

CHAPTER 2

A Just War Versus Just War

Hard Power, Soft Power and Stupid Power

Never, never, never believe any war will be smooth and easy, or that anyone who embarks on the strange voyage can measure the tides and hurricanes he will encounter. The statesman who yields to war fever must realize that once the signal is given, he is no longer the master of policy but the slave of unforeseeable and uncontrollable events.

—Winston Churchill (1874-1965).

The concept of a *just war* is intended to place moral restraints on warfare. Developed in the West over many centuries it sets criteria for *whether* and *how* warfare should be conducted. It is based in religion, politics, and the experience of countless human conflicts. There are certainly many situations in which a war is both justified and moral.

Whether a proposed war is a *just war* depends upon whether it meets *all* of the *just war* principles set forth in international law regarding armed conflict, including the Geneva Conventions.¹⁰ These general principles include:

- legitimate authority,
- just cause,
- right intention,
- last resort,
- reasonable chance for success, and
- proportionality.

In addition to determining *whether* a proposed war is a just war, the general principles also determine *how* a just war must be waged. These additional principles include *noncombatant immunity* and *proportionate means*.

Reasonable people may disagree in a particular case how the above principles should be applied. However, even the most casual observer would conclude that Bush's war in Iraq failed the test in not only one way—which would be enough to flunk it—but in multiple ways, namely it failed to meet *any* of the five following

¹⁰ If the United States is contemplating warfare, the proposed war must also meet principles set forth in American military doctrine. Bush also ignored this.

general principles: legitimate authority; just cause; right intention; last resort; and proportionality.

Assuming for the sake of argument that Bush even considered the principles of a just war before attacking Iraq, which appears unlikely, it is possible that his brain simply *misunderstood* them—thinking that the goal was “just war,” not “a just war.” That would explain a lot.

The Five Pillars of a Strong Coalition

Under the *general principles* (set forth above) for determining whether a proposed war is a *just war*, there is no requirement that a nation assemble a coalition, although even cavemen understood the benefits of united effort. A nation may act unilaterally if all the general principles are met. Of course, common sense and other considerations come into play. These include treaty obligations, organizations such as NATO and the United Nations, other commitments and obligations under international law, and an astute sense of military conflict and geopolitics.

In most major conflicts—especially culturally complex conflicts such as the Iraq war—a strong diverse coalition is a common sense necessity. However, the Bush neocons had no desire or need—or so they thought—for a coalition of any kind. As imperialists who knew what they wanted, the Bush neocons saw an effective coalition for Iraq as a distraction that would only complicate unilateral action and lead to unnecessary sharing of glory and plunder. So why did the Bush regime assemble the Bush League of Nations? It did so because it needed propaganda to sell the Iraq war to America.

Assuming that a coalition is appropriate in the particular case, proposed here are five essential pillars of a *strong* coalition:

1. A Just War—The proposed war must meet all *just war* principles set forth in international law regarding armed conflict, including the Geneva Conventions. As set forth in the previous section, these include: *legitimate authority*, *just cause*, *right intention*, *last resort*, *reasonable chance for success*, and *proportionality*. Each and every member of the coalition should independently determine on the merits that the proposed conflict is a just war, without reference to unrelated matters, such as threats, or payments or other benefits received or promised, from other coalition members.

2. Clear Goals—Clear goals are the *raison d'être* of the coalition and must be precisely stated with sufficient detail: (1) to permit meaningful analysis, discussion, and agreement among the coalition members, (2) to permit the development of detailed plans to achieve the goals, and (3) to allow the coalition members to later determine unequivocally whether or not the goals have been met. The goals must not be so general—say, for example, “to promote peace”—that they provide little basis for meaningful guidance, planning and agreement.

3. Trustworthy Leadership—The chosen leaders of the coalition must be trustworthy and widely viewed as such. It is especially problematic if coalition leaders or coalition member nations have, or are believed to have, an agenda different from the stated goals of the coalition.

4. A Sensible Plan—A detailed plan must be developed and agreed upon, based on the best available information and analysis, including respect for divergent views. It must include sufficient resources to ensure winning the war, as well as winning the peace that follows the war, and it must include a clear exit or endpoint, together with a timeline. The informed consent of the citizens of each coalition nation should be obtained in some meaningful direct or indirect fashion.

