constantly denounced, derided, attacked by the thinkers of the Enlightenment, who counter posed to fanaticism reason and rationality. And today these two words - and there was a big debate on it, a big, big debate on it -, because some argued, as Rousseau did against the Enlightenment majority, that without some degree of fanaticism you can never bring about any change. And if you become like Enlightenment philosophers, Rousseau argued, you sit back and you enjoy your life, you think, but you achieve nothing. So he said, in Confessions, he wrote that fanaticism has certain values. By that he was implying

not certain religious values, but he was implying that when people are moved to action, they have to be not a 100% reasonable, let's put like that, that if people are totally and completely rational, they do nothing. So this is an interesting debate which is being going on since that time. But initially the word fanaticism was totally linked to religious fanaticism. That's what it was, a person who, in defense of his shrine, or his temple or his church or his synagogue or his mosque is prepared to do whatever needs to be done to defend what he thinks has to be defended.

Later, the word fundamentalism arose. This is a word which essentially arose from within Christianity. There is no word for Fundamentalism in Arabic. It's a word which arose during the wars of the Reformation and it's a word which arose largely from the Protestant break with Catholicism, and the Protestants used to describe themselves as Fundamentalists. And the origins of the United States of America, a country which was created by Protestants Fundamentalists, people who fled Britain to take someone else's country, the origins of that country are rooted in this Fundamentalism. It's part of their historical memory of the founding fathers, and even though the constitution of the United States is completely secular, because Jefferson and people were guided by the Enlightenment, nonetheless there has always remained a very strong streak of protestant fundamentalism in American culture.

I start with that to reverse what people normally discuss when they talk about Fundamentalism. Of all the countries of the West, the United States is the most religious. If you look at the annual law, biennial statistics which come out from the United States, the figures are quite interesting. Especially when contrasted with Europe, or even many countries in the Southern hemisphere. Ninety percent of the US population, when it is asked says that they believe in the deity. Seventy percent say that they believe in angels. Now, from my point of view, it would be a bit more progressive if 90% believed in angels and 70% believed in the deity because angels have a surreal side to them. And one can imagine, it's a creative thing to imagine angels, but to believe in the deity gives you a certain hardness which is difficult to break from. And so today, for the first time in a long, long time, we have an US administration in which the president is a Fundamentalist. He confesses it, born again Christian. That he is born again we know. That he is a born again Christian he has told us. The Minister for Justice in the United States, the attorney general John Ashcroft, Christian fundamentalist, begins every morning in the Department of

Justice by holding hands with his colleagues and forcing them to sing hymns. Some of which they have written, they are very bad ones. Then we have General Boikin recently appointed Intelligence Undersecretary for Defense. That's his title: Intelligence Undersecretary for Defense. The word Intelligence is seriously misplaced, because this general has just informed people that the only true religion is his vision of Christianity, that his God is more superior to the God of Islam, Allah, and that his Christian God will always triumph over Allah, and then he went on to show how intelligent he was by denouncing Islam as a religion of idol worshippers. Anyone who has been to school and studied comparative religion knows that the one thing about Islam is that it's totally hostile to idols, to the extent that Mohammed even left behind instructions saying that there should be no images of him ever. That there was only one God and nothing else. No images of people who lived on Earth. So to this day on we are not allowed to show images of Mohammed, if you do, believers get very angry. So, for this American general who puts on his uniform and goes to preach in church every Sunday to say this, is astonishing. It's astonishing, and this is the world's most powerful country, the world's only empire today under the control of people like that. And it's this Fundamentalism which I have described as the mother of all Fundamentalisms, this combination of military power, economic power and this particular belief. There was a very weird event after the tragedy of 9/11. Two weeks afterwards, there was a big gathering in a New York stadium, and there was the president, the great thinker himself, next to him the Reverend Billy Graham, another great thinker and Evangelist preacher. And the Reverend Billy Graham addressed this gathering of people who were there to mourn the victims of 9/11, which the whole world mourned. And Reverend Billy Graham said, when he was addressing, he said "Mr. President, I've received e-mails and phone calls from all over the country. Hundreds of thousands of them, asking a question. And the question was: how come that God let them do it to us?" So the whole gathering waited for Billy Graham's reply, after all he is the senior Christian preacher. What was he going to reply? Everyone looked at him, even the great-thinker-president! What was he going to reply? And he replied: "I had to answer I don't know".

