Daddy, loves Mummy.
He kicks her, punches her, shouts nasty words and makes her cry.
And Daddy loves me.
He burns me, slaps me, locks me in a cupboard and calls me a failure.
I hate love.
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No doubt we did find a very challenging theme for our first thematic issue for 2013. Challenging in just too many levels. First of all we decided after a conversation with the Ovi writers’ team to focus in ‘Nationalism’ this time. And then it was something I’ve been thinking for long time; that eight years after its birth, the thematic issues of the Ovi magazine needed some kind of renewal in every single level.

With the magazines and the newspapers entering a new era where their print form gradually retreating and the same time more and more of the traditional magazines entering the only internet era - latest example the long lived and popular Newsweek – we felt that it was time for Ovi magazine to upgrade, evolve.

And in a very twisted way it is partly because of the popularity and visitation. In Ovi magazine we are very proud for our diversity, for our freedom of speech and expression. We pride our democratic attitude and tolerance and we think that we are adding something in the global democratic development. The same time all these eight years but especially the last two we have been awarded with an amazing and constant increase of readership. So we should firstly give something more to our readership regarding both quality and quantity and the same time reach more people.

Please don’t misunderstand me; Ovi is a non profit publication and everybody contributes from writing, drawing even helping with the actual technical part voluntarily. There is absolutely no profit here. But we have a message and a battle to give, especially during our times turbulent with a variety of issues from political to financial or even existential. And Ovi since its foundations was created out of frustration and need for expression.

The Ovi magazine, the Ovi thematic issue and the Ovi special issues are something unique in the world of the eZines trying to combine traditional magazine print forms with the endless possibilities internet gives. And we should try to make the best of it.

Like everything else in Ovi magazine there is a constant evolution, we try to correct, change, adapt if necessary; always inside the red lines we have mark ourselves. Tolerance, democracy, freedom of speech, respect, anti-racism, anti-fascism.

And since I talked about our red lines time to return to the theme of this issue. Nationalism. And I must admit that in the beginning except the challenging of the issue I felt a certain enthusiasm seeing in it a good chance to exhibit all the above. Then questions started. So what is nationalism and how you identify nationalism. As oppose to patriotism or as a partner to fascism? Hitler was a nationalist; he actually flagged the word as the essence of his philosophy. But Stalin and Mao were also nationalists in their own very unique and twisted way.

What about Argentina’s Peron? And why the most nationalist elements of the British populist spectrum admire Margaret Thatcher? Was Yasser Arafat a nationalist or a liberator patriot and then what does that makes the Iranian mullahs and the Afgani Taliban? And the same time the Lapi people, the indigenous that live in a non existent situation between Russia, Finland and Sweden they also talk about the nation and need for national unity. Again the words “nation,” “nationalism” jump here and there always with different meanings and approaches.

Semantics you might say. I absolutely agree. It is about semantics but how far semantics can excuse a holocaust in the name of nationalism? Now we are all more confused since we are talking theoretically about something that has cost millions of lives.

In this thematic issue of the Ovi magazine we are not giving answers about “nationalism.” We simply express opinions. We also start a dialogue with only aim to understand better. That’s why we invite everybody to participate and you can do that in our magazine. You can do it commenting or sending your own opinion/essay/article and we promise to publish it.

Ovi magazine with the 24th thematic issue, welcomes you to a new era and effect. A big thank you to all the contributors of the Ovi magazine for their daily participation to the big or small battles we give, a big thank you to the Ovi friends and a huge thank you to all the Ovi readers from all of us.

We sincerely hope that you will enjoy this issues of the Ovi thematic magazine

Thanos Kalamidas

“How far semantics can excuse a holocaust in the name of nationalism?”
The term “nationalism” is generally used to describe two phenomena: (1) the attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their national identity, and (2) the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve (or sustain) self-determination. (1) raises questions about the concept of a nation (or national identity), which is often defined in terms of common origin, ethnicity, or cultural ties, and while an individual’s membership in a nation is often regarded as involuntary, it is sometimes regarded as voluntary. (2) raises questions about whether self-determination must be understood as involving having full statehood with complete authority over domestic and international affairs, or whether something less is required.

