

Jim Adams  
Ground Floor Flat  
163 Ditchling Rise  
Brighton  
BN1 4QR

Monday 11<sup>th</sup> July 2005

email: jim-adams@supanet.com

Robert Glaberson  
Re: "**Security through détente**"

Dear Robert

Since I am uncertain whether I wish to attend today's meeting to consider the London bombings, but I think, despite my own shortcomings in what I can produce as a correct and considerate analysis, that your essay deserves a more fulsome response, I have decided to develop some further critical analyses of what you have to say.

### **Reason and Intuition.**

Our response to events – social, political – can occur at many levels and in many ways. One categorization might be between reasoning about the world – that is, forming rational models, or 'mind maps' of what we are thinking about, checking the consistency of our assumptions, and comparing as best we can with the 'real world' out there, and by a choice of principles based on reasoning and experience of what is optimum, framing a plan of action, and the second categorization, which human evolution has provided us with, and which therefore presumably has survival value to our species, is an emotional response based on an intuitive and immediate grasp of the essence of a situation, and of leadership based on bonding of the group to overcome the dangers by which it is threatened.

You begin with a premise, that we face threats, and from where, and provide leadership in directing our attention to a means whereby these threats may be resolved. My purpose in this note is to ensure this premise and its conclusions is subject to a modicum of rational analysis, and a hope that any forthcoming rational plans of action should be based on facts, so far as they can be ascertained, and that ethically based reasoning and the widest possible collective experience of the world should determine our response based on optimum leadership.

Let us begin by splitting the model into its component parts and seeing what we mean.

### **Securing the Premises.**

You state "... the West faces serious threats to its security emanating from a number of Middle Eastern countries".

The West here is presumably not Sweden, but includes countries such as the United States and Great Britain. That the United States and Britain are embroiled in Iraq, whereas Sweden is not, can only be part of the reason. 9/11 after all occurred before the invasion. That the security threat is based on these two countries' real or alleged behaviour would seem a reasonable assumption, or otherwise we are led to believe threats and acts of terror are occurring without reason in gratuitous acts of violence.

We are then led to ask "what is the rationale for these acts?", the reasons for which we are free to dismiss as being invalid only after we understand what they are.

The above only relates to acts of terror 'emanating' from certain groups, which have Middle Eastern connections.

We must be careful not to conflate such groups with other groups that may have other objectives, such as Hamas or Hezbollah, not to conflate membership of such groups with mere vocal support of them, nor to conflate all or a specified number of Middle Eastern governments with, for example, Al Qaida.

In particular, we must distinguish between acts of terror from such groups, from other types of assumed, alleged or real 'threats', for example the alleged purpose (which the Iranians are vociferous in denying, and the Americans and Israelis are vociferous in alleging) of the Iranian nuclear power programme as a precursor to the production of nuclear weapons.

It is important to note here, that the security of the West is not threatened by insufficient deterrence were such a purpose to be fact, and there is an asymmetry, only partly justified, between the West's acceptance of Israel's substantial nuclear arsenal and the threat of invasion of Iran, now for the moment shelved, based on a denied intention of the Iranians to develop nuclear weapons.

We note also that the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, which is a running sore poisoning dialogue between many Middle Eastern governments and the United States, and between people from Middle Eastern countries and people from the United States, is an additional source of tension, which must itself be considered as a separate factor distinguished from others.

I now turn to the statement "... these countries in return perceive a threat emanating from the West".

There are always some tensions between countries, many of them being of a long-term nature. I would categorize relations between Turkey, Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia and the 'West' as being manageable and in many ways normal. An internal problem for the Pakistani regime is that the West supports it.

There have been direct threats, war planning and/or attack by the United States against Iraq, Iran, Syria and Afghanistan. Anti-US sentiment is high (but not a part of regime policy) in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. There is widespread distrust and antipathy to the US throughout the Middle East, including for reasons of 'sexual decadence', economic exploitation, support of corrupt regimes, Christian fundamentalism, support

for Israel and its actions against Palestinians, and because of the often blundering, violent and corrupt nature of the American presence in the Middle East.

As for solutions, we are indeed talking about solutions *in the plural*. There is no single solution because there is no single problem. Forums already exist where they are deemed necessary: there is the Arab League, meetings of Arab Foreign Ministers, the U.N., OPEC, and there are many other bilateral and multilateral organisations, some temporary, some permanent, in which dialogue takes place, decisions are made and from which consequences are drawn.

### **The Threats.**

You state "... a number of hostile states seek to develop weapons of mass destruction". In terms of nuclear weapons, unless you are talking about North Korea, which is not in the Middle East, or Israel and Pakistan, which continue to produce and develop nuclear weapons, I think one might try to justify such a categorical remark in a way that you presumably cannot. Syria's chemical weapons and delivery systems are claimed to be a minimal response to Israel's nuclear arsenal. Whilst the corrupt Saudi royal family is vast, it is extremely doubtful its central core is anti-Western and in this respect the Saudis appear to be essentially pragmatic.

You state "Terrorism at the present time constitutes the most immediate threat to the United States". I rather think that sensible attempts should now be taken to prevent economic meltdown in the US in about two years' time, with a currency collapse due to the unsustainable budget deficit, and that this is perhaps the most significant threat.

I believe if we cannot argue correctly about WMD because our category is too wide, so we cannot think correctly about specifics, this makes it impossible or difficult to deal with potentially severe and urgent problems in this area.

I shall pass over the section on "**The Causes**" because in a broad sense I agree with it.

On the section "**War Not Viable**", I would remark that we often here are not dealing with a single evil enemy, as if we were fighting Hitler. We are dealing with politicians, for example in Iran, who are '*difficult*' or perhaps '*extremely difficult*'. It is one of the problems of diplomacy to resolve difficulties. I agree, here as elsewhere, that war is not an option – in Iran, war is only an option only if the US wants to lose, and I think this has registered in the war games that have taken place, and in the manoeuvrings by the US *nomenklatura* to exclude the neo-cons from positions of power where the neo-cons were seen as advocating a war with Iran. Indeed, if you read the journal 'Foreign Affairs', if you read between the lines, there seems to be the possibility that the US is conducting secret diplomacy with the Iranians.

Yours fraternally

Jim Adams ([jim-adams@supanet.com](mailto:jim-adams@supanet.com))