So I think we should put Fundamentalism in perspective. That's why I started by discussing the United States of America. We should put this Fundamentalism in perspective. And Fanaticism also needs to be put in perspective. There are fanatics of all sorts in this world, in every sphere you can find them. You have literate

fanatics, who believe very firmly to a particular literature. I'm sure that in your own field of psychoanalysis and medicine, you have different fanatical currents, who believe very sharply in one school or the other, and get very angry, and of course, we know perfectly well that within the Marxism, different currents arose, which were equally and fanatically denouncing each other as they were denouncing the enemies, so we have to get a sense of perspective and not get worked up by these words.

Let me discuss something very controversial: suicide bombing today. You just read on the newspapers reports, suicide bombers went and attacked a town, they killed themselves and they killed civilians on the other side. And they did it in a cafe etc. And it's horrific, we know that. It's horrific! But, to completely dissociate what a suicide bomber has done from the reality of the occupation that is not permissible. And it's very interesting. Recently, a very moving article was written by a man called Avraham Burg, who is one of the founding fathers of Israel, a Zionist, very hard core Zionist, and he wrote an article in an Israeli paper which was reprinted all over Europe. He said "I feel very ashamed of being an Israeli and a Zionist, because of what we have been doing to the Palestinians". And he said: "if you treat them like this, the way we treat them, why - when life is no longer worth living - why shouldn't they go and kill themselves and take a feel of us as well?" It was very important that this was said by a Zionist leader in Israel. Because if people like me say it, they say: "you are encouraging terrorism". You see, that's how the language has become debased. Especially since 9/11, but even before that.

So that's the two concepts of Fanaticism and Fundamentalism. Let me take two other concepts: courage and consciousness. Courage comes in different ways. Courage comes when someone you don't expect to be courageous suddenly does something and you look and say: "where did he or she get the courage to do that? Where did this come from? What was it that moved them?" And I want to give you one story of courage. One year before the United States invaded Iraq, they tried to overthrow a democratically elected government in Latin America, in Venezuela. Many of you will have read about it. And the thing about Hugo Chavez is: some like him, some don't, but that's not the point. The point is he has been elected 6 different times by the people of Venezuela. The Venezuelan constitution has been accepted by 2/3 of the people. And everyone agrees it's a very democratic constitution, now

the opposition is using it. But the United States tried to topple him. And for 48 hours they succeeded. But, ultimately, the poor came from the barrios of Caracas and surrounded the Palace, and the soldiers mutinied refused to accept the coup, coup d'état, and that was that. So you have a situation where Chavez attempts to topple him, he is put in prison, he is kept, and a very interesting event happened, and I want to describe this event to you because for me this event shows more courage than anything else. The new president of Venezuela, the new president within inverted commas, who is a local corrupt businessman, the sort of businessman the United States loves to put in the power everywhere, he was being sworn in his presidency inside the Miraflores Palace when the soldiers burst in and ended his experiment in democracy, it was ended very quickly. But before that happened, the general who had carried out the coup, went outside the palace where there is a big band which plays the national anthem when the president comes out or when a visitor comes, head of state. And the general said to this band, which is a military band, they are all soldiers, and there is a young ... 17 or 18 years old, who plays the trumpet whenever the president comes or someone comes to visit him. And the general came out and said to this band: "the new president of Venezuela, I would be bringing him out now to show him to the press, at the minute he comes, you start playing the national anthem". And the soldiers at the band said: "What new president? We elected one, Hugo Chavez." And he said: "never mind, something is happening and you don't need to know about it now. You just play the national anthem". And the soldiers were talking to each other quite agitated because they didn't know. And then the general came to this 17 years old kid who played the trumpet and said: "when I bring the new president out, you will play the trumpet." And this 17 years old kid said: "but my president is Hugo Chavez", general. "I play the trumpet for him because he has been elected!" And the general said "You know who I am? I'm general so and so and I'm ordering you to play". And the 17 years old boy took the trumpet and said: "General, you seem to be very keen that someone should play the trumpet. Here, you play it". And when you have courage of that sort, which is very courageous for a 17 years old soldier to tell a general go and jump in the lake, then it becomes very difficult to defeat popular leaders, elected leaders etc. But that courage of the young boys is an interesting phenomenon. What gives them this courage? Why? What has Chavez done to encourage people like that? Not so much. He hasn't done so much, but a few things have been done. The land on which the slum dwellers live has been given to them, which is a big development in that

