

A couple of days ago, I did not have an idea of what unilateral or multilateral meant. Today, I still truly do not, but at least after some research I have a better picture. It seemed that the United States did not have too much positive information to go on. I found story after story about America should do this and America should do that. America seems to have tons of negative publicity but, I don't live in the world of should and ought. It is not reality itself, it is a small view on how someone thinks it should be. So trying to not be too negative and just throwing more fuel on the fire, I am just going to put information on the table like Noam Chomski. He really does not choose sides or offer solutions that is why he can speak so long.

On September 23, 2003, Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary General, opened a general debate with an address to diplomats, heads of state, and governments from around the world. "Will nations act together, working through the UN in a multilateral approach, or will they arrogate to themselves the authority to act militarily to solve their own and the world's problems unilaterally?" (P1) He was concerned that if it is not adopted, it could set precedents that a unilateral and lawless use of force, with or without justification. Kofi Annan did not mention the United States by name but his suggestion that the United States taking a unilateral path was clear. Speaker after speaker spoke to the assembly on the virtues of multilateral approach, over the unilateral approach. Only the United States proclaimed the unilateral approach as virtuous.

So obviously unilateral must mean, I am going to do what I want no matter what anyone else wants – no matter the consequences. Multilateral must mean it is a collective view that we all must agree on before we do something really stupid. So for those of us who look to the bigger picture of a better world, not just a better America, we'll probably need to go multilateral. There are also a couple of things that will have to be arranged. The first is the elimination of the veto, a privilege only granted to the permanent members: United Kingdom, France, United States, Russia and China. The idea any single country can veto a Security Council is undemocratic and unjust. It could be replaced by a requirement that all Security Council resolutions pass by a two-thirds majority. The General Assembly should always be able to override the Security Council. We should also expand the permanent members from Asia, Africa and new European members. We add the world's largest democracy, India, to the list. To tell you the truth, we should probably eliminate permanent members altogether. Why not face everyone to reelections every four years? If you weren't a good boy, Santa is not going to stop by and drop the presents! In general, you have to reform the United

Nations to make it more democratic and representative to ensure that powerful nations can not impose their will on weaker nations. Solon of Athens once wrote, “ The law is like a spider web. The small are caught and the great tear it up.” (P18)

Is there a new world order or disorder? Truth is there is both, relatively, unilateralism has sparked disorder. Also, there is not longer the two big powers, the USSR and the United States threatening each other. So we think over the past fifty years there has been a Cold War or no World War, but for the last fifty years on a world scale we have only had seventeen days of peace. (P2) There was always a war going on in some part of the world, mainly colonial. The liberation wars in Kenya, Algeria, Angola, Mozambique and others. Great powers using proxies like the Korean and Viet Nam War and later we had Nicaragua, Afghanistan, the Gulf War and Kosovo. Why has there been so much disorder? The nature of war has changed. “ The bourgeoisie does not wage war for fun, or patriotism, or to save the poor Kosovos or to save little Belgium or anything of that character. They wage war for profits , for markets, for raw materials and for spheres of influence.” (P34) They do not wage war to exterminate people. That is not the point of imperialist wars. The purpose of capitalist wars is to capture markets so complete destruction makes absolutely no sense from a capitalist viewpoint. The positive side is they just want your stuff, hopefully, not too many will get killed, where, someone like Hitler was doing it for an idea and he'll take everyone with him who does not buy into that idea.

I have some large, beautiful fish tanks. One day my wife said, “ Boy, that one fish is picking on everyone.” “I said, Yes but he isn't really that bad.” She complained some more about him until I finally took him out and brought him back to the store. After he was gone, the next fish in line, who became boss, was ten times worst than the last guy. So, from now on, if things aren't that bad, and my top fish gets pushy to keep everyone in lineso be it, as long as he doesn't start killing off others. I think it is the same with the world – everyone has to keep in line. I think it is not too bad having America as the big fish, but we should have the United Nations as the multilateral “big fish”.

For myself, I know there is always going to be another big fish, so I do not worry about it.