



## **Fourth World Dialogue**

**A WEBCast and Radio Broadcast Production**

# **“World War and the Fourth World”**

**With Rudolph C. Ryser and his guests**

**Dr. David Price**

**Mr. David Martinez**

**Dr. Steve Niva**

### **Program Synopsis**

Before September 11, 2001 indigenous nations in many places in the world had been engaged in low-intensity conflicts either in defense of their peoples and territories or in movements of self-determination (as many as 80 different conflicts). These conflicts had been described in the press and by foreign policy spokespersons as “internal conflicts” or as regional conflicts. The efforts of the peoples of Kashmir, for example, to exercise self-determination had been thwarted by the interventions of India and Pakistan. Similar conflicts between indigenous nations and states’ governments (i.e., Tibet and China, Chechnya and Russia, Papuans and Indonesia, Tamils and Sri Lanka, Palestinians and Israel) had been underway for as many as fifty years. Guests on Fourth World Dialogue point out that these conflicts involving questions of political self-determination, resource access and cultural rights were transformed by President George Bush’s declaration of war into conflicts between “terrorists” and states acting in their self-defense on September 11, 2002.

The U.S. “war on terrorism” is being used as a justification for states’ governments to use American force to attack and quell legitimate movements of self-determination. America’s war on terrorism is drifting into a generalized war on indigenous nations instead of a war focused on defeating the bigotry and violence of a movement driven by religious zeal, fueled by illicit drugs and precious resources like diamonds, conducted with the tactics of organized crime and systematically organized like a transnational corporation.

# **Fourth World Dialogue**

## **“World War and the Fourth World”**

Original presentation: March 11, 2002  
Olympia Center  
Olympia, Washington

Host: Rudolph C. Ryser

Guests: Dr. David Price, S. Martin's College  
David Martinez, Secretary General of ASIN-Philippines  
Dr. Steve Niva, The Evergreen State College

Transcription: Sandra Baker and Associates  
Sound Engineer: Morgan A.D. Ryser  
Production Assistants: Siu Ching Tsang  
Elizabeth McCormack  
Administration: Margee Thompson

Producer/Director: Rudolph C. Ryser

Produced by the Center for World Indigenous Studies for Radio broadcast and WEBcast. © 2002 Center for World Indigenous Studies – All Rights Reserved

\* \* \* \*

*This program is made possible by the Center for World Indigenous Studies. It was also made possible through support in part by a grant from the Washington Commission for the Humanities, a statewide non-profit organization supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities and local contributors.*

\* \* \* \*

*The opinions and statements contained in this program do not necessarily represent the views of either the Washington Commission for the Humanities or the National Endowment for the Humanities.*

**Transcription of: Fourth World Dialogue**  
"World War and the Fourth World"  
Center for World Indigenous Studies

***Introduction***

MR. RYSER: I am Rudolph Ryser, Chair and Executive Director of the Center for World Indigenous Studies. This is the March 11th, 2002 edition of the Fourth World Dialog.

For this broadcast, our subject is World War and the Fourth World. Are indigenous nations becoming targets of the War on Terrorism? Are Fourth World nations the enemy of the state?

To answer these and other questions, we have as my guests some of the leading observers on the subject. My guests include distinguished observers and analysts from the fields of anthropology, international politics and law.

To my far left is Dr. David Price, an associate professor at St. Martin's college in Lacey, Washington where he teaches courses in anthropology and social justice. Dr. Price studied anthropology and intellectual history as an undergraduate at the Evergreen State College. He received his AM from the University of Chicago, and Ph.D. from the University of Florida.

He has conducted cultural anthropological and archeological fieldwork and research in the United States

and the Middle East. He is the author of "Atlas of World Cultures: A Geographical Guide to Ethnographic Literature." Duke University Press will publish his next book. In this upcoming volume, Dr. Price documents the US government's attempts to suppress academic freedom as he charges. His new book is entitled "Cold War Witch Hunts: The FBI Persecution of Activist Anthropologists."

To my immediate right is David Martinez, an attorney, journalist, poet and political activist born in the Philippines. While in law school, he organized indigent farmers on his island of Negros against sugar barons and politicians seeking to seize the farmlands. He passed the bar in 1970, taught law, and provided legal advice to indigenous people in the Philippines and settlers.

After denouncing the martial law declarations of the Marco's government in September 1972, Mr. Martinez was immediately arrested and jailed. After two months in jail, he escaped to Malaysia and was there incarcerated for three months before being repatriated to the Philippines. He was listed on the "Top 30 Most Wanted" of the Marco's government before the government itself collapsed.

He has served as the Director for Refugee Affairs of the Movement for a Free Philippines, and he has served as the editor of Asian American News in Southern

California. Mr. Martinez is now the Secretary General of ASIN, A-S-I-N, the Alliance for Separate and Independent Nations, Philippines, about which we shall learn more in our discussions.

To my far right is Dr. Steve Niva, professor of international politics and Middle East studies at the Evergreen State College. He writes regularly for Middle East Report and is an associate at the Middle East Research and Information Project in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Niva has lived and worked in the Middle East and has spent time in the occupied Palestinian territories where he has focused on popular resistance to the Israeli military occupation. He published several articles immediately following the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in US newspapers and journals abroad including Common Dreams, the Jordan Times, the Middle East Times of Cairo and the Globe and Daily Mail of South Africa.

## **War on Terrorism Impact Six Months After Attacks on US**

Welcome to the broadcast all of you. It is now six months since the war on terrorism was declared by US President George Bush. Local conflicts in Israel, the Philippines, Somalia, the Russian Republic, and elsewhere have intensified in these months, and the US government

is now assigning small commando troops to support the governments in these areas. What does this mean for indigenous nations in the Middle East, Philippines, Eastern Africa, and the Caucasus? Big question.