5. Excellent Execution—The sensible plan must be properly executed, with a clear chain of command, and with a process for making necessary adjustments along the way.

The requirement of a just war is included as the first of these five essential pillars because it is the starting point and the most important point. If the Bush administration had allowed—or better yet, led—a national discussion of the application of just war principles to the proposed Iraq war, the war would not have occurred, and America and its allies and friends would have been miles ahead in the so-called war on terrorism. Regarding a possible war in Iraq, a strong coalition would have developed a plan of action to accomplish desired goals through strong peaceful steps, with the possibility of war only as a last resort, and only if *all* of the *just war general principles* were first met, which they never were.

Incredibly, even after more than four years of war in Iraq, the Bush regime and its GOP enablers had not established a single one of the five essential pillars of a strong successful coalition.

The mere process of considering the five pillars of a strong coalition would have led to better decisions and better plans regarding Iraq. However, Bush and Cheney were driven by the neocon *groupthink*. Already knowing the “answer,” they had no need for the hard work of analysis and critical thinking. They saw no need for a plan to win the peace. They did not earn their pay. They were guilty of dereliction of duty. They were guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors.

Their hardcore true believers described them as *strong*, but the right word is *stupid*, which brings us to the next section.

Hard Power and Soft Power—plus Smart Power and Stupid Power

Joseph Nye, the dean of Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, wrote a book that should be required reading for Bush and the neocons: *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. *Hard power* is using military power and economic power to achieve desired results. *Soft power* is using various measures short of military power—such as economic assistance, diplomacy, cultural exchanges, and other forms of international persuasion—to achieve desired ends. Nye describes soft power as the “ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion.”

Nye believes that, ideally, neither hard power nor soft power should be used exclusively. Rather, it is usually best to combine the two—what Nye calls *smart power*. During the several decades of the Cold War, the United States led by several presidents, both Democratic and Republican, used a mixture of hard power and soft power—primarily the hard power of military *deterrence* (vs. its actual use) combined

with the soft power of broad international cooperation and pressure—to help speed the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Although Nye doesn't use this term or have an additional category, it is apparent that Bush and the GOP have created a *fourth* category—*stupid power*—which we define here as “using either hard power or soft power in an incompetent, ideological, faith-based, non-analytical fashion, especially where military decisions are made by civilian bureaucrats without active military experience who intentionally ignore professional military advice.”

Bush and his neocons use hard power in a knee-jerk fashion, without understanding its limits. They do not understand, and choose to ignore, the benefits of soft power, thereby undercutting America's hard power and gutting America's capacity to lead a cooperative international effort against terrorism. Nye believes the United States must not proceed unilaterally but must return to the hard and soft power blend that was the foundation of the U.S.-led Western alliance that prevailed in the Cold War.

If fewer than 50 criminals carried out a 9/11-type slaughter, what would be the sense of America declaring war on Islam? If Canada attacked America, what would be the sense of the United States bombing Argentina or Venezuela? Well, perhaps we shouldn't use Venezuela in this example—since Bush might just take that opportunity to invade Venezuela, given that America's rightwing neocons and oil companies hated the results of Venezuela's presidential recall referendum in August 2004, overwhelmingly won by Hugo Chavez, Venezuela's democratically elected president whom the Bush neocons had previously tried to depose.¹¹

SIDEBAR: A Key Question

Why do bystanders in Iraq—average Mohammeds—cheer the attacks on American forces and the killing of American soldiers? That is a question Bush doesn't like to think about.

In Bush's simple black-and-white fantasy world, we got rid of Saddam, and therefore all Iraqis should love us. Bush cannot grasp a simple reality—that Iraqis who are grateful that American troops deposed Saddam are entitled to be violently opposed to the occupation of Iraq by American forces.

The Bush regime and its GOP supporters apparently believe that self-appointed vigilantes who catch the murderous thug in your neighborhood are justified in moving in with your family, eating the best food off your table, and joining your wife and daughters in bed.