country. And this is the first time in Venezuela where you have an oligarchy not just of wealth but of skin color, where the oligarchy has been defeated and you have a person with a different skin color in power. And you have a continuing assault and offensive against Chavez in the television, which is privately owned - 90% of Venezuela's televisions are privately owned - attacking him all the time, and yet he wins. Which shows that consciousness can be created and is created through concrete measures and through the everyday lives of people, which sometimes is so strong that it can override all the media networks and the propaganda which's been waged against him? Because what people have experience themselves, is completely different. And this young trumpeter will go down in Venezuelan history albeit in a footnote, as a young soldier who refused to obey the orders of a General and nothing was done to him. They couldn't touch him.

And from that episode we move on to another episode to discuss how in big political upheavals, sometimes, and in awkward situations, humor becomes very important. I'm a bit concerned about this because when I wrote my latest book, "Bush in Babylon", people who distributed the book in the United States got very nervous. And the reason they got nervous was because the cover showed a young Iraqi boy, two years old, urinating on the head of an occupation soldier. You can't see it from there, but you can see him urinating on an occupation soldier. And the United States said, our distributor said, but people will get very worked up; I said "no, no, the book explains it". Why this cover is important? Because of the role children play, young children play when their countries are occupied. It's something we tend to either forget or not talk about too much. So I said: "it's a funny cover". But at the same time, it has a serious purpose: it's to show what happens to children. And so, when the USA occupied Iraq and captured it, the first two weeks after the occupation they were desperate to get stories of them being welcomed. No one welcomed them, of course. But they wanted to show that they were being welcomed. And so they tried to give children chocolates, to come and shake hands with the marines, the children would smile, the photographs would be taken. But because most of the Western journalists covering this and photographers didn't speak Arabic, they couldn't understand what the children were saying when they were smiling. There was a British journalist, Susan Goldenberg, from The Guardian, who spoke Hebrew, Arabic, she has been in that region, and she reported it. She reported that the children used to have bets with each other to see who would go and shake hands

with the marines. Then they would win the bet. And the children, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 years old would go and shake hands with the marines, smile and say "We hate you, you motherfucker". Why did they do it? One it's bravado, but secondly because young children feel the pain and anger of occupation and humiliation much more than their parents, and because they do not have, they have not developed, at that stage, a rational way of thinking. Instinct to them is more important than fully worked out thing. So whereas their father or their mother would be frightened of saying this to a soldier, they are not frightened. And you have the same phenomenon in Palestine. The children who have picked up the stones and started to throw them, the Palestinian children, who started to throw them at the Israeli soldiers. It was not the grown-ups. It was the children who did it. Then you have an example of unintended humor in occupations. You have an American politician, not politician, Defense Minister Paul Wolfowitz, Undersecretary of Defense, who was nearly blown up a few days ago in Iraq, but who on a previous visit, he arrived in Baghdad and he gave a press conference. And at this press conference, when he was asked "the war is not going well for you, could you explain why?" he said: "the reason is there are too many foreigners in Iraq". Think about it! He was not referring to the British and American occupation armies. He was referring to other Arabs coming in from neighboring countries to help their Arab brothers as foreigners. So the fact that a senior American can stand in Baghdad and say "the problem in Iraq is that there are too many foreigners, that's why we have this mess", but don't relate it to himself, the whole Arab world laughed, laughed and laughed! But the Western journalists covering this press conference didn't laugh, because they are so deeply embedded now in American culture, in the needs of the American empire, that they have lost - some of them, or most of them, not all of them - have lost this critical insight. Twenty years ago, every one would have laughed. One third of the British army is in Iraq, a hundred of thousands of Americans are in Iraq and they say the problem is that there are too many foreigners.