Would you like to start, Steve?

DR. NIVA: By and large, it doesn't mean a lot of very good things for indigenous people. I think indigenous nations around the world confronted clearly for the last 500 years a number of difficult situations that range from genocides to domination to economic devastation.

In that context we have to think about these things, but I think in particular since September 11th, indigenous nations are going to be particularly impacted by this increasing militarization of international affairs, in a sense, of the status quo. Which means that indigenous nations that have not had the right to self-determination respected, have not had the struggles for their rights respected and resistance to the status quo in any particular way, I think, are now going to be forced under the rubric of being terrorists according to this war on terrorism.

And we've already seen a number of countries around the world using the war on terrorism and extra military support from the United States and other countries to do just that, to suppress groups which are challenging the

status quo in some particular way.

### ***War on Terrorism Impact in the Philippines***

MR. RYSER: David Martinez, he's opened up, I think, a whole broad panorama, but perhaps from your perspective you might be able to elaborate on say the impact in the Philippines.

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, I believe I can elaborate on that much more particularly because in the last few months, as you already know, 650 American troops were sent to the Philippines ironically to train these special Filipino military contingent of 1,200 men, which would translate to approximately one military advisor, American military advisor for every two military soldiers. I know that our people are not that dense.

The truth of the matter is, as far as my particular county is concerned, we have had an authentic struggle, military struggle for independence at least in our time since 1968.

Very recently now, under the last decade or so, an extremist fringe element of bandits known to the Filipinos' world as Abu Sayyaf have engaged in adamantly heinous crimes, kidnapping, beheading, ransoms, that kind of stuff. And everybody, including the Philippine government and media, recognizes the distinction between these rebels and terrorists.

After September 11th, following the language of

President Bush, President Arroyo locked them up, and worse than that the media followed suit.

It's so surprising because these countries are run by one group and they speak the same language. Where the president goes, wherever the United States, the repression will always follow. And that's tragic, I think. It's tragic when -- when a people are struggling for genuine self-rule who are resisting oppression of the greatest magnitude, it's not denial or neglect. Their land is being destroyed, their crops are being monopolized by commerce. Their leaders are being systematically singled out, you know, bribed, coerced or removed from office.

These people are trying to find a voice. That voice, after 9/11, because of this muddling of the line between the rebels and the terrorists, is on the verge of getting lost.

MR. RYSER: Well, how does that, though, affect what people actually do, that is there are 600 troops of the Americans sent in, and the Philippine government has 1,200 troops. They're obviously fighting against one small group. They're not necessarily fighting against other groups. Isn't that the case?

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, it is and it isn't because the tragedy is -- normally the Third World country -- I mean you hear, what, "We don't like

intervention." In the Philippines it's very interesting because although most Filipinos were happy to see the American bases leave the country in 1991, today under very special circumstances, most of the Filipinos are welcoming the American soldiers. Why? Not because we want intervention, not because -- not for any other reason except the Philippines, the Christians -- I'm sorry to say this, but it is a Christian Philippine government, has been too corrupt, too incompetent to deal with these terrorist problems. Not only that, they're taking advantage of this small, local conflict to persuade President Bush that these people are followers of Al Queda even though that association is extremely tenuous.

And he's happy to accommodate her because it's -- it's an easy front. It's easy to win. He can't possibly lose. You have 90 soldiers in the jungle. I mean it's much more severe. So it's a combination of politics and money one has to say yes. If the Americans can help us get rid of these terrorists, fine, but at the same time, he's concerned about one thing: money. Filipinos, by and large, still feel that the only way this thing could work is if the Americans are honest with their intentions because if they're going to continue seeking to develop oil that remains untapped, oil and gas reserves which remains untapped because of the continuing civil war.

So a lot of people are saying, "Are they here to help us get rid of the terrorists, to rescue the two Americans, or are they here to make sure that in the exploitation of the oil and gas in the future, there will be Americans that's in control?"

### ***A Great blurring between "terrorist" and "freedom fighter"***

MR. RYSER: David Price, how do you see the impact of this war on indigenous people?

MR. PRICE: Well, to follow up on a phrase that David just used, there is a great blurring that is going on between what's being called terrorist and what's being called freedom fighter or people who are fighting for or working for legitimacy, straight issue of legitimacy all around the world.

We should all have great concern that there really hasn't been a definition of terrorism that has been put out there by the Bush administration or by anyone in the coalition. It's simply a phrase that everyone in the discussion seems to have preconceived notions to the degree that they don't have to stop and define what it is. The reasons for that are fairly obvious and that is once you start defining the term behaviorally rather than logically, you start talking about using force to get a political cause rectified. And when you start doing that, you have to start questioning the actions of what

are seen as legitimate military forces.

So the closest thing we get to a definition of terrorism is something like illegitimate military forces, which raise all sorts of questions about what is legitimacy.

You know, as an anthropologist and someone who's been studying issues of indigenous people and people in multiethnic regions for some time, I have very grave concerns about what this so-called war on terrorism is going to mean to indigenous people around the world. We're already seeing just in Europe, among the vast, that there have been tremendous crackdowns on, you know, with people in Spain and in France that are being routinely rounded up and arrested at much higher rates than even a year ago. A year ago the rates were unacceptable in terms of getting people due process and such.

The other question I have is with this undefined notion of terrorism -- has to do with looking at in the past the types of activities here in the new world, here in North American that have been deemed terrorist. We're dealing with indigenous peoples. You know, in the past people have been forbidden by a force of law to teach native languages, religious practices have been outlawed, you know, here in the Northwest. In British Columbia the practice of potlatch was outlawed for almost 100 years as a terrorists activity.

