

**Military ‘Solutions’ Are Really the PROBLEM. They Escalate Global Violence.
Let’s Choose Humane, Sustainable Ways for TRUE Security.**

DESCRIPTION: In our daily lives, we know better than to think violence solves problems, but at the national level the U.S. government routinely threatens and uses military violence all over the world.

Militarism makes problems worse, so why does the government keep using militarism? Who benefits from this?

We should **thoroughly debunk** the use of military violence as a way to solve international problems.

We could achieve more profound, holistic “national security” by renouncing violence and promoting peace and fairness.

This highly participatory workshop will encourage participants to share their information and insights.

Introduce myself. State this workshop’s title and four goals listed below.

I want this workshop to accomplish four goals:

1. Help people debunk military “solutions” as **INHERENTLY immoral, unjust, and counter-productive**, regardless of any particular problem or crisis in any particular nation or region.
2. Help people replace the “national security” model (which leads directly into military violence and loss of our constitutional rights) with a “TRUE security” model that affirms everyone’s human values and real peace and justice.
3. Provide concepts and “talking points” for our workshop participants to use when talking to other people.
4. Help us see how peace connects with other across issues

Summary of Main Sections:

- **70 years of endless wars**
- **“Do something” means: Do something violent – and militarize our “Homeland”**
- **Deceive the American people and normalize violence**
- **Militarism backfires: Military “solutions” are really the problem**
- **A nonviolent foreign policy**
- **TRUE security**

Before any introductions, let's start with this story.

Before we introduce ourselves, I want to tell you a story that will understand this workshop.

On the far opposite side of my hometown, a family is suffering domestic violence. The man abuses his wife, and sometimes beats her. Their kids are afraid.

So I took it upon myself to buy a lot of guns and go over to that far side of town.

The roof of my own house leaks, the plumbing doesn't work right, and some parts of my house's electrical wiring are dangerous. But I decided not to fix any of that, so I could afford to buy a lot of guns.

I wasn't sure exactly which house was theirs, so I started shooting at several houses in that neighborhood. I did not positively identify the specific middle-aged man, so I shot at many of that neighborhood's middle-aged men.

The people in that neighborhood should have been grateful that I went there and took action. After all, something needed to be done. But instead of thanking me, they started shooting back at me.

This workshop moves through a sequence of my brief comments interspersed with your brief answers to many questions.

We have a lot of content to cover, moving from the current violent U.S. foreign policy toward a humane, nonviolent alternative.

Well! I went home, urgently sold some of my possessions (you might say I "privatized" them to people who wanted to buy them at discount prices), and I bought some more guns.

I went back to that neighborhood and shot at the neighbors who were shooting at me, but they still did not appreciate all that I'm doing for them. Now I am angrier than ever at the ungrateful people in that neighborhood.

Also, my wife and kids are criticizing me for shooting so many people. My wife and kids are also criticizing me because I let our house fall into disrepair and – instead of fixing it up – I used that money to buy even more guns.

So I ordered my wife and kids to stop criticizing me, so now I listen to all of their phone calls and read all of their e-mails to find out whether they are criticizing me.

Now everybody is mad at me. I think I'm just taking action to protect security of the other family and mine.

1. Does anyone here think I'm actually protecting the security of that family on the other side of town?
2. Does anyone here think I'm actually protecting my own family's security?

We can cover all of the points if we answer briefly and keep things moving briskly.

At the end of this workshop I'll provide copies that you can use at home so you can go through this process later – alone or with other folks – at your own pace.

Let's introduce ourselves: your name and where you live now

Raise hands to show where we are starting from in this workshop's subject matter:

1. How many of us feel **pretty well informed** about US foreign policy?
2. How many of us have **participated in peace** activities?

We have experienced 70 years of endless wars:

Let's understand the scope of U.S. militarism:

The U.S. had a Department of War from 1789 to 1947. During that time – more than century and a half – our nation fought only a few foreign wars.