Nationalism has long been ignored as a topic in political philosophy, written off as a relic from bygone times. It came into the focus of philosophical debate in the nineties, partly in consequence of problems, having to do with the treatment of ethnic and cultural differences within democratic polities, which are arguably among the most pressing problems of contemporary political theory.

In recent years the focus of the debate about nationalism has shifted towards issues in international justice, probably in response to changes in the international scene: bloody nationalist wars such as those in the former Yugoslavia have become less conspicuous, whereas the issues of terrorism, of the “clash of civilizations” and of hegemony in the international order have come to occupy public attention. One important link with earlier debates is provided by the contrast between views of international justice based on the predominance of sovereign nation-states and more cosmopolitan views that either insist upon limiting national sovereignty, or even envisage its disappearance. Another new focus for philosophers is provided by issues of territory and territorial rights, which connect the topic of nation-states (or, “the nation state”) with questions like boundaries, migrations, resource rights and vital ecological matters.

http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nationalism/

Nationalism, ideology based on the premise that the individual’s loyalty and devotion to the nation-state surpass other individual or group interests. Nationalism is a modern movement. Throughout history people have been attached to their native soil, to the traditions of their parents, and to established territorial authorities; but it was not until the end of the 18th century that nationalism began to be a generally recognized sentiment molding public and private life and one of the great, if not the greatest, single determining factors of modern history.

http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/405644/nationalism

Nationalism is a political ideology that involves a strong identification of a group of individuals with a nation. There are two major perspectives on the origins and basis of nationalism, one is the primordialist perspective that describes nationalism as a reflection of the ancient and perceived evolutionary tendency of humans to organize into distinct groups based on an affinity of birth; the other is the modernist perspective that describes nationalism as a recent phenomenon that requires the structural conditions of modern society, in order to exist. There are various definitions for what constitutes a nation, however, which leads to different strands of nationalism. It can be a belief that citizenship in a state should be limited to one ethnic, cultural, religious, or identity group, or that multinationality in a single state should necessarily comprise the right to express and exercise national identity even by minorities.

The adoption of national identity in terms of historical development, has commonly been the result of a response by an influential group or groups that is unsatisfied with traditional identities due to inconsistency between their defined social order and the experience of that social order by its members, resulting in a situation of anomie that nationalists seek to resolve. This anomie results in a society or societies reinterpreting identity, retaining elements that are deemed acceptable and removing elements deemed unacceptable, in order to create a unified community. This development may be the result of internal structural issues or the result of resentment by an existing group or groups towards other communities, especially foreign powers that are or are deemed to be controlling them.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nationalism

There are four core debates which permeate the study of nations and nationalism. First among these is the question of how to define the terms “nation” and “nationalism.” Second, scholars argue about when nations first appeared. Academics have suggested a variety of time frames, including (but not limited to) the following:

Nationalists argue that nations are timeless phenomena. When man climbed out of the primordial slime, he immediately set about creating nations.

The next major school of thought is that of the perennialists who argue that nations have been around for a very long time, though they take different shapes at different points in history.

While postmodernists and Marxists also play in the larger debates surrounding this topic, the modernization school is perhaps the most prevalent scholarly argument at the moment. These scholars see nations as entirely modern and constructed.

It should not be surprising that the third major debate centers on how nations and nationalism developed. If nations are naturally occurring, then there is little reason to explain the birth of nations. On the other hand, if one sees nations as constructed, then it is important to be able to explain why and how nations developed. Finally, many of the original “classic” texts on nationalism have focused on European nationalism at the expense of non-Western experiences. This has sparked a debate about whether nationalism developed on its own in places like China, or whether it merely spread to non-Western countries from Europe.

http://www.nationalismproject.org/what.htm
The theme of nationalism which Ovi’s contributors have been asked to address, has consumed rivers of ink. It is a veritable challenge to even attempt to condense it in a few hundred words but, for whatever their worth, here are a few synthesizing thoughts. They have appeared in greater detail in two books I have published lately. One appeared in Ovi’s bookshop as an e-book titled *Europe beyond the Euro*, and the other is titled *Europa: an Idea and a Journey*. The interested reader may wish to peruse them for a more thorough treatment of this thorny issue.