We're entering an era now where to use the term "terrorist" gives a great deal of legitimacy to the American government to go and do acts that would have been unthinkable just, you know, six months and one day -- one day ago. We've entered a new era where, you know, a media that was already not very critical of what was going on with the administration in Washington have now reached new levels of looking the other way with their inconsistencies and not asking for, you know, information.

I use the Freedom of Information Act very regularly to get information from the government, and the Freedom Information Act is dead. Several months ago I've been trying to get federal documents that right now the government won't even pretend they're going to go through the motions of getting. All of this is in the name of, you know, higher security for the good of all.

I think all of us need to be very careful and very aware for just what this means for indigenous peoples, you know, both here within this county and all around the world because as this war hysteria increases, we're seeing the Bush administration talk about a multi -- multitheater war with as many as six or seven nations around world. We can see what's starting in the Philippines happening in places like Yemen, happening in places like Somalia.

MR. MARTINEZ: Georgia.

MR. PRICE: Georgia, and in some sense what may be happening is, you know, a payoff for leaders such as Putin, you know, from Russia. Letting us -- him joining our coalition will allow him to deal with his troubles with Chechnya which are very much, you know, indigenous people contest you know, regions where this is going on. And that's a very great danger -- that we may be willing -- the United States may be willing to look the other way while we allow, you know, well-armed militaries to create mass acts of genocide against minority populations within their own border.

DR. NIVA: A few other pressing examples right now, just to add briefly to what Dave was talking about, is Human Rights Watch just came out with a report saying that this is near degradation of human rights among countries who have joined the United States in the war on terrorism and a few Uygurs would be the weaker community in China.

China has been given a free hand. If they look at it the other way, they've been given a free hand to crack down on the weaker people in the far west of China. And in Turkey, the price of admission to join the club will be a free hand to do what they will with the Kurdish population in the Southeast. Israel has immediately taken advantage of this by launching a very

widespread -- widespread attack on Palestinians since September 11th. And the list goes on. So this is a very -- this is where the most immediate impact on indigenous people can be found on this quid pro quo on the war of terrorism. If you join the United States, there will be a blind eye turned toward exactly the same thing.

### ***Is war about states defending against radical elements?***

MR. RYSER: But isn't it so that in the case of Israel, in the case of the Russian Federation, even in the case of the Philippines, the position taken by the government is that they're merely defending themselves against radical elements that seek to undo the government and breakdown democracy and undermine freedom? Isn't that the case, Steve?

DR. NIVA: Well, that's what the governments will say, and indeed the grain of truth in that is that there have -been like with the Abu Sayaf from the Philippines or like with certain groups like Hamas or Islamic Jihad in Palestine or certain elements of the PKK in Turkey which is the opposition pro-Kurdish group in Turkey. Indeed there have been some heinous crimes committed, brutal acts of aggression and terror, but when you look at the activities of these governments, it's not just against those groups even sometimes it's

not even against those groups at all. It's actually against the citizens, the civilians, the masses of people from those particular groups, those indigenous groups or ethnic groups. And in fact, often it's directed towards suppressing their rights to their language, suppressing their rights to organize themselves, to self-rule, to self-determination. It's usually when you investigate a number of those examples that I just mentioned you find that it's primarily not a military conflict that they're very concerned with. It's primarily the denial of the rights of another group of people within their particular territory.

MR. MARTINEZ: If I may add a little bit to that. Anyone who studies the story of indigenous resistance in the Philippines in the last, say, 20, 30 years, will very quickly find that the majority of the so-called attacks or violent reactions of indigenous peoples was never directed against the government, against the state, per se. The Kalingas of the Igorot country in the Philippines for example were resisting dam builders. Lumads or the indigenous peoples, non-Christian peoples in Mindanao were resisting building plantations, banana plantations. They believed or perceived they were grabbing their land, they were, and forest concessionaires. And it was very, very seldom where they actually encountered and killed soldiers or

fired on military installation.

In other words, what I'm trying to say is that these so-called acts of terrorism, many of them put under one homogenous heading, are actually anti-capitalism -- you know, elitist capitalism, antiglobalism, anti-intrusion, but now they're under the same bottle and made into one liquid for everybody to drink.

### ***Capitalism, resources and the War on Terrorism***

MR. RYSER: David Price, do you have some thoughts about that?

MR. PRICE: Well, you know, there's also part of the current problem is that with September 11th, America essentially walked in on the middle of a very long and complicated movie and wanted to pretend as if it suddenly understood, as if it had been attacked and blind-sided out of the blue, where, in fact, America, you know, for a few hundred years has been involved certainly in the last 100 years certainly the period of Neocolonialism around the world has been around in interfering and running the affairs of other nations all around the world.

One of the problems, I think, for Americans right now, understanding the sort of reactions that are coming from indigenous peoples around the world is that when these dams are being built, which, you know, move people

out of the places where they've been living for a very long time, when you bring in plantations, when you bring in a foreign economic system, it has a very serious impact on people. And that they're going to react to this in some sort of organized way is natural.

Unfortunately to most Americans, again, they're coming in very late to the picture. They see some -- they see some news footage, or they read something in the newspaper, they hear a story on the radio where someone is lashing out, out of these conditions, and they're seen as an aggressor rather than someone who's reacting to a situation or perhaps defending themselves against an intrusion. And that's a big part of what's missing, I think, in our analysis, that you see in the newspapers. And there's certainly, in terms of the analysis part of it, that's missing is you really don't get the depth of the American involvement in these situations.