Then, of course, there's Iraq's oil, which *virtually all* Iraqis believe, for some crazy reason, had something to do with Bush's decision to invade.

¹¹ Chavez's subsequent reelection as Venezuela's president was fueled in part by the Bush administration's clumsy anti-democratic posturing regarding Chavez and Venezuela.

If the situation were reversed, and foreign soldiers—say, Islamic troops who didn't speak English—occupied North Dakota or Massachusetts, the good patriotic citizens of those great states would take up arms and fight to kick them out. On the other hand, pseudo-cowboy rightwing Texans like Bush and Cheney would recognize the quisling, crony-capitalism opportunities in collaborating with the enemy—and cozily do business with them, just as they already do with the princely Saudis and a host of other rightwing dictators. Bush and Cheney certainly wouldn't sign up for any combat duty, nor would any of their offspring.

The Bush neocons are virtually clueless in determining whether we are winning or losing the war on terrorism, perhaps in part because they spend most of their time trying to put the right political spin on their accomplishments or, more accurately, lack thereof. One of the numerous Bush fantasy spinners is former Attorney General John Ashcroft, who resigned on November 9, 2004. In his resignation letter to Bush, Ashcroft stated, "The objective of securing the safety of Americans from crime and terror has been achieved."

In April 2004 the U.S. State Department issued its annual counter-terrorism report, "Patterns of Global Terrorism," which stated that terrorist attacks in 2003 had declined to 190, the lowest level reported in 34 years, and a 45% reduction from Bush's first year as president (2001). The Bush administration triumphantly claimed the report showed their policies were working. Deputy Secretary Richard Armitage said, "Indeed, you will find in these pages clear evidence that we are prevailing in the fight." Another State Department official predicted that the trend would continue.

But, oops! The 2003 report was very wrong. On June 10, 2004—after *outsiders* had questioned the data—the State Department acknowledged it had made a mistake in reporting a drop in terrorism and that, in fact, both the number of terrorist attacks and the number of victims had *increased sharply* in 2003. However, don't hold your breath waiting for the Bush administration to correct its prior statement and say, "You will find in these pages clear evidence that we are *not* prevailing in the fight."

The Bush administration believes that bombing is the first and only medicine in addressing terrorism or fabricated terrorism, so long as we are doing the bombing. This faith-based belief is similar to their belief that America can simply drill its way out of its energy problems, which we will discuss later.

There is a role for smart bombs, but smart bombs become dumb bombs when dropped by dumb leaders who make dumb decisions.

Al Qaeda and other evolving terrorist groups have changed their tactics and are now less susceptible to attack and eradication by military power alone. More effective are the cooperative proactive efforts by intelligence agencies and police around the world, coupled with the cooperation of the vast majority of the citizens of the world. Unilateral military efforts by an isolated, go-it-alone America have failed, and they will continue to fail.

The willing cooperation of as many people as possible in our joint anti-terror efforts will help us understand the whats, whys and hows of terrorism. Many plots are uncovered and foiled thanks to an unexpected tip from someone who has stumbled

upon relevant information, disagrees with the terrorist agenda, and believes that America and its allies are on a higher moral ground. Therefore a key priority is for America to act in such a way that it truly deserves the willing support of the world. In this regard, Bush has utterly failed America and its soldiers.

SIDEBAR: San Jose Mercury News, Letter to the Editor, September 10, 2003, “Millions for peace, billions on Iraq”

“Seventy-five billion dollars is a conservative estimate of our projected 2004 military expenditures for Iraq. This is based on current spending levels as well as the figures presented by President Bush in his address to the nation, and it excludes additional tens of billions for reconstruction, support of coalition partners, and other costs.

“On the other hand, the U.S. Peace Corps’ annual budget for 2003 is only \$295 million, notwithstanding bipartisan congressional support and increased funding.

“In other words, we spend more for 35 hours of our military occupation of Iraq than we do for the worldwide operations of the Peace Corps for an entire year.

“Although I want to believe that all of our military efforts are intended to promote peace, we do sometimes err in pulling the war lever, with tragic unintended consequences.

“The people of the world, especially Americans, reap huge peace dividends from the work of the Peace Corps. The peace dividends from our military campaign in Iraq are dubious at best.”