But – in an Orwellian irony – since 1947 when the Department of War changed to the Department of Defense, the U.S. has been almost constantly at war. We simply pretended that endless wars were for our “defense.”

Since the late 1940s, the U.S. has felt entitled to bomb and attack a great many countries. We overthrew governments – including functional democracies that U.S. businesses and politicians did not like. Likewise, the U.S. has armed and supported a great many dictators and violent thugs who served U.S. business and geo-political interests.

The US has been fighting wars practically non-stop for more than 70 years, but 1942 was the last time Congress

actually declared war. All of our subsequent wars have been started by presidents with or without approval by Congress, in violation of the US Constitution and often in violation by the Vietnam-era War Powers Act.

1. The U.S. has military bases in nearly every country on earth. Approximately how many foreign military bases does the U.S. have? (800)
2. Why does the U.S. have so many military bases in so many countries?
3. During the Cold War, the U.S. created NATO and the USSR created the Warsaw Pact. After the Cold War ended a quarter of a century ago, the Warsaw Pact was dissolved. What did NATO do after the Cold War ended?

More insights into U.S. militarism:

Nearly 200 years ago, in 1823, U.S. President James Monroe proclaimed “The Monroe Doctrine,” which asserted – with absolutely no basis in international law – that European nations were prohibited from interfering in any nation in North or South America, and that if they did, the U.S. would react militarily against them. The U.S., in effect, asserted dominance over the future of the Western Hemisphere.

Latin American governments came and went, but the U.S. repeatedly intervened there militarily, overthrew democracies, supported military dictatorships, and exploited Latin America economically.

4. In which Latin American countries did the U.S. overthrow democracies and support military dictatorships? Just call out those countries' names.

In recent years – especially after the Soviet Union's collapse – many Latin American nations replaced their military dictatorships with real democracies. The U.S. did **NOT** help that process of democratization. We did **NOT** use the U.S. military to create or protect their freedom.

5. Who can briefly summarize the work of the U.S. Army School of the Americas at Fort Benning, Georgia?

6. The U.S. extended our “War on Drugs” into Mexico, Central America, and South America. To what extent is that relevant to this workshop's topic?

Examples:

- It is a gimmick to allow the U.S. military further control over their militaries
 - This gimmick allows further domination of their domestic politics.
7. The U.S. keeps declaring “war” on lots of things: War on drugs. War on poverty. War on terror. What happens when we frame everything as a “war?” What does a “war” mentality do?
- #### Examples:
- It prevents debate, because dissent is seen as disloyalty.
 - It limits the terms of debate before you even begin.
 - It dictates the use of the military (or violence by police, prisons, and other coercion).
 - Violence becomes the means of decision, total victory the goal. Anyone who suggests otherwise is labeled a dreamer, an appeaser, or even a traitor.

When a crisis occurs, violence is assumed to be the solution:

In an international crisis, the need to “do something” is assumed to mean “do something violent.”

When an international crisis occurs, Americans want our government to “do something.” Because militarism has been the U.S.’s default policy, “do something” is nearly always assumed to mean “do something violent!”

Military reactions displace honest diplomacy. We need sincere communications for nonviolent problem-solving, but the U.S. discounts that with macho military violence.

1. Do you agree that our government, media, and much of the public automatically assume that the perceived need to “do something” means to “do something violent”?
2. Why is violence automatically assumed to be the appropriate response?

Our government uses militarism within the U.S. too:

Regardless of which political party controls Congress or the Presidency, the U.S. government uses militaristic methods against our own people within our own country. Who could give examples? Examples:

The domestic “**War on Drugs**” is waged on despised kinds of Americans – a war with militarized SWAT teams and heavy weapons used in residential neighborhoods to batter down doors.

Hawks like to say, “**After 9-11 everything changed,**” and repeat it often, so as to drill into our brains the notion that we are in endless wars – as Cheney, Rumsfeld, and others told us repeatedly – so we need to accept the loss of our Constitutional rights and the militarization of Homeland Security and the militarization of local police.