I mean, I know, you know, here in this town, here in Olympia, Washington, the local newspaper from time to time will carry these odd little side-bars that they get from the Gannett Press where they talk about, you know, "Osama Bin Laden," you know, "ten years of terror," and they also want to start ten years ago or nine years ago.

They don't want to go further back and look at his links to Mujaheddin and their links to the Central Intelligence Agency. It's always we want to start in this very

convenient period and not look at the extent to which American foreign policy has been embedded in the creation of these situations.

## **Is it necessary to define the enemy?**

MR. RYSER: Don't you think, David and Steve and you as well and Dave Martinez, don't you all think that it is necessary from the point of view of the United States, which after all saw itself attacked in New York, in the Pentagon in September, isn't it necessary from the leadership's point of view to define some kind of enemy to justify a defensive position?

MR. PRICE: Well, I've -- I think it's very natural to want to do that. I think the way that our government has chosen to do that is counterintuitive and very odd. If you look at the individuals who -- the commandos who took over this airplane, these series of airplanes, four, and, you know, crashed them or attempted to crash them into these buildings, all but, I believe, one or two were Saudi Arabians. It's very interesting. And now we're involved in this war in Afghanistan, talking about taking drastic action in Iraq and cleaning up a good half dozen scores that have been left hanging out there for quite a period of time.

While it does appear that Al Qaeda was connected very directly to these actions, Al Qaeda has been

operating in Afghanistan, but the real tie to this is Saudi Arabia. What we're doing in Afghanistan is a very convoluted way of -- of dealing with this.

Your question is: What are we supposed to do? Are we supposed to strike back at someone and so on? Well, I do think we should go out and get the organizations that are responsible for this, but doing a prolonged military and paramilitary attack on a, you know, largely gutted, you know, shell of a nation, Afghanistan, doesn't really get to that. I think we were very quick to do it. I think the United States took every opportunity it could to use military action without trying to use the royal court or other legislative bodies to deal with this situation. So I believe something should have been done.

I'm not exactly sure what this accomplishes by going out and once again, you know, bombing Afghanistan.

DR. NIVA: Yeah. I think that the biggest danger that we're beginning to see, and I think that biggest danger that -- particularly for on the topic of indigenous people that they should be concerned about is that what is happening with the war on terrorism is no longer -- and I would say a number of months ago became no longer about September 11th. It became no longer about responding to the particular group and network that was responsible for these atrocious acts, I mean which -- I mean I will consider would fall into the range of

crimes against humanity. That should be prosecuted as such, as war crimes.

The groups that were responsible for September 11th are very isolated, marginalized, fringe groups of a couple of networks which engaged in this operation. That can be handled, as David was somewhat suggesting, I think, through international sort of criminal law approaches, a manhunt, a multinational/multilateral coordination of police investigative units, et cetera, et cetera.

What we've seen instead of this model is not only beginning the attacks on Afghanistan which already take you away from September 11th, because the Taliban had nothing to do with September 11th other than being sort of, I would argue, paid off by Bin Laden not to stop him.

And -- and now the talk of Somalia, of Yemen, of Iraq, of the Philippines, et cetera, there's absolutely no link at all to the particular networks around Bin Laden, around Al Queda and these people.

So I think this is the danger that we're trying to focus on. Indeed I think the United States would be absolutely legitimate in responding to the particular attacker and the groups that committed these terrible crimes, but outside of that, I don't think it's justified, and in fact, I think the United States is now beginning to create precisely what it says it's fighting.

It's creating anti-American sentiment. It's creating hatred. It's created more bloodshed, and in fact, I don't see it as making Native Americans more secure.

MR. RYSER: Go ahead, David Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: I came to this county as a refugee in '74 and still have -- still feel that I have a foreigner's perspective, so let me share that with you. The way I view -- the way I view America -- America's method of defining the enemy is this way: Every time this county feels that it is aggrieved or is victimized, it proceeds with a very, very broad brush to demonize and personify the enemy. Before -- before America got involved with the Second World War, most Americans didn't care which way it would go. This country became isolationist.

And Churchill was begging, you know, the American leadership to come in and save Europe, and by and large, because of public opinion, the leadership said, "We can't even if we wanted to." When Pearl Harbor happened, something you can be certain was as devastating to the conscience of the civilized world as September 11th, it's said that Churchill fell on his knees because now America had an excuse, a legitimate excuse to go to war.

All of a sudden, in the American media culture, the Japanese were no longer immigrants, as a people. Japanese were the enemy. Hirohito was a monster. The

entire viewpoint of the people and its government changed. Now, the same thing happened in Iran after the taking of the hostages. This fellow who so many, many American journalists and scholars looked at as a -- the voice of the Iranian people, the Ayatollah, suddenly became the most evil man in the world. And there was no adjective in the dictionary that was -- then came Saddam's turn. Today it's the generic terrorist that is, you know, evil. Of course, there was a time that it was Russia, USSR, and the evil empire of President Ronald Reagan.

There is this American fantasy every time it's hurt or perceives itself to be hurt, to look at the world as black and white, no gray. But 95 percent of the world is gray. People who are not anti American or pro soviet or pro communist these are people who just want to make a living and want to be left alone without being pushed around or kicked around or exploited even by foreigners or their domestic elite. And thus in the end I wish this county and the public, because politicians merely react to the public, to learn to listen to the world because the world, as that picture on the wall shows us, is not black and white.

### ***Is the bin Laden Movement using indigenous nations?***

MR. RYSER: When Osama Bin Laden said publicly on October 12th, 1996 in a declaration of jihad,

"It is the duty now on every tribe in the Arabian Peninsula to fight jihad and cleanse the land from these crusader occupiers," he spoke to peoples who have been under the dominating or in the association of the Saudi family for more than 50 years. He urges the tribes in the Arabian Peninsula to defend themselves against the Saudis and other governments who would sell the wealth of the land, as he charges, and their souls for money and recognition from the United States of America.