—Jim Swanson

The Bush neocons have been staggered by reality in Iraq. Their struggle to even find words to explain the resulting mess is palpable. Rumsfeld, for example, in discussing the so-called war on terrorism at a security conference in June 2004, said, “It’s quite clear to me that we do not have a coherent approach to this.” He acknowledged that America might not be winning the war on terror. He didn’t know if terrorists were being trained at a faster rate than we can kill or capture them, and noted: “How many more of those folks are being trained and developed and organized and deployed and sent out to work the seams and the shadows and the caves?”

Sadly, the Bush regime has aggravated and complicated the threat by midwifing countless terrorist snakes, each like Hydra, the nine-headed snake in Greek mythology, and there is no one snake—say bin Laden or a bin Laden wannabe—who controls all heads of all Hydras. Yes, it will be a great joy to see bin Laden dead—an important job that must be done, a job that Bush botched—but at this sad point in history it won’t make much difference.

The United States and the world are paying dearly for the real-world education of the amateur Bush neocons. Never have *Diplomacy 101* and *War Strategy and Tactics 101* courses been so expensive, and never have the students been so ill prepared and resistant to learning. How do you teach “Diplomacy 101 for Dummies” and “War

Strategy and Tactics 101 for Dummies” to blockhead students who already have their faith-based answers before they even understand the questions?

Over a period of several months in 2006 Jeff Stein, National Security Editor for the *Congressional Quarterly* and frequent contributor to *The New York Times*, conducted lengthy interviews with counterterrorism experts in Washington, as well as with several U.S. Congressmen having oversight responsibilities regarding terrorism and America’s spy agencies. The fundamental question he raised was, “Do you know the difference between a Sunni and a Shiite?” The appalling results were that many of America’s experts and oversight congressmen don’t even know the basics, such as, for example, whether Iran is predominantly Sunni or Shiite. Stein sums it up in his October 17, 2006, piece in *The New York Times*: “But so far, most American officials I’ve interviewed don’t have a clue. That includes not just intelligence and law enforcement officials, but also members of Congress who have important roles overseeing our spy agencies. How can they do their jobs without knowing the basics?”

SIDEBAR: Just a Deck of Cards

Do you remember all the fun the Bush chickenhawks had with that famous deck of 52 playing cards, with Saddam as the ace of spades, and so forth? It was exhilarating! America just had to capture or kill the 52 thugs, and the job would be done—*mission accomplished*. We just had to shred that deck. It was a tidy and simple solution for the gullible.

This all made perfect sense to the armchair civilian Bush neocons, who ignored professional military and diplomatic advice in pursuing their warmongering fantasies. But they neo-conned themselves and the American people. They lied, and countless hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children died.

By misplaying the hand—by cheating—Bush continues to create countless new decks of militants, who—unlike those in the Saddam Deck—are a real and present danger to America and the world. The new decks should be called *Bush Terrorist Decks*. They were created because Bush dealt from the bottom of the deck. What card is Bush? He’s the joker, of course, the deadly joker.

When an American soldier dies in Iraq, one might ask: Did the killer come from a brand-new Bush Terrorist Deck that did *not* even exist before Bush started dealing from the bottom of the deck? The answer in each case is almost certain to be “yes.”

It is not surprising that the Bush neocons and America’s rightwing media no longer talk about the original Saddam Deck of Cards, given that Bush’s Iraq plans collapsed like a house of cards.

When adversaries stand up and go head to head with the United States military in conventional open field combat, they die. The kill ratios favor America by a large margin, as they should, and most of the enemy die without knowing what hit them. Without sensing the immediate threat, they are breathing one second and dead the next.

Like British King George III's experience during the American Revolutionary War, the enemy's evolving military tactics in Iraq surprised America's King George III and his cocooned advisors. Britain's King George III expected America's progressive revolutionary patriots from Massachusetts to "fight like men" in open-field battle in fixed formations, while wearing brightly colored uniforms with a big "X" on each. That was the conventional warfare style of that era.

