

TERRORISM. In the conservative governments' climate of fear and panic, politicians were rallied by the cry to win the War on Terrorism. But public opinion is polarised by the debate whether the War on Terror is a just war, or itself a terror act.

One is compelled to ask: Is the cure (the War on Terror) worse than the disease (terrorism)? Did our leaders succumb to delusion, prejudice, revenge and greed* with the War on Terror?

Had an attempt been made to understand and act upon what motivates suicide bombers - rather than just react to the violence of 9/11 with yet more violence - and had the billions of dollars that were poured into the War on Terror been spent more wisely, we would have a more peaceful world today.

The motivation of terrorists is not understood or ignored by the architects of the War on Terror: Rather than a desire to sabotage 'our way of life', rather than simply religious or ideological, the motives often are rife repression and economic despair.

It may sound simplistic, but somehow this slogan is compelling: 'Feed the poor, instead of war.' And I think it is a simple but powerful truism: 'Terrorism will abate, with no more hate!」**

** Naomi Klein wrote in her 2007 book The Shock Doctrine - The Rise of Disaster Capitalism (excerpted in SMH, Good Weekend, 15 Sep 2007): 'Every aspect of the way the Bush Administration has defined the parameters of the War on Terror has served to maximise its profitability and sustainability as a market - from the definition of the enemy to the rules of engagement to the ever expanding scale of the battle.'*

The War on Terror has cost about 500,000 lives and \$1,000,000,000,000

It is estimated the health costs for vets of the Iraq war will be \$2,000,000,000,000

Victims of 9/11 and terror acts since then (outside Iraq) number appr 10,000.

***At a Sydney peace rally, shortly before the outbreak of the 2003 war on Iraq*

In the SMH - 2 Dec 2008 - Naomi Wolf writes about Barak Obama's choice of Hillary Clinton as his secretary of state: (In their world-view ...) "... America tries to solve the world's true problems: Environmental degradation, resource shortages, inadequate literacy, and the appalling poverty in which the 'bottom billion' live. Obama understands, as I believe Hillary Clinton does, that resolving those crises is the true key to matters of war and peace - the true marker of the possibility of international alliances. I believe Obama knows Clinton realises that conflict emerges from these problems, and that using military intervention without addressing them is inadequate. America's president-elect may even understand that his choice for secretary of state learned to look at statecraft and global policy by sitting with - and listening to - a dirt-poor woman in a sari in a dusty village."

**