Does this quote, which Osama Bin Laden is purported to have made, does this suggest that Bin Laden seeks to use tribes in the Middle East, or suggest that he wants to use indigenous people anywhere in the world to overthrow governments like the Saudi Arabian government or Iraq or any others for that matter?

DR. NIVA: Well, his use of the word "tribe" is kind of interesting. I mean, I think, that's sometimes a phrase used to describe particular groups in Saudi Arabia that came under this new Saudi government, which was set up in 1932 when Saudi Arabia came into existence. I think -- I think Bin Laden himself, if we just take him as an example, his call is to Muslim peoples to unite. This is his call. In fact, his call would be to transcend -- I believe, transcend tribal differences and unite under the banner of Islam.

And his vision -- which is a very popular notion,

I think, amongst many Islamic activists certainly since the 1970s. There's a growing movement in the Arab and Muslim world towards reclaiming sort of their cultural heritage and throwing off the legacy of imperialism which they saw internalized by the governments that were ruling them. They felt the governments were trying to westernize them and the governments were largely dominated by external powers, mostly the United States -- if you take the Middle East, mostly by the United States which took over from Britain as the kind of imperial power in the region after World War II.

So Bin Laden's message draws upon, I think, that kind of notion of uniting with some peoples particularly in the Middle East to get rid of foreign occupation and its legacy. And so I think this is -- I think this is the main focus.

Let me just say, though, that his particular brand of Islam is not a widely accepted nor is it is very popular vision of Islam. He, like a number of radical Muslim activists in the Middle East, got their training, as David was mentioning, in the 1980s in Afghanistan fighting the Soviet Union, which was a CIA-funded operation where the Pakistanis and the Saudis, in particular, wore the gloves of the operation with their particular ideologies. And they promoted this sort of Taliban style, very reductionist, very crude notion of

Islam and Islamic practice that certainly it's not accepted in Iran, and it's not accepted in most of the Arab world. It's not accepted in most Muslim countries around the world.

So I think that's the nature of his call is to overthrow the regimes in the region under this banner of Islam. I think there's an element of trying to appeal to various peoples as their -- as their particular nationality or tribal origin, but I think it's this broader message that he is promoting.

### ***Is bin Laden's goal the same as the West's goal?***

MR. RYSER: Does it not, though, suggest, as you observed, that in one sense Bin Laden is describing his goal as not much different than you described the West's goal as being, and that is the homogenization of tribes into unified groups that don't have cultural identity to state onto themselves? Is he not in effect by his assertion here making essentially the same claim?

DR. NIVA: Yeah, if I could just very briefly. I think you're onto something there. I think one way of thinking of Osama Bin Laden and what he represents, and, again, I should stress it's a very minority small point of view in the broader Muslim world, which is one of the largest religions on the planet. And

his is a very small and marginal view, but someone once said that Bin Laden in some ways represents kind of the -- the rearview mirror image of what the West has done in the Middle East and the Muslim world in particular. He's sort of its extreme counter-response in a way reflecting, I think, a lot of the negative things that came through colonialism. He sort of represents in reverse.

MR. RYSER: But still in one sense the position he seems to be taking is not at all different than the kind of position that other bodies might take saying the indigenous populations ought to homogenize under the leadership and control of some state or some particular belief.

David Price?

MR. PRICE: There may be something else going on also at the same time and that is, you know, in the last six months, we've all sort of forgotten what the original statements were from Osama Bin Laden in terms of his reasons for coordinating these attacks. And one of them was dealing with issues of the Palestinian people. In the west, you know, this caused great discomfort and people wanted to say, "Well, that's a new complaint for him so let's not really address that because all along he hasn't been concerned about that."

But his fundamental complaint was to get the United States military presence out of Saudi Arabia which, of

course, the United States had agreed to do within less than a year of the end of the Gulf War in 1991. This was very clear. James Baker, secretary of state, made this very clear that we would be leaving. They didn't want another Subic Bay. They didn't want another one of these, you know, occupational military forces, but in fact, the government stayed there. Excuse me, the military stayed there, stayed there in great force.

And our government has been very, very successful in erasing from our memories that this was, you know, one of the prime reasons that we had a military-occupying government in Saudi Arabia which is a very volatile place for us to be, given Saudi Arabia's political religious position as the guardian and the keeper of Islamic holy places. And for us to be there is not a minor detail. So when he's making these speeches of, "I," you know, "call for every tribesman to come forth and such," he's very much talking in a colloquial, you know, tongue saying, "I want the common person to help me get rid of these people who are militarily occupying our country," which the United States is. And it's very unpopular that we're doing that.

### ***Is this an asymmetrical war between a movement and states?***

MR. RYSER: So as I think about it, Osama Bin Laden represents a kind of movement, a small movement perhaps but a movement nevertheless, an organization, a

non-state body that seeks to unite those dispossessed in an effort to preserve Islam, and for that then, we are to accept that it is a legitimate act to then attack different entities in the world, whether it be a ship or a building or a business or something like that, to advance this agenda.

Is it not conceivable that we're in fact looking at -- I hate the word except that it fits -- an asymmetrical or unbalanced conflict really between, in effect, a movement and states' interests and both of them seeking to achieve essentially the same kinds of goal even though they aren't exactly the same goal? The same kind of goal meaning the unification of other interests under single banners. And so they're feeling the competition is over who will win the flag. Do you understand the question?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

MR. RYSER: Go ahead, David.