Likewise, the unconventional tactics used by insurgents in Iraq shocked our King George III and his neocons. Ignoring America's best military minds and a host of other dissenting voices, the Bush neocons instead put on their own special fantasy eye glasses, which caused them to conclude wrongly that the Iraq war would be a short war won by the massive use of *shock-and-awe* power. Because such explosive action is the type of warfare that dominates television coverage—and bearing in mind that television coverage was the closest *any* of the Bush neocons had ever come to actual warfare—perhaps America should forgive them for their myopic views. Or not.

Definitely not. High crimes and misdemeanors by warmongers must not be forgotten or forgiven.

Sadly, in addition to eschewing soft power, the Bush neocons had a limited and warped view of how the use of hard power would play out. They chose to ignore the realities of other forms of hard power such as guerilla warfare, improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other roadside bombs, kidnappings, assassinations, improved IEDs, beheadings, booby traps, sabotage, even more improved IEDs, and so forth. They chose to ignore the tremendous uncertainties and unintended consequences that are inherently part of the "fog of war."

Unfortunately, the unprecedented damage caused by the Bush regime's addiction to "stupid power" is not limited to Afghanistan and Iraq. A fool on Monday is a fool on Friday. A fool with head lice carries the lice wherever he meanders.

In the next section we consider the Bush regime's failed nuclear weapons policies.

Bush League Nuclear Weapons Policies: An Exercise in Stupid Power

Unlike the risk of Saddam's WMDs, which existed only in the propaganda used to sell Bush's war on Iraq, the risk of nuclear weapons being used against America and its friends *is* real, and America's allies are rightly dismayed by Bush's failure of leadership in this arena.

A single nuclear explosion in an American city would be catastrophic in terms of lives lost and lives shattered, and it would change America forever. It would also severely impact America's civil liberties, likely causing even more damage to the Constitution than that inflicted by the Bush regime during its GOP Reign of Error.

Bush's efforts have been a combination of insufficient—in failing to safeguard and reduce the stockpiles of existing nuclear weapons and materials—and counter-productive—in implementing Bush League policies that encourage, rather than prevent, the proliferation and use of nuclear weapons.

One necessary first step is for America to aggressively support and fully fund the joint Russian/American program to reduce Russia's stockpiles of nuclear weapons and to prevent them from getting into terrorist hands.

SIDEBAR: Safeguarding Nuclear Materials

The Iraq war diverted attention from a hugely important national and world security concern, namely the identification and safeguarding of dangerous nuclear materials at hundreds of sites around the world. Researchers at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government reported that less potential nuclear bomb material was safeguarded during the two years after September 11 than in the two years before. They note that the safeguarding would be progressing much more quickly if only *one-tenth* of the cost of just the *first year* of the Iraq war were devoted to securing nuclear material around the world.

The 2001 Baker-Cutler Commission estimated that a total of \$30 billion spent over ten years would pay for the destruction of most of the loose lethal nuclear materials, as well as the secure containment of the rest. Effective programs exist to accomplish this, but they must be funded. Thirty billion dollars is an enormous sum of money, but it is less than 3% of the projected direct cost of Bush's war on Iraq.

Thanks to a Bush administration that is widely seen as imperialistic and hostile to Islam, the risk of a nuclear bomb exploding in a western city has greatly increased. In advance, let's name it the "Bush Bomb."

It is at least one thousand times more likely that a nuclear bomb will be delivered via a container ship or truck into an American city than by a long-range missile. Yet, Bush and the GOP continue to push the fantasy of a Star Wars nuclear shield for ideological reasons, while hundreds of ships arrive each week in America without inspection, and while Bush drags his feet on the program to safeguard nuclear materials.

In the so-called war on terrorism, which side are Bush and the GOP really on?

America's allies and friends want America to stop developing "better" nuclear weapons, as there is no such thing. Proliferator Bush rants against the evils of WMDs, while he pushes dangerous programs to create new ones.

America must immediately abandon the expensive rightwing boondoggle and fantasy know as Star Wars, which, in addition to not working, encourages America's potential enemies to respond by developing and deploying more nuclear weapons.

Many current and potential rogue nations want nuclear weapons and other WMDs precisely because they have seen Bush in action and heard his threats.

SIDEBAR: What Was He Thinking?