Then you have the problem of transference. This is a concept well known to all of you, I'm sure. But let's look at it in relation with Israel and Palestine. When Sharon decided, after 9/11, to embark on his war against the Palestinians, he decided to go and occupy Jenin and teach the Palestinians a lesson, which they have been doing since 1948, but anyway, this is one more lesson to be taught. And a Israeli colonel, very brave colonel in the Israeli army told a journalist from the

newspaper Maariv, the Israeli newspaper, he said "if we are forced to go and occupy this Palestinian towns and refugee camps again, whether we like it or not, we will have to use exactly the same tactics used by the Germans in the Warsaw Ghetto". That's what this Israeli colonel said. Not a single American newspaper reported this. But the fact is that many Israeli themselves understand what they are doing. And when people ask the question how come that people who were themselves tortured, massacred, killed, suffered during the Second World War, how can they behave like this to another people? We have to say that's why: they've learnt too many bad things, which you do as well from that particular experience. And there is a very interesting book by Victor Klemperer, who was a German Jew who survived the Second World War and kept a diary every single day. It's an amazing book. He survived because he was married to a German woman who gave him cover and then he and a group of other Jews in a similar position survived. But he observed every single thing, every single thing in that period of 12 years. And he describes how, in some ways, the worse thing was not even being arrested or being taken to a camp - though he said, of course, what could be worse than that? - but it was when they were made second class citizens in Germany and forced to wear the star. And when you read those descriptions, which he is giving of the humiliation inflicted on them, when someone seeing a Jew with a star would just spit on them, or make it difficult for them to go from one part of the city to the other, or take them out when going on buses, when they have been through that experience and you read descriptions today from Palestinians of what they are forced to undergo when going through a simple checkpoint, a simple checkpoint, what happens to them and how they are threaten by Israeli soldiers, who treat them as if they are an Untermensch, a subhuman species, and the other thing Klemperer writes in this book is, he said when he first started getting these words of the Jewish people, the Jewish nation, as if Jews were exactly the same one monolithic group all thinking the same, he said: "we first heard this from Hitler". He would use them to say "these are the people we have to crush", and he suddenly recalled on where he had first read these words. And he said he had first read them in Zionist literature of Herzl. And he said that's where Hitler had picked the stuff up from in Austria; in his anti-Semitic youth days from anti-Semitic politicians who quoted Herzl, who read Herzl. Because prior to that, most Jewish people who were integrated in different parts of Europe, especially Western Europe, France, Germany and Britain, thought themselves off as Germans, or French or British. And so he discusses how this came about, how this process



came about. And it's a very interesting question. And it's a question that should be studied now in relation to what is happening to the Palestinians. Listen, every single day, if you want, you can read an account from the Israel Peace Movement, Gush Shalom, very brave courageous Israelis, another example of courage. The Israeli soldiers would say "we will not fight beyond the 67 frontiers". The Israeli peace makers who go out and help Palestinians every day. And every day they send e-mails, how another Palestinian child has been killed, talking about children again. And these children, young boys who are killed by the Israeli Defense Force so called, are never killed because they have a bullet in their arm or a bullet in their leg, it's a bullet in the head. Always. Or 90% of the cases are bullet in the head. So with children being targeted in this fashion, why is the world silent? For official Israelis, the Palestinians are an Untermensch. For official Americans the Palestinians are all terrorists. For the venal Arab regimes existing in that region, the Palestinians are an embarrassment. That's essentially what happens, and the whole world, which talks about human rights and this and that, doesn't look even at what is happening to the Palestinians. So here we have not just the case of transference, for instance, but a very classical example of double standards, of two different ways of looking at the same experience. When it's happening before your eyes, you don't see it because you don't want to see it. Because if you saw it every single day, you'd want to do something, and there is nothing you can do.

Then there is the question of language. The language which, since 9/11, has made the word terrorist apply to anyone who doesn't agree virtually with the policies of the American government. And the first speech made by Bush after the 9/11 said, he didn't say "if you are not with us you are against us". That's obvious and that can be true in a way. He said "if you are not with us, you are with the terrorists". Very different. Very different. And no one challenged this in the United States of America, because they were in a deep trauma. And it got completely accepted. So, every opposition to existing regimes in different parts of the world was called terrorism, and they were supported. That's how Ariel Sharon became a valued allied in the war against terror. That's how Vladimir Putin, in Russia, became a valued allied. Because of what he had done to the Chechens. I mean, more Chechens have been killed than the casualties in the entire Balkan region incident. But the world doesn't notice it, because it's a justified war. It's a war against terror. And the language which is used in the media, the global media, is a language of deference, a language of conformity,