MR. MARTINEZ: If I may very quickly. I think the first thing that -- that we need to do is make a very clear dividing line between the motive and the method. Osama Bin Laden, the motivator, is understandably a hero not only in the Muslim world, but among a lot of other people who may not be Muslims but who have been kicked around for far too long because basically what this message is it's an impulse for freedom stripped of rhetoric and ideology and religion.

It's the impulse for freedom. The desire for one's destiny not to be decided by someone else. That's the motive. It's a very powerful universal motive.

The method chosen by him and his, you know, loyalists, this particular Al Qaeda group, is what's not -- that's the one that does not enjoy popular support. The problem is that the media lumps the man and method together, and worse makes a judgment based on the behavior of its worst members.

And so what happens is the legitimate aspiration of very many indigenous peoples and captive nations get lost in this fight between this so-call, somebody's called it, a clash of civilizations. It gets muddled and lost, but this resistance is going to find expression here and there sometimes quote legitimately. Sometimes quote illegitimately. Sometimes properly and improperly, politely and heinously. They're going to find expression for as long as indigenous peoples and those who speak for them are denied a forum through which they can vent their frustrations and a formula by which they can achieve the equity that they desire.

## **85% of the terrorist attacks are against businesses.**

MR. RYSER: Earlier, you were all making observations that indigenous nations, often as a consequence of developmental pressures, corporations

developing in the jungle, oil businesses being developed in the jungle or deserts, will sometimes, because of dams in the Luzon province in the Philippines, respond to that with either political action in the form of demonstrations and absent the ability to affect change will then use their own force and violence to attempt to effect change in that development.

The United States State Department released a report just this last month where it tabulated over the last ten years the number of deaths a gruesome notion but a number of deaths worldwide that were a direct consequence of so-called terrorist acts, and they were characterized according to the target that was hit. And this instance the target might be business. It might be government. It might be some other kind of other public institution. It might be private institutions.

85 percent, by our count, of the incidents that have taken place before September 11th, and that was in the thousands worldwide, were business entities that were affected, 85 percent. Now, on February 27th, US Secretary Paul H. O'Neil was quoted in the New York Times to say, "Our crackdown on terrorists is blind to nationality and origin. It's a net being cast on all terrorist parasites that threaten our allies and our national security."

Now, it strikes me that your observations earlier

about some of the targets, namely the business and/or corporate interests, is bolstered by the State Department report which lists the number of incidents. And now we have the secretary of the treasury, who apparently quite on his own, but perhaps with the endorsement of the president's office, decides that that broad net that you referred to, David Price, earlier, now is really cast over virtually anything and everything that threatens as they say "allies and our national security." What do you make of that?

MR. PRICE: Well, it really is an extension of that very vaguely precise line of George Bush made within days of September 11th, "You are either with us or you're with the terrorists." It's an amazing statement.

It precludes any sort of defense to say, "If you want to oppose me in any way, you are with the demons. You can -- you can only side with me. We can have no disagreement on this issue. To have disagreement is to support terrorists." And when the State Department takes this formula, this is what they do with it. They take it and they look at business interests. You're either, you know, in favor of our expansions in ways we're going to have them or you're with terrorists. If there's anyone who's opposing the expansion of business interest in an international way, you're with the terrorists.

If you look at the extent to which the police,

paramilitary police forces in this country have been allowed to expand their reach when there are protests against the international monetary fund and world bank, you know, far beyond what we saw at the WTO police riots in Seattle a couple of years ago just in the last few months in New York and D.C. with these protests, you've had an extraordinary show of force to the point where these individuals who are, you know, out protesting the expansion of capitalism in this international mobile and global world are being seen as terrorists and treated as such by the police in these situations.

### ***Indigenous nations most active opponents to “development”***

MR. RYSER: Is it possible by virtue of the observations and suggestion I made initially and then with O'Neil's remark that if it is true that indigenous nations are themselves some of the most active opponents to development efforts in various parts of the world, does it not follow logically that they, therefore, fall into the category of terrorists who are attacking the national security?

DR. NIVA: I think that's absolutely correct. In fact, I think one area where you're going -- you're going to see a lot more activity under the rubric of fighting the war on terrorism which impacts indigenous people is in the Amazon basin. Very recently

the Bush administration announced that it was going to extend its war on drugs involvement in Columbia to actually include active counter -- counter-insurgency operations. In effect operate openly and aligning themselves with the Columbian military to fight any kind of resistance or opposition.

It doesn't have to do with the drug war anymore. It's just fighting opposition, meaning obviously some of the rebel groups in Columbia, but even further, it's quite likely to have a big impact on indigenous peoples because the American administration openly said we want to put more money into defending the oil pipelines that we have in Columbia. Now a number of indigenous groups in the Amazon basin are seeing the writing on the wall.

In fact, they just met in January. There was a large gathering of some -- I read somewhere 300 to 400 groups sent representatives of indigenous groups from the Amazon basin to Peru for a meeting or to Ecuador for a meeting where they called for the demilitarization of the Amazon Basin, meaning from Brazil to Venezuela to Columbia to Ecuador to Peru because what they see with what's happening in Columbia is a further militarization of that region. And that region has incredible mineral resources and incredible oil resources that the governments in all of those countries are desperate to exploit.

MR. MARTINEZ: Timber, too.

DR. NIVA: And timber as well. So what they see is this obvious connection between this excuse of sort of cracking down counter-insurgency war on terrorism and the direct attempt to extract more of the resources from those lands, which will directly, and already has been for some time, negatively impact indigenous people from pollution, from, you know, the gold mining or the oil drilling to the dislocation and dispossession of tribal territories, to all kinds of other negative consequences of disease and other things that we're seeing. They're already seeing this connection. They're already making this connection. I think -- I think that's an area that all of us should be looking at is what's happening in the Amazon basin.