Let me begin with a sharp distinction between nationalism interpreted as patriotism, as loyalty to one’s country and respectful of the patriotism of others for their country, and blind destructive nationalism, characterized by an overzealous almost fanatical regard for one’s country alleged superiority and a misguided dishonorable disregard for others’ countries often considered inferior and resulting in innumerable wars. Even a cursory look at European history will confirm this statement.

When nationalism is positive and constructive it calls the individual to self-sacrifice, puts loyalty high on its scale of values, it is proud of the national language, the native soil, the history and culture of the nation and the right of self-governance and determination. This is patriotism in tandem with nationalism. When nationalism is negative however it becomes exaggerated and blind to the fault of one’s nation; it turns into a destructive force leading to attempts by one nation to dominate other nations. Perhaps the best example of this kind of xenophobic destructive nationalism bent only on mere military glory and prowess is Nazi Germany, a nationalism gone crazy. More than patriotism we ought to call this kind of negative nationalism chauvinism and xenophobia. It declares “my country right or wrong.” To use a metaphor, if my mother happens to be a drunk, the best way to help her is to first acknowledge the truth that she is a drunk and then try to help her, while continuing to love her even as a drunk. The chauvinist instead proclaims “my mother, drunk or sober.” This is an important distinction often overlooked by those historians and scholars who collapse the word patriotism into nationalism.

A common language is very important but does not necessarily result in instant nationalism. In Italy, the modern European nation I am most familiar with, there was a common literary language in place since the 13th century, as exemplified in Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, Petrarch’s *Canzoniere* and Boccaccio’s *Decamerone*. Politically, however, we need to wait six more centuries (1860) for Italian national unification to become a reality. I shall return to this theme of nationalism vis a vis universalism further down in the essay.

To better discern the above mentioned distinction we need to go back to ancient Greece where there was indeed a common language and culture and yet they were not able by themselves to overcome centrifugal political forces and unify the city states into one country. There was however patriotism best exhibited by Leonidas’ small force of 300 Spartans confronting the invading oriental Persian “barbarians” at Thermopylae in 480 B.C. Those Spartans were sacrificing themselves for a common Greek culture, a culture spread for a short while all the way to India by Alexander the Great. So, paradoxically, the universalism of an empire succeeded where nationalism as we know it failed. In the Roman Empire too we see an empire with Latin as a lingua franca, as a unifying principle beyond military might. That empire lasted a bit longer, some two thousand years if we include the Byzantine empire which is a continuation of the Roman empire.
When we come to the Middle Ages, after the fall of the Roman Empire, another intriguing thing happens. National languages (French, English, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German) begin to sprout but it is the Catholic Church and Latin that were the unifying cultural factor to the whole continent of Europe. Without understanding the simple historical fact that Christianity which continues to supply the unifying cultural factor to the whole continent of Europe. That a form of effete cultural showmanship and not allegiance to France.

Napoleon provides the illusion of a unification of Europe but what he provided was really French imperialism with a national foundation. In America a common English does not prevent the colonists from declaring independence from its European colonizing nation and proclaiming their own independent country. Later on, the French and American revolutions advance the idea, popularized by Rousseau’s “Social Contract” and flourishing in the 19th and 20th century, that the nation rather than the province was the basis of political organization.

In the 19th century, to men like Mazzini, Garibaldi, Verdi (see his opera Nabucco), nationalism was an ideal worth striving for and even dying for. In mid 19th century both Italy and Germany become unified countries politically, but culturally they both possessed a viable and vibrant culture centuries before. The number of sovereign nations in Europe reached 24 in 1924.