The federal “1033” program urges the **Pentagon to provide extremely militarized weapons to local police departments.**

Local police departments tend to hire military veterans who have been trained in how to occupy and dominate foreign populations – and who also have absorbed experiences and traumas and strong emotions arising from such violent militarism. Local police forces deploy these persons to occupy local communities within the U.S., so

militarism comes home to roost in our local communities. Local populations – especially in poor neighborhoods and communities of color – are treated like enemy populations to occupy, rather than as people to be served.

The government spies on us, as if we were enemies.

Is it any surprise, then, that so many people within the U.S. are experiencing the police as an occupying army, and that police very often overreact with far more violence than needed, including shooting unarmed people?

Overall, military violence in other countries – and also at home – has become the default assumption for how to deal with any problem, foreign or domestic. If militarism is the default, this displaces looking for more workable solutions. If the only tool is a hammer, you will treat every problem as if it were a nail.

Public opinion surveys find more and more Americans saying our nation is “on the wrong track.” Why do you suppose these surveys never ask the public whether the U.S.’s excessive militarization is evidence that our nation is “on the wrong track” – and these surveys never ask whether militarization is a reason why our nation is “on the wrong track”? Why don’t the surveys ever ask about that?

Martin Luther King recognized and denounced this disparity:

Martin Luther King, Jr., criticized the war in Vietnam on several grounds. He said the U.S. was on the wrong side of history. He said that the war was wasting money that should be spent on ending poverty. Also, on April 4, 1967, one year before his assassination, his “Beyond Vietnam” speech bluntly stated: “**A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.**”

1. Is this “spiritual death” part of our nation being “on the wrong track”?
2. King said this in 1967 – nearly 50 years ago. What evidence are we seeing now of our nation’s “spiritual death”?

Let's look at international conflicts with the roles reversed:

CASE 1:

Imagine if al Qaeda had killed or disabled many thousands of young Americans and stolen trillions of dollars from U.S. taxpayer. How would most Americans feel?

But actually it was the U.S. government – with bipartisan support – that killed and disabled many thousands of young Americans and wasted trillions of dollars (much of it stolen by corruption abroad and at home).

1. Why aren't Americans angry with our government for such massive betrayal?
2. Why don't the American people consider these facts – the hard realities?
3. Why doesn't this kind of role reversal ever occur to Americans' thinking?

CASE 2:

Let's consider a case study about Pakistan, but reversing our roles in ways the American government, media, or population never mentions.

Suppose Pakistan became concerned that people in other countries – including a peace activist in your neighborhood – were organizing opposition to Pakistan. So Pakistan sends a drone into your neighborhood to kill that person – and the drone kills a lot of innocent bystanders.

1. How would U.S. politicians respond?
2. How would U.S. news media respond?
3. Instead of Pakistan, suppose the other country were Russia. How would Americans respond to a Russian drone attack on an American neighborhood?

Militarism becomes “normalized” at both the international level and the domestic level:

Deceive the American people and normalize violence:

A few minutes ago I quoted Martin Luther King's powerful speech about Vietnam and peace issues. In that same speech, King criticized the U.S. for being on the wrong side of history in violently fighting poor people while militarily protecting corrupt elites, both in Vietnam and also elsewhere.

1. While politicians and media keep telling us the U.S. is “the greatest democracy in the world” and “a shining beacon of freedom and liberty,” let's call out a few of the realities that debunk our self-image of democracy and freedom. *Examples:*
 - The U.S. imprisons far more of our population than any other nation on earth.
 - U.S. militarism provokes people to take terrorist actions against us.
 - The U.S. attacks many nations and civilian populations.
 - The government spies on people here and elsewhere.
 - Government actions make Americans feel powerless and undermine support for our govt.

- Repression of journalists and whistleblowers actually increased during the Obama Administration. Tom Engelhardt's “Tom Dispatch” article from February 4, 2015, concluded, “In the Obama years, the only crime in official Washington is leaking or whistleblowing; that is, letting the public in on something that we, the people, aren't supposed to know about the workings of ‘our’ government.”