MR. MARTINEZ: George Bush, whom I never voted for, not that I could even if I wanted to, I'm not an American citizen. Anyway, George Bush set the tone when he said, you know, almost like a Pope, that according to the bible, the Christian bible, he who is not with me is against me or with us is against us.

Less than two weeks ago President Arroyo of the Philippines followed suit. As I said earlier, there is popular support for American troops in the Philippines as long as they behave, but there is a large seminar there, close to 40 percent, that either opposes their presence

or has raised very serious questions about American intentions. Responding to this non-unanimity, our president goes on national television and says, "Anyone who disagrees with the American/Filipino military exercises against terrorism is not a Filipino," quote/unquote. What does that make me?

It's this demonization. There is this -- this -- it's so easy to demonize the enemy because very often when nations-states, and governments and dictators, leaders whether of free republics or captive nations speaking for so-called people demonizes the enemy and personify the enemy, the first thing that that does, it makes them blameless. The victim becomes blameless, and the victim is now authorized to use all means possible and all means necessary to rectify the injustice and to pay for the injury.

I might want to say a footnote here. There is a general in movies, the Clint Eastwood type, you know, that kind of mentality where if one perceives an injustice and the injustice is real, and if one perceives the regular mode of providing a remedy for that injustice doesn't appear to work like a corrupt police department, that allows John Wayne and Charles Bronson and Clint Eastwood to do their thing. That's what George Bush is doing now.

But that's not the tragedy. The tragedy is that

presidents like Arroyo in the Philippines, to some extent the leader in Pakistan, Indonesia's leadership --

DR. NIVA: Sharon in Israel.

MR. MARTINEZ: Israel. Well, Israel would have done it with or without the American support. They're very happy with the American authority. It validates everything they want to do. Are all either taking advantage of this policy, or -- well, they are. That's exactly what they're doing. There are too many Clint Eastwoods out there and too many of the people who are going to suffer will not have a voice.

One last thing Rudy, very quickly... there is -- I'd like to mention the element of religion here because what it has done in the Philippines -- that's the only county I can speak with some authority. I'm not Muslim, but I know what's happening. After 9/11, the Muslims, in Manila, by and large, when they would apply for work, used Christian names. Muslim women standing on the sidewalks removed their veils, otherwise "jeepneythe" drivers, you know, transportation drivers won't stop for them.

There is a wave of anti-Muslim feeling. Why? Because the government and the media have conspired -- I don't know willfully or not. They have conspired to throw this blanket of blame over everyone who is of the Islamic faith, and I find that extremely sad. As Steve

was saying earlier, innocents are being punished for the crimes of a few, for the misdeeds of a few. The only thing that can do is to breed more contempt. The only result that this can have is to create more future terrorists.

## **What do you advise the leaders of indigenous nations and leaders of states' governments?**

MR. RYSER: We have just a few minutes, and I have one final question for you: What would you advise the leaders of indigenous nations and what would you advise the leaders of the states' governments principally, the United States, Britain, France, those that are in the alliance? How would you advise them to proceed from now on?

David Price?

MR. PRICE: Oh, boy. Well, I guess I'd start with what I would if -- how I would advise the United States, or you know, First World -- so-called First World leaders on what to do, I would advise them that whatever their next move is, it should not be a military move. Right now where we're sitting today it's a very frightening place. President Bush in the last few days has made known his new nuclear policy, and it's not one that makes the world a safer place. It involves, you know, multiple uses of atomic weapons in different

places.

I think what needs to be done is that the United States needs to stop and take stock on where it is, how it got to where it is, and look on ways to work towards peace rather than deciding you can bomb people into submission or bomb people into seeing their side.

MR. RYSER: What would you advise indigenous nations' people?

MR. PRICE: Run for cover.

MR. RYSER: Steve?

DR. NIVA: On the latter question, certainly right now it's a very difficult time to take up an overt opposition given what we've been describing as a clear pattern of using the rubric of the war on terrorism to include any kind of dissent but especially overt and especially armed dissent. It seems to me right at this moment as -- to put it another way, run for cover or. Clearly now is the time not to be engaged in that kind of -- that kind of overt dissent and that kind of involvement.

I think -- I do believe, however, that the majority of people in the world, if not a great number of people in the west, if not a great number of people in the United States, which is, I think, we are misled by these opinion poles showing this unanimous support for the president. I think if you scratch it, it starts to break

apart when you start asking very particular questions. I think there's a significant body of opinion that has great concerns about this particular approach to terrorism, this blanketing of any dissent as terrorism, this emphasis solely on military actions, this blatant unilateralism, which ignores international law and international forums to solve its problems.

And so my advice particularly to native people and indigenous groups would be to try and find ways of working for that international solidarity from -- not only from other groups facing similar circumstances but also from -- from the places in the world that could have an impact on changing those policies. I think -- I think we shouldn't deceive ourselves by accepting that -- that the power being sort of waved in front of us is monolithic and unquestionable. I don't think that's true. So I think we really need to maximize international solidarity and especially call for international law, the rule of international law and multilateralism at this time.

MR. RYSER: David Martinez?

MR. MARTINEZ: I would ask the nations of the world to do only one thing. I would say to them, "You're already bleeding. You've been bleeding for a very, very long time. Do it publicly. Bring journalists in, bring the media in, bring CNN, bring any one who has

a little instamatic or video camera, anything, photographs, stories, let the world -- keep telling the world this is how you live your lives., You know, defending yourselves from corporations, the owners you've never seen and will never see, the ruling elites who are in a tight embrace with foreign partners, military, paramilitary, countries, places where a knock on the door means you don't ever see your sons or your daughters again. Let the world see more and more of this because the world is a conscience. There is hope for this world."