a language which doesn't ask any longer the key critical question which needs to be asked of power. It's different; it varies in different parts of the world, but the main stream, the big main stream television networks are all infected by this. So curiously enough, at a time when we have more talk about globalization, there is less real information about what is going on in the world. Most of this information comes from the same sources, the sources who run the world, the sources who lead the globalization, the process of globalization, the sources who carried out wars. They are the ones who also dominate the main stream media etc. But we should be pleased that at long last there are signs that the Pentagon, the big military machine of the United States, the Pentagon has last decided to make a turn to culture. How do we know this? We know this because an announcement was made about 6 weeks ago that they was a special showing in the Pentagon of a movie. This was a movie called "The battle of Algiers", by an Italian film maker, Gilo Pontecorvo. It's a classic film of the 60s and the 70s about the war in Algeria. And it's a very brilliant film. If you haven't seen it, you should see it, it's very brilliant. And it was a film which was shown in art house cinemas all over the world; the French banned it, etc. What made the Pentagon call for this film? And to show it to the people who work there? It's interesting. It's the resistance in Iraq which brought that about. They wanted to know what to do when they occupy an Arab capital. And someone must have told them "watch the battle of Algiers". "The battle of Algiers" is a film in which the French win that particular battle, but lose the war. And at the end of the film you can see a new storm arising, which was finally driving the French out of Algeria. So I hope they learned the right lessons from "The battle of Algiers". Because the other lessons they could learn are the way you can crush the resistance is by arresting, killing, torturing, very brutal scenes of torture show how the French tortured the enemy. I mean, torture became institutionalized in the Algerian war of resistance. It also shows how women participated in the struggle, carrying bombs in the shopping baskets. It also shows what happened in the Algerian war of resistance, what we now call suicide bombers, people who were prepared to sacrifice their lives to strike a blow against the French. Because in a way, once you start any liberation struggle or any war, anyone who participates in this war is probably a suicide, because they might die. When you take this decision, that you could be killed, you could be described as that. And it happens in Algeria. So I was trying to think what the American generals would think as they were watching Gilo Pontecorvo, which is an old Marxist film maker in Italy, watching this amazing film in front of their eyes. Maybe it will give them some

pause for thought but we can hope. Because the one thing that has happened, if you come to discuss resistance, is that this is a resistance that was expected by many of us, but not expected by the United States. And you ask how did this distinction happen? When I'm sitting in my study in London after having spoken to three Iraqis from different cities of Iraq and I'm writing an article before the war, and I'm saying if the United States, once they capture Iraq, which, of course, they can, because they are militarily they are the strongest power in the world, what will they do afterwards, once they will be dealing with the resistance, because there will be a resistance, without any doubt, there will be a resistance. And then, we were not believed. They said: "no, no, no, you people live in old dreams, there will be no resistance". They actually thought they would be welcomed with sweets and flowers. Why did they think that? Because the dictator of Iraq was unpopular. That's one reason. He wasn't popular, but even people who didn't like him didn't want to be occupied by the US. Why? Because they have a historical memory. This is a country which was only created in 1920. And from that day on, it fought against the British who created it. And there were epic struggles of resistance in Iraq, in every part of Iraq against the British Empire. And the grandfathers who fought against the British are still alive, they are old, but they are alive. And stories are transmitted from one generation to the other; this is what we did when the British occupied us. So resistance to empires is part of the historic memory of the Iraqi people. They don't forget it. It's like resistance to occupation in Europe is part of the memory of many European countries that resisted the Nazi occupation. And yet all these people suddenly forget what occupation means when it comes to Iraq. They ask them not to resist; how can they not resist? And then they say "but don't resist the way you resist", but how else can they resist? They can't just resist with words, because words are ignored. And already this Iraq resistance has begun to shape, to reshape politics in the United States of America. The fact that you have two democratic candidates who will stand against - one of them will be the candidate against Bush, Howard Dean and Wesley Clark - are beginning to attack the war in Iraq and say it was a mistake, and Howard Dean is saying we should pull the troops out, why is that happening? Where have they recovered those terms from? They didn't speak before the war in Iraq. The reason that's happening is because of the resistance in Iraq. Why are the Europeans now keeping their mouths shut? They were desperate to join the bandwagon. Joskar Fischer, in Germany told, Joskar Fischer, the German foreign minister, attending the Iraqis said "don't resist the Americans". Chirac said, telling the Americans, God