2. What is the difference between **mis**information and **dis**information?
3. When politicians, mainstream media, and the dominant nationalistic culture replace knowledge with lies, this leads Americans to believe in “American exceptionalism,” the notion that the U.S. is so special that we are not bound by international law, and that the U.S. is entitled to attack any other nation on earth if our government chooses to.

In ancient times the writers of Greek tragedies referred to this as *hubris*, the kind of arrogance that led to tragic outcomes. The U.S. keeps acting on the *hubris* of

“American exceptionalism,” and we are reaping the consequences.

4. One way to militarize our culture is to inject massive amounts of fear into it. Who are we told to be afraid of?

Examples: Communists – foreigners – immigrants – terrorists – Muslims – dark-skinned Americans – homeless people – gays and lesbians, etc.

In our daily lives, we know better than this:

If we were to ask the public whether they want peace, nearly everyone would say yes. But **violence and war have become so “normalized” that many people think war is the way to achieve peace.**

In our daily lives, we have better sense than to choose violent ways of solving problems:

- If your neighbor’s dog is barking, you do not shoot your neighbor’s dog. If you disagree with a member of your family, you do not assault him or her.
- Suppose your car does not run properly. Would you find out what the problem is, or would you simply pound on it with a big, heavy hammer?
- During my decades-long career of working in a Washington State agency that interacted with other state agencies, we sometimes disagreed with another agency

Militarism backfires: Military “solutions” are really the problem:

So now we get into the core of the workshop’s title: **Military “solutions” are really the problem.** The truth is that militarism does not even work! **Militarism backfires and makes problems worse!**

Many people do not see the connection between ends and means. They think “the end justifies the means.” In contrast, **Gandhi, King, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation all affirm that the ends we reach depend significantly on the means we use to get there.** Whatever we sow is what we will reap.

An acorn is the seed that grows into an oak tree. Likewise, militarism is the seed that grows into more wars. And likewise, nonviolent alternatives are the seeds that grow into peace.

Who can call out some examples of the U.S. fighting enemies who are fighting us with weapons the U.S. had provided to our allies? Examples:

- Now ISIS is using weapons that the US had provided to someone, and the US – which had wanted to overthrow Syria’s President Assad – is now his ally in fighting

General Douglas MacArthur said this on May 15, 1951: “It is part of the general pattern of misguided policy that our country is now geared to an arms economy which was bred in an artificially induced psychosis of war hysteria and nurtured upon an incessant propaganda of fear.”

Somebody said, “War is terrorism with a bigger budget.”

about how to solve a problem, but none of my co-workers ever said, “Let’s get a bunch of guns and go over to their headquarters office and start shooting people until they surrender to us.”

- If we want to have a civilized nation and a civilized world, we must **renounce violence in international matters**, just like civilized individuals do at the **interpersonal** level.
- Why do we allow our federal government to use violence when problems occur instead of finding out what caused the problems and addressing the root causes?
- Why don’t Americans understand that?

ISIS, and the US also is on the same side as Iran and Hezbollah – both of whom our government has demonized – in opposing ISIS. In mid-September 2014 Congress rushed to pass a bill authorizing President Obama to train and arm so-called “moderate” Syrian rebels to fight ISIS.

- This backfired also decades ago when President Reagan armed **Afghanistan’s Mujahedeen** to fight the Soviet Union’s troops that were occupying Afghanistan in the 1980s. The Mujahedeen evolved into the Taliban and led to al Qaeda, so then the US started fighting the very forces that we had previously armed.
- The US has a long history of arming one group to fight another, only to discover that the group we had armed became a new enemy, so we fought against our own weapons. The brutal US occupation of Iraq prompted people there to create “al-Qaeda in Iraq,” which led to

the “Islamic State,” which created another US enemy that would not exist if the US had not already attacked Iraq in 1991 and 2003.