When the whole world wept when Akino died, the Filipino martyr, when the whole world wept when the Kennedys were killed, when the whole world cheered during the fall of the Berlin Wall, it showed that there is -- there is a universal impulse for fraternity, justice, and brotherhood. This world is not beyond hope. That's my message to the indigenous people.

To the western world lead by America -- I say this to America because America speaks for -- leads the world. The America that the Third World respects and adores and admires is no longer here because of this -- it is the American of Tom Paine, the America of Jefferson and Adams. That's the America we love. A country struggling to be free -- a country that believes in civil liberties and national sovereignty. A country that hated tyranny.

What do we see instead? We see -- speaking for my people -- an expansionist America of Kennedy and Roosevelt. We see the interventionist America of the Vietnam War. We see the corporate America that is gobbling up our farmlands and our timberlands. The only way for terrorism to be addressed in the long run is for western civilizations and countries like the United States to return to their true political faith. And what is that? It's simple. That men and nations as well are created equal.

## **Audience questions.**

MR. RYSER: Thank you very much.

And now, if you have some questions in the audience, I'd be happy to receive those. If you can collect them quickly, we will then read any questions that you have. We have some time now to do that. I hope you have put some questions together, and I hope you've enjoyed this presentation up to now. If you hand me those questions, that will help me begin. Oh, one of the things I wanted you to do and you've all done it nicely so far is write really clearly. Let's see.

This is -- is there any correlation between indigenous peoples being labeled as terrorist and scarce resources?

MR. PRICE: Yes.

MR. RYSER: All right.

MR. PRICE: You know, it is no accident that the battlegrounds that we're -- we're looking at in the next year or so are areas where there are a multitude of very important resources. Afghanistan, of course, not being an exception with UNICAL, and opium, which is an amazing lucrative resource that's being grown there, once again, now that the Taliban is gone, that's the most important thing that's happened economically is that opium poppies will be coming up, and we can all start getting lots of heroin again.

But yeah, you can't talk about U.S. interests abroad without talking about resources and certainly that's been an on-going problem of indigenous people in this country and other countries around the world.

MR. RYSER: Any other comments?

Okay. I want to thank Martha Henderson for that question. And then I have here from Brent Krump ( How will the war on terror affect the legitimate actions of US and indigenous groups when they disagree with the current administration? Any comments? Observations?

MR. PRICE: How about you, Rudy?

MR. RYSER: I do have one. I think it is very unlikely that indigenous peoples in the United States will say anything. As has been the practice historically, American Indians have chosen not to

intervene in such discussions because they choose not to be criticized for yet another thing that they might be demonized for. And so I think the chances are very slim that any indigenous nation in the United States will criticize these policies even if they disagreed with them. Now, that doesn't mean some individual leaders might not make a comment here and there, but for the most part, such comments will not occur.

The question here is how does the US -- I'm sorry -- the U.N. figure in?

MR. MARTINEZ: The United Nations?

MR. RYSER: The United Nations, how does it figure into this discussion?

MR. MARTINEZ: I'll take a shot at that. All we have to do really is look at how the United States reacts every time the United Nations does anything. When the U.N. does something the Americans -- the American government likes, look at their reaction: This is forum for democracy. Right? A brotherhood of nations, the expression of the popular will of mankind. Oh, wonderful words, rhetorical words. But when the United Nations doesn't -- does something that the United States disagrees with, what is it? It's an organization hijacked by third -world despots. I mean these are quotes.

The U.N. has a role to play. It is often a

painful, long process before anything could ever get resolved in the U.N., but if you're talking about, what, 190, 170 -odd independent countries, it's always a long and painful process, but sometimes that is the only price we need to pay for harmony in this world.

If you look at the history of civilization, eastern, western, the story of man, how long did it take before we created mechanisms for resolving conflict? We must learn to be patient, and the only way to do that is to work within the framework of the United Nations to the extent possible. The idea of the United States telling the world, "If you're with us, fine. If not, we'll go to NATO. If NATO isn't with us, we'll go to NAFTA. If NAFTA isn't with us, we'll do it alone." It doesn't ring -- it doesn't resonate well with people who are --who feel powerless.

DR. NIVA: I think the United Nations -- in addition, I think the United Nations could play an important role in a couple of areas. Could play, it's not right now, but it could play. I think it could play a very important role in this issue of terrorism in that the United Nations, particularly through the setting up of something like an international criminal court, which has been discussed for some time, could be a forum where people who engage in acts of violence, of massive violence against civilian populations, whether they be

states or non-state actors, could be brought to justice.

In a way I think that would be legitimate in the eyes of the international community.

Unfortunately the United States' response to September 11th is not by and large legitimate in the eyes of international community because it was seen as a unilateral action with some possible ulterior motives. I think bringing the U.N. into it will give legitimacy to tracking down and hunting people who give these kinds - who do these kinds of criminal and outrageous kinds of acts, and it could also bring sort of people together to actually find these people.

Secondly, I think the United Nations could play a very important role for indigenous peoples. There's a draft declaration for the rights of indigenous peoples. It's been in circulation since roughly 1993, '94, and this could be an invaluable document for helping indigenous peoples get international support and legitimacy for their struggles for self-determination, cultural survival, et cetera. It could be a really important document that I think could rank along side the existing human rights documents, which have increasingly, I think, become very important in the international community.

MR. RYSER: I want to thank you all very much for your questions and for your answers. This was a

stimulating discussion. Your answers were a spot on, and I hope all of you have enjoyed them and found them useful and informative. This is the end of our program, and I want to thank you all. And that is all the time we have for this edition of the Fourth World Dialog. Until next time, thank you and good-bye.

Program end.....