“See, free nations are peaceful nations. Free nations don’t attack each other. Free nations don’t develop weapons of mass destruction.”

—George W. Bush

When Bush uttered these words in Milwaukee on October 3, 2003, what was he *really* thinking? Perhaps he was thinking his statements did not apply to America because America was no longer a “free nation.” Or was he thinking that America is *the exceptional nation*—just like himself, above the law, a rogue, and an outlaw. Or is it possible he had consumed one too many Milwaukee brews that morning and wasn’t thinking at all?

Bush is America’s problem in a nutshell. America needs to devote more resources to building and sustaining *nuclear families* throughout the world, and less on nuclear bombs. America needs a better balance between guns and butter. But anyone who advocates even a modest shift away from GWB—“guns, warmongering and bombs”—gets a bullet in the heart from America’s rightwing propaganda machine.

Recommendations regarding America’s nuclear policies are set forth in *Beyond Iraq and Afghanistan—A 7-Point International Plan* in Chapter 19 of this book.

Guns Versus Butter:**First in Guns ...**

There is an enormous *guns-versus-butter* imbalance in America’s foreign policy, one consequence of which is a simple rightwing recipe for war that might be called “Wrong Wicked Warmongering.” Here’s that simple recipe for war:

Start with 400 parts *guns* and 1 part *butter*¹² ... stir in GOP foreign policy incompetence ... cook and sugarcoat ... serve hot ... and surprise! ... you get *WAR*.

America’s total military spending is more than the combined total of the next 14 most militarized nations, at least 10 of which are either NATO allies or close friends of America. America’s military spending is more than 45% of the world’s total. It is more than six times the military spending of either Russia or China.

America is by far the world’s No. 1 arms dealer, providing almost half of the weapons sold to militaries and militias in the developing world. There is probably more public debate about America’s international sale of cigarettes—another deadly market in which America is number one—than about America’s arms sales. The vast majority of these arms sales is handled routinely by large corporations with virtually

¹² Joseph Nye, author of *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, noted that America spends only about one billion dollars annually on public diplomacy, meaning that we spend about 400 times as much delivering bombs through the Department of Defense budget than we spend delivering ideas through diplomacy.

no fanfare or public debate, much like other commercial transactions. After all, business is business. So-called capitalism is America's God and is not to be questioned.

Principal beneficiaries of America's 400-to-1 imbalance in guns-versus-butter include numerous corrupt governments and ruthless dictators. The principal losers are the least, the last, and the lost of the world. All Americans should be ashamed, especially the leadership of the Southern Baptists in America. In many civil wars and other bloody conflicts, both sides use American weaponry. This includes even Iraq, where Iraqis trained by Americans are using American weapons to kill Americans, as well as countless thousands of Iraqi civilians.

SIDEBAR: Bloody Irony: Telling Questions Never Asked

How many American casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq have been inflicted by bullets, explosives and other weaponry manufactured in the United States by American workers or elsewhere under the direction of America's defense industry? How many such casualties have been inflicted by armaments manufactured by America's allies? GOP leaders do not even want to think about—or you to think about—the answers to these embarrassing moral questions.

Although no American leader plans for Americans to be killed by American weaponry, the law of unintended consequences does apply, and this law extracts an especially enormous cost when American foreign policy is myopic, faith-based, unilateral and militaristic. “Those who live by the sword die by the sword.” Or perhaps more accurately in these Bush League times, “Those nations that live by the sword cause lots of innocent people to die by the sword, including their own finest.”

According to a U.S. Defense Department report for fiscal year 2003, America has over 700 military bases outside the United States in 130 countries. This does not include secret torture facilities run by foreign governments and contractors for the Bush regime's gulag. In comparison, America's emerging principal rival, the communist People's Republic of China, has no bases outside its borders. Even the three *evil* nations included in Bush's nonsensical moniker, the *Axis of Evil*—North Korea, Iran and Iraq—have *zero* military bases outside their own borders.

America's huge military footprint in the Islamic world was not established with the intent of jeopardizing America's strategic interests, but that has sadly occurred because of weak leadership in the Bush White House and GOP Congress. Now is the time to greatly reduce America's military presence in the Middle East. Iraq especially needs more butter and fewer guns.