- In Vietnam the **National Liberation Front (“Vietcong”)** whom we were fighting were using many of the weapons the US had provided to the South Vietnamese army.

This is a long, repetitive story. **Military violence nearly always backfires. The US continually creates new enemies to attack. This provokes the creation of even more new enemies, and so on, and so on, and so on.**

The CIA knows about “Blowback,” but keeps provoking more of it:

When ISIS was getting started, they vigorously publicized its beheadings of three journalists. Why do you think ISIS publicized these beheadings so vigorously? It was a strategy in order to antagonize the U.S. and provoke the U.S. into an unwinnable military struggle there. The U.S. politicians and news media foolishly took the bait and escalated the U.S. wars there. **Increased U.S. militarism and drone violence provoke more terrorist reactions, so the U.S. escalates again, the in this vicious circle we chase our tail in escalating wars against entire populations in many countries.**

The Pentagon and CIA have long understood the concept of “blowback” – the retaliation that occurs after the U.S. uses military or covert actions in another country, but the Pentagon and CIA keep escalating these violent escapades.

Are the Pentagon and CIA playing the President and Congress and American people for fools?

Are they deliberately escalating the “war on terror” for self-serving purposes of power and profit?

Of course, the more enemies we create, the more power the Pentagon and CIA are given, and the more profits U.S.’s weapons manufacturers make. *Examples:*

- We know about the power of the military-industrial complex. They lobby. Weapons manufacturers give generously to political campaigns.
- Military contractors spend \$150 million a year on an army of 1,000 lobbyists designed to keep America at war, protect the Pentagon’s budget and keep those dollars flowing into their corporate accounts. (Source: www.winwithoutwar.org)
- Col. John R. Boyd (U.S. Air Force, retired) has been a fighter pilot, tactician, strategist, conceptual designer,

The U.S. treats Iran as an enemy, but the U.S. messed up Iraq in ways that tilted Iraq’s new government toward Iran.

Navin Bapat from the University of North Carolina found that **between 1997 and 2006, U.S. military assistance correlated with a 67 percent increase in the duration of terrorist campaigns in the country receiving the aid.**

Jeremy Scahill, the brilliant journalist, has written, “**US policy has been its own worst enemy... We’ve created the very threats we claim to be fighting.**”

and now a reformer. He stated: “People say the Pentagon does not have a strategy. They are wrong. The Pentagon does have a strategy. It is: *‘Don’t interrupt the money flow, add to it.’*”

Most Americans assume that our government wants peace. But the harsh reality is that **peace would reduce the budgets and political power** of the Pentagon, the CIA, and the National Security State (Homeland Security, NSA, etc.).

Do you think that the U.S. government – while paying lip service to seeking peace – actually wants endless wars with more enemies?

The US government – whose agencies have publicly written about “blowback” – does not really want to “win” a war, but rather to continue provoking new enemies and conducting endless wars in order to continually shift hundreds of billions of taxpayers’ dollars every year into the business corporations that supply the War Machine – and to continually shift political power from honest democracy into the Pentagon, CIA, NSA, Homeland Security, and other parts of militarized America.

If this is the case, then the biggest threat to U.S. security is the recklessly violent military-industrial complex!

They get rich and powerful while endangering and bankrupting the 99%.

Ends and means are directly connected, so military “solutions” make problems worse. If we want peace, we must use only peaceful means.

If we want a peaceful and just domestic society, we must use only peaceful and just methods at the local and national levels.

Do we agree with this?

Instead of cruel violence, we need a **NONVIOLENT FOREIGN POLICY:**

How to start toward a nonviolent foreign policy:

Most Americans think that the U.S.'s foreign policy focuses on advancing democracy. This workshop's first part debunked the assumption that we promote democracy in other countries.

Most Americans also think we help poor nations with generous "foreign aid." However, the truth is that most of the U.S.'s aid has a political agenda – and especially a military agenda – because it is designed more to **manipulate** than to help, and much of our "aid" is actually **subsidies** for nations buying weapons from U.S. manufacturers.