speed, quick victory. They've shut up again, which is positive. Why? Because of the Iraqi resistance. Without this resistance, none of this would have happened. And the other thing the Iraqi resistance has done is to stop all the crazy talk of invading Syria and Iran, which they were talking about only a few months ago. And then another thing: when they weren't talking about it, they would say "well, maybe we won't need to invade Syria and Iran, when they see what's happening in Iraq they will just obey us". Think about it. They see what is happening in Iraq. At first, they were not referred to as the resistance, they were just terrorists; if you look at the American press they are terrorists, but slowly, there are decent American journalists who are beginning now to say "this is a resistance war", and the Associated Press journalists now report it as the resistance. It's not, and many American papers don't say that, but that's what it is. That's what it is. You now have a classic first stage of guerrilla warfare against an occupation, it's classical. It was like this in the Vietnam, it was like this in Nigeria, it was like this Kenya during the British occupation, it's the first stage. It's decentralized, it exists in different cities, it doesn't move, it hasn't yet acquired a national basis. It's the first stage. And it's going to be very difficult for the United States to pull out. If they do, they would see it as a defeat, they knew it, and so they are trying to get everyone else's armies in there so they can reduce the US casualties. They wanted Japanese troops in Iraq. Think about that. Bush put pressure on the Japanese Prime Minister to send troops to Iraq. At first they agreed, but then there was an explosion behind the scenes. Apart from anything else, I don't see how the rivers of Iraq would supply all the sushi! But finally the Japanese Prime Minister - who didn't want to say no directly to Bush - so he said to Bush "there is a problem in Japan, we cannot send our soldiers because they don't speak Arabic". And so we are sending them to special language schools to learn Arabic, and when they have learnt, we will think about it again. It will be a very long wait. But the interesting thing is, for me, the number of people who were surprised when the resistance began. No one in the Arab world was surprised, incidentally. None of us who follow the Arab world was surprised. But the whole West was surprised. I think that you Brazilians were surprised too. Maybe I'm wrong, maybe you were all expecting it, but looking at your media, I think people were surprised here. And this shocks me deeply. Really I find this the most shocking thing. It's almost as if we are in a world where the populations of countries do nothing else but wait to be liberated by the United States. It's not like that. And one of the fiercest critics has come from the poets of Iraq. I don't have time to read that poetry to you. These are great Iraqi

poets who are out of the country, exiled under the days of Saddam. Exiled. There was a great poet Saddi Youssef one of the great Arab poets of today, whom I met after Baghdad fell, it was a very depressing time, and he said to me, there were three of us, me, Massafa Narouad and Aljouhahiri, all three great poets of Iraq, not just me. And he said every year Saddam would send us a message saying "I know who you people are, you are leftists, you are communists, I don't care, you are great poets, come just for one poetry reading in Baghdad, and there would be a million people", which is true, incidentally. There would have been a million people to listen to that poetry. And Saddi Youssef came to me and said: "Should we go?", but yet they killed too many communists, we didn't want to go, and we were worried, why should we go and give his regime support? And then Aljouhahiri said "what about our lives? He has killed many people". And he said Saddam Hussein sent us a message saying "The blood on my neck guarantees your safety". And Saddi Youssef said: "somehow this was not very reassuring to us". So we didn't go. But this poet, Aljouhahiri, died in exile age 100. Saddi Youssef lives in exile in the area of London airport. Mussafi Narouad lives in exile in Damascus. And they write poetries to each other, savaging the occupation of their country. Savage attacks. They are published in my books. Savage attacks. And the United States stopped them returning to Iraq. They can't come back. They are on the black list. So this culture that the Arab World has produced has been a very interesting culture, that when oppositions weren't allowed, the poets took over. Not just in Iraq, in Syria, in Egypt, and the Arab poetry is quite amazing. It's sung by very big names singers. They don't just recite it, they sing it. And these songs cross borders. Just cross borders. Every single café will be singing a poem by Saddi Youssef, attacking the occupation, as we know has happened. Or Alkabani before him, or Aljouhahiri. So it's a very vibrant culture. And I go mad when people say, especially when I'm in the United States, but don't you think the Arabs have a problem, they don't have an opposition and I say yes! I say the big difference between the United States and Britain on the one hand and Iraq today is that in Iraq we have an opposition. That's the big difference; there is no opposition in the United States or Britain. All the parties agreed with each other - until the resistance started. And I said more importantly than a formal opposition at the level of politics, there is the every day life of the people. It's what they say to each other on the streets, what they speak to each other in the cafés. I say, if you want to send journalists who just sit, who can speak Arab and can listen to the talk in the bazaars and in the cafés of the Arab World, you would find a very politically