A better balance between guns and butter would help America fight more effectively the fewer wars it would need to fight.

... and Last in Butter

According to a 2005 report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 852 million people are chronically hungry, an increase of 10 million

from the previous year. These people cannot find adequate nutritious food for their families and themselves and are undernourished. Their hand-to-mouth struggle to find enough food is a daily one, and many starve to death. More than 16,000 children die *each day* from hunger-related causes.

More than one billion of God's 6.5 billion people earn less than \$1 per day, the international poverty line, and more than 3 billion people, about half of the Earth's population, earn less than \$2 per day.

America must return to leading international efforts to focus on *the least, the last, and the lost* throughout the world. The industrialized nations—except for the United States—eagerly seek a united effort to reduce world poverty and starvation by half within two decades, but the Bush administration became obstructionist and went AWOL.

By invading Iraq, Bush greatly reduced America's capability and desire to address more urgent problems afflicting Christ's people—"the least, the last, and the lost"—around the world. These problems include starvation, rampant disease, wars, genocide, the growing gap between first and third world nations, and the growing gap between the haves and the have-nots in third world nations.

Bush's efforts on behalf of the world's poor are dwarfed by his efforts to help America's Super Rich. He delivers far more sound bites than commitments to the world's poor, and he later substantially shortchanges his meager commitments to them. On the other hand, Bush "religiously" gives record pork, record tax cuts, and record corporate welfare to America's Milking Class, which he affectionately refers to as his "base." Jesus weeps.

Massive government subsidies for agriculture in America and Europe greatly damage subsistence farmers in the third world, causing many to fall below the "survival line." America's agricultural subsidies are not designed for America's working farmers, but are designed as corporate welfare for huge agribusiness companies and wealthy people who often do not even live on their land.

Even using hyped White House figures intended to buff Bush's "compassion," the total worldwide cost of all his efforts to help Christ's most needy is only a tiny fraction of what he wastes on his war on Iraq. Christ's forgotten people need bread, but Bush delivers bombs.

Tragically, America is the leader—without followers—in the Bush League War on Iraq, when America could have been *the* leader—with a world of followers—in efforts to save the helpless and forgotten.

America must engage the world community in nation building, with justice and freedom for all the citizens of each nation, not just the freedom of ruling elites and international corporations to have their way.

America can and should use its soldiers to wage peace. When called on to participate in humanitarian efforts, America's soldiers perform heroically and magnificently. In this role, America's "soldiers for peace" are America's best ambassadors and truly America's finest. Few doubt their intentions and cost effectiveness, in sharp contrast to the performance of public trough companies like Halliburton. America's troops bring credibility and accountability, not cronyism and corruption. Deploying thousands more specially-trained National Guard and active-duty troops after the December 2004 tsunami in the Indian Ocean, and in Pakistan and Kashmir

after the devastating October 2005 earthquakes, would have advanced world peace, in addition to promoting America's own self interests.

The United States must use consistent verifiable metrics to measure the amount of non-military humanitarian assistance it provides to the rest of the world. It must track its effectiveness, make process improvements, and publish the results—the good along with the bad. The assistance should not be provided unless the host nation allows the United States to implement accounting and anti-fraud systems at least as rigorous as the United States uses at home.

One central pillar of the Bush administration's "success" is misinformation. According to one poll, Americans think the United States spends 24% of its national budget on assistance for poor countries! This is almost *100 times* the meager *one-fourth of one percent* that the United States actually spends, which is the *lowest percentage* among major industrialized nations.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of America's assistance is typically reduced by misguided political considerations, inadequate oversight and corruption. Too often the assistance comes with strings attached that effectively funnel money back to favored rightwing corporations in the United States.

The same *public-trough* principle holds true in a war setting. If American assistance to Iraq is viewed as a gold mining operation, then Halliburton gets the gold, and the Iraqi people get the shaft.

In the next chapter, we turn our attention to the "almost forgotten war" in Afghanistan, that center stage in the war on terrorism that Bush and his GOP "Mission Accomplished" catastrophically turned into another "Mission Not Accomplished."