Think about your own personal values – and think about the FOR's values.

Imagine what would be different if the U.S. were to base its foreign policy upon these values. How would that foreign policy be different from what we have now?

Examples:

- Truly nonviolent
- Grounded in profound respect for the oneness of the entire human family
- Profound respect for human rights
- Economic justice
- Profound respect for environmental integrity and sustainability
- Creating friends worldwide instead of provoking enemies worldwide
- We would not need to fear terrorists or other nations

Steps toward choosing a nonviolent foreign policy:

How could the U.S. let go of our nation's *hubris*?

Earlier in this workshop I mentioned that the Greek tragedies referred to *hubris*, the kind of arrogance that led to tragic outcomes. The U.S. keeps acting on the *hubris* of "American exceptionalism," and we are reaping the consequences.

Now if we want a nonviolent foreign policy, how could we help our nation repent and heal from our *hubris*? What would you recommend as some first steps toward repentance and healing from *hubris*, so we could move into a better future?

What myths and misconceptions should the U.S. let go of in order to clear the way for a nonviolent foreign policy?

Current U.S. foreign policy has continued because the American people have been believing some myths and misconceptions.

What did the politicians, the military, the media, and U.S. cultural myths tell us that allowed the American people to support the Vietnam war?

Examples:

- Asians don't value human life.
- We are doing this for their own well-being.
- We are winning the war.

What have the politicians, the military, the media, and U.S. cultural myths been telling us since at least September 11, 2001, that have allowed the American people to support our current wars?

Examples:

- They were responsible for the September 11 attacks.
- Those people have always been fighting.
- Islam is an aggressive religion that is contrary to Western values.
- We are winning the war – and need just a little more time, and another "surge."

How to deal with “deniers”?

The movement to protect the earth’s climate must deal with the “climate deniers.” Likewise, if we want to change to a peaceful foreign policy, we will have to deal with people who deny that peace is possible.

“Climate deniers” cause two big problems:

1. They are rich and powerful, so they shape public policy.
2. They deceive and confuse the general public in order to prevent solutions.

Both of these are true also of the “peace deniers”:

1. They are rich and powerful, so they shape public policy.
2. They deceive and confuse the general public in order to prevent solutions.

Let’s address each problem one at a time.

1. What strategies and methods might we use to reduce the power and influence of the “peace deniers”?
2. How can we protect the public from being deceived and confused by the “peace deniers”?

Militarism makes us **LESS** secure:

The default violent way to “national security” does not work.

It actually makes problems worse.

Militarism actually makes us **less** secure.

If we want to **truly be secure**, we must stop war and the culture of violence – both in our foreign policy and in our domestic policy.

Instead of a narrow military approach that ends up being suicidal, TRUE security would improve all aspects of our lives.

One step toward peace would be stopping dishonest speech. EXAMPLES:

Why do people refer to the **military** budget as the “defense” budget?

It is used much more for “offense” than “defense.”

In recent decades the U.S. government has used the euphemism of “force” instead of the accurate word “violence.” When I think of “force,” I think of a strong grip on a pickle jar lid and twisting it hard to open the jar. Politicians keep saying “force” when – if they were honest – they would say violence, and acknowledge that our military violence actually kills many innocent people.

War supporters like to refer to “surgical strikes,” which sound precise and medically clean, when actually U.S.

Several famous persons have said, “War is a failure of imagination.”

If the dominant orthodoxy in the U.S. is that “national security” requires military violence, we are **preventing the kind of imagination** that will get us out of the default trap of war.

If “war is a failure of imagination,” what could any of us imagine as creative alternatives – creative ways to function in the world – without war?

bombs and drones kill enormous numbers of innocent persons, whom we dismiss as mere “collateral damage” instead of admitting that these are innocent persons.

How could we make language more honest and accurate?