conscious population. Much more conscious, much more aware than eventually any section of society in the United States. They follow what goes on; they're engaged with the world. They know what is going on. So I said there are comparisons on the question of political consciousness are much much better in the Arab World. So what's then, finally, to conclude the whole debate about Fundamentalism? Look: the United States, after the end of the Cold War, was desperately in search of an enemy. Why? Because in order to preserve their hegemony, great empires need enemies, it's not just the Americans, it was the British before them, and the French and the German and the Prussian and the Roman. All empires have certain characteristics in common: a) they need an enemy; b) they pretend that their own interests are universal interests. So what is in the interest of the USA to preserve its empire automatically becomes a universal interest. And the values they defend become universal values. And that's what we have to oppose. That many of the values defended are not universal. And so 9/11 came like a gift from Heaven for them. It was a crazy thing Al-Qaeda did, though it was very dramatic and sensational, but it completely played into the hands of the Bush administration, which has used this event to try and reshape the world in their own image. And we live now in a time when what we have what is known as the Washington consensus. And incidentally, the notion that the Islamic World these full of people desperate to become Al-Qaeda is nonsense, it never was the case, it isn't the case today, but the Americans, by their policies of occupation are driving people in that direction. Because people feel "What else can we do? Who else is fighting?" All the secular alternative in the Arab World was destroyed during the Cold War by the United States. Osama was a close friend of theirs, who they trained to go and fight the Russians in Afghanistan. So having destroyed these voices they now look and they find no one. But it was done systematically by them. So when we talk about Fundamentalism, I would argue that it's imperial Fundamentalism. The belief that what the United States decides economically, politically, militarily is the model for the world. And look how deep this view has becoming entrenched all over the world. That leaders, elected leaders, in countries of the Southern Hemisphere elected to break from the neo-liberal consensus begin to tremble at the thought of it. Can we do it? They will crush us! But no, they can't crush every one, if people start to do it. And the whole of Latin America is in revolt against this system. This is a laboratory which they have used for many years during the Cold War. Military dictatorships were perfected in Latin America; torture was perfected in Latin America. Latin America was controlled many earlier

days by the corporations of the United States Central America. And now neo liberal economics were tried out Latin America and Argentina collapsed. And Venezuela tried to find its own way. And Bolivia has now exploded. And Brazil has elected the government to break with neo-liberalism. It's ironic when Cardoso says in public "I wish Lula was a little bit more like himself and a little less like me". But it's not untrue. So the election of Lula, the changes in Venezuela, the movements in Bolivia and Ecuador, in Mexico, what do they indicate? They indicate that people do not want to live under this style of regime, where everything is determined by money, everything is privatized. No state provision, no social provision, reducing the safety of the state. What is this if not Fundamentalism? And once you produce this sort of economics, then you produce a culture which has to defend that, and that weakens democracy and can even destroy democracy. Because if democracy means there is no difference between centre and left, or centre and right, whoever you elect, basically they do the same thing, because of the free market Fundamentalism, which is enforced. Soon people get fed up and say "what's the point of this after all?" And this is happening in Europe, in Britain, where fewer and fewer people are voting. And so it's not just the question of finding a different way, we have to find it for the future of the world. And find one way to find it is by challenging US imperial Fundamentalism not in a foolish way, because they can't be defeated militarily, but politically it can be done. In my opinion, there is absolutely no reason why the countries of the South cannot get together and begin to work and think differently, to challenge them. Look, Iraq is a tiny country and showed they can challenge the US army. Surely the countries of the Southern Hemisphere are strong enough to challenge them politically and economically. And once it begins to happen, then the Empire doesn't look so strong after all. When Americans supporters of Bush talk about comparing themselves to Rome, I tell them, because I debate very often in the US, I say "Well, you can compare yourselves to Rome. I don't mind the comparison. But remember two things: one, Rome fell and the second thing I think you should learn from the Romans is that when they went and took over a part of the Mediterranean World, they didn't expect people to love them for it".

Thank you, thank you, I'm very touched, thank you very much. I'm happy to answer any questions you have.