Although glib politicians keep saying, “America is #1,” the truth is that the U.S. ranks 34th on the list of 35 developed nations in the well-being of children, according to the United Nations Children’s Fund. The U.S. ranks 35th in life expectancy, 34th in infant mortality, 17th in education, and 37th in health care.

In June 2014 the Institute for Economics and Peace released its annual “Global Peace Index.” It reported that in 2013 the world spent \$9.8 TRILLION trying to contain and deal with the consequences of violence.

All over the world, people know we have better uses for our tax dollars.

What would a **nonviolent federal budget** look like?

In September 2013 the American peace movement and others prevented US military intervention in Syria. We actually convinced to reject Obama’s proposal for air strikes against Syria. Now we need to mobilize again.

Congress keeps feeding our tax dollars into our national addiction to military violence. How could the peace movement reach out to the general public to create a majority that will say “NO!” to war?

TRUE Security: Several years ago I wrote about what I call “True Security.” Here is a summary:

TRUE security cannot be won by weapons. It's rooted in social and economic justice, civil liberties, a vibrant democracy, a healthy environment, and humane values.

The American people are afraid of terrorists.

But Americans **also** have deep, troubling fears about the crumbling economy, the loss of civil liberties, the

deteriorating environment, and the future our kids and grandkids will inherit.

The government keeps escalating fear of terrorists **deliberately** and the second set of fears **unwittingly**.

**→ To keep this workshop on schedule we might jump to the table on the final page.
If we jump there, people can read this material leading up to that table later on their own time.**

The so-called “war on terrorism” failed to address the underlying causes of terrorism. Instead, the Bush regime exploited the September 11 attacks to frighten the American people into supporting more militarism, giving up our constitutional rights, and letting the government claim dictatorial powers – all in the guise of “protecting” us. Militaristic and repressive reactions only turn more people into enemies and escalate the cycle of violence. In 2008 the voters chose Barack Obama, but he continued the Cheney-Bush foreign policy and escalated some aspects of it (especially in Afghanistan, drone wars in many countries, in Syria, etc.)

Leaders in both of the big political parties manipulate the American people's fears in order to increase the military-industrial complex's power and serve the US's global empire. **But ironically, militarism and the centralization of power are not the solutions but rather are actually the root causes of people's real fears in the first place!**

On the other hand, the public really is justified in fearing for their economic security, health security, environmental security, civic security, etc. For several decades, **both political parties'** presidents and Congresses have passed laws and appointed officials that have pushed most Americans downward, threatened our retirement plans, hurt our quality of life, degraded our food supply, ruined our environment, restricted the media, corrupted our political processes, and so forth.

In any debate, whoever frames the terms of the debate has a tremendous advantage. If “**security**” means more guns and wiretapping, then the Pentagon is providing security, so anyone who disagrees becomes defined as a threat to public security because -- as Bush said after 9-11 -- “you're either with us or against us.”

This is **NOT** a partisan matter. Obama has escalated Bush's attacks on dissenters. Obama has attacked, prosecuted and punished more whistleblowers and more

journalists than any president in U.S. history. An honest government need not fear and repress journalists and whistleblowers. The truth is not our nation's enemy. The truth does not threaten our true security.

However, if the peace and progressive movements can show that Americans' feelings of insecurity really come from gross and specific injustices (e.g., social, economic, political, environmental), then we can re-define TRUE security as reversing those injustices. We can promote progressive alternatives, take the moral and political high ground, and win the public over to our side!

The peace movement and multi-issue progressive movements can support each other toward common goals that will serve the broad public interest and protect our future.

People want security, but we can't gain TRUE security by making wars and sacrificing civil liberties. TRUE security must be based on peace, social and economic justice, a sustainable environment, a vibrant democracy, civil liberties for everyone, and many other progressive values.

Let's help the American people see that the familiar policies of militarism, dominance and greed are a sham being foisted upon us. Let's empower the American people to reject that false notion of security and affirm the deeper, more profound kind of TRUE security. Let's collaborate with a wide range of allies in a strong movement so the American people can choose a peaceful, just and sustainable future.

Progressive movements for peace, social justice, economic justice, healthy environments, etc., offer positive alternatives that can actually solve the problems. We progressives can relieve people's fears and increase their TRUE security.

Sometimes our movements debate whether to work on a wide range of progressive issues versus focus our energies on a specific issue (e.g., Iraq, or minimum wage, or the

climate). If we reframe the unifying issue in the overall context of providing TRUE security, we can connect at this more profound level, so all progressives become allies rather than competitors.

A multi-faceted campaign for TRUE security can unite and support all peace and progressive movements!

It can also unite the broad American public across many social and political categories (age, religion, race, class, occupation, political spectrum, etc.) into an electoral majority. Current policies threaten everyone's security, but progressive alternatives offer TRUE security for the American people. This bottom-up approach deals with many kinds of security. **What kinds of security do we advocate for our nation's people? Examples:**

- **Economic security:** Job security, living wages, job safety, cures for poverty, help during hard times, protection from child labor, secure retirement income, etc.
- **Food security:** Safe and nutritious food, locally grown food, freedom from hunger, etc.
- **Health security:** Access to affordable health care, respectful treatment, choices in health care options,

focus on preventing diseases, strong public health services, etc.

- **Environmental security:** Sustainable ecosystems, enough water, clean water, clean air, freedom from toxics, healthy forests, land use planning for sustainability, etc.
- **Personal security:** Thoughtful and sensitive policies and services for domestic violence, child abuse, gender issues, human dignity, substance abuse, etc.
- **Community & cultural security:** Respect for all cultures and languages, freedom to practice any religion or no religion, corporate accountability, limitations on corporate power, removing the underlying causes of crime, comfort in walking anywhere at any time, ways to heal and reconcile when someone hurts another person, etc.
- **Political security:** Freedom from governmental oppression or abuse, support for civil rights and civil liberties, meaningful opportunities to participate in democratic political processes, etc.

The table on the next page contrasts the typical American way to achieve national security with this **better way to achieve TRUE security.**

I invite each reader to incorporate this kind of strategy within your respective issues and movements. How can you reach out to the public with this welcoming and supportive approach? I invite your feedback. Please feel free to contact me at (360) 491-9093 or glenanderson@integra.net

Thank you!

→ See the next page for a contrast between the status quo and TRUE Security.

Typical American Way to Achieve National Security

Better Way to Achieve TRUE Security

Vision:	U.S. dominates all other countries.	U.S. cooperates fairly with all other countries.
Axis of Evil:	Iraq, Iran, North Korea	Martin Luther King never called people evil, but he identified 3 evil systems: Racism, Militarism, Poverty
Goals:	National security against other nations	Global security and equitable relationships among all nations
	Political, military, economic, cultural dominance	Self-determination Economic well-being for all Respect for other cultures & religions
Methods:	Military action, arms sales, covert operations, selective diplomacy	Sincere diplomacy Nonviolent direct action at international level (e.g., nonviolent peace force)
	Unilateral action Coalitions that the US controls and others must endorse	Multilateral resolution of conflicts Support the UN, international law, treaties
	Development initiatives linked to "good" governments Economic practices that support US interests	A new Marshall Plan to eradicate global poverty Unconditional commitment to the poor
	Volunteerism and acts of charity to help the poor without changing structural inequities	Short-term: Generous actions with no selfish motives Long-term: Structural changes for justice
	Minimum wage	Living wage. Guaranteed minimum income
	Conflict management focused on violence as individual pathology	Nonviolent resistance to systemic violence. Interpersonal conflict resolution skills
Motivation:	Hatred	Love, compassion
	Fear	Faith
	Power	Justice
	Self-centered (Greek word <i>porneia</i> : people as objects)	Other-centered for the other's sake (Greek word <i>agape</i>)
Result:	Global chaos	Global community