There is no doubt that nationalism played a major role in World War I. Those were the chickens coming home to roost given that the Congress of Vienna of 1815, after the demise of Napoleon, paid little attention to nationalistic aspirations in its division of European territories. Nationalism was certainly in the mind of Woodrow Wilson when he declared at the Treaty of Versailles the principle of self-determination. What you ultimately had there were for multinational empires limited by the boundaries of their predominant

nationality: Austria-Hungary, the German Empire, the Ottoman empire and the Russian empire. Certain historic states simply disappeared from the map while Czechoslovakia, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania appeared suddenly and out of nowhere on the map of Europe.

After World War II nationalism spreads to Arab countries, India, the Far East, Africa below the Sahara, on the dovetail of European imperialism. As the UN exemplifies the world is now made up of hundred of nations despite the predictions of nationalism’s disappearance after the second World War. Nationalism in fact goes viral and produces after World War I tyrants such as Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Franco and Salazar, Mao, Castro, Amin; they all considered themselves super-patriots. The schizophrenia on the part of Mussolini is almost comical. On one hand he fancied himself a Roman Emperor out to restore the ancient glory of the Romans and establish Italian hegemony in the Mediterranean; on the other hand he was, monkey-like, imitating all the worst features of a narrow negative kind of European nationalism, colonialism and all, as evidenced in the most powerful European nations. Had he remembered the true glory of the Roman Empire and the Italian Renaissance and the Catholic Church he would have known that the core of that glory was not narrow nationalism but universality. Those were all universal movements to which Italy had become accustomed, thus rendering rabid nationalism a straight jacket of sort.

The question thus arises: has this gift of nationalism on the part of Europe to the rest of the world
been a positive or negative one? Hard to answer such a question in the light of what we have just explored above. What remains paradoxical in all this is that Europe now claims to have abandoned nationalism forever for a sort of unifying federalism called the EU. Some no longer speak of the European Union but of the United States of Europe where nations govern themselves internally but contribute to a unified political goal and a common cultural identity and in the ideal spirit of solidarity and brotherhood, equality and liberty. But is this a reality as we speak? What about the rabid regionalism of an Umberto Bossi out to declare independence from Italy. Is that universalism or parochialism of the worst kind?

Were not égalité, fraternité, liberté also the ideals of the French revolution? When things were going well economically, this seemed indeed to be the case in the EU. Now that hard financial times are upon us in the West as a whole, words like solidarity seem to have suddenly disappeared from the vocabulary. What one hears is the cold utilitarian language of the bureaucrat, the banker and the venture capitalist devoid of humanistic criteria, euphemistically characterizing his capitalistic activity, based on social Darwinism, as entrepreneurship, abysmally ignorant of the genuine heritage of European civilization. Which leads one to suspect that once again, just as with Italian unification, the cart has been put before the horse and the European cultural identity remains elusive at best. Indeed, we live in a Brave New World.
often get very embarrassed by the rise of nationalism in my home country, Greece. Somehow, a bunch of misguided airheads and the youths that fell for their doctrine of hatred believe that they are true Greeks and they represent Hellenism or protect it from the “corrosion” of immigration.

I feel so ashamed that the Greek nation became synonymous with xenophobia, neo-Nazism and far-right nationalism. In a country that suffered so much by the Nazi occupation and that had experienced mass emigration to Europe, the Americas and Australia, to have now groups of skinheads beating up any immigrant they find is disappointing.

How can they ever call upon the ancient Greek ancestors of theirs, to justify their brutality and ignorance? If they had ever read the speech of Alexander the Great at Opis, where he famously claimed that he does not classify people according their decadence or race but their virtue, I wonder why then they think they honour his memory by beating immigrants.

Have they ever understood the teachings of many ancient Greek philosophers, especially of the Stoic movement and those of Zeno of Citium? They promoted cosmopolitanism and believed that all people are manifestations of the one universal spirit and should live in brotherly love and readily help one another.

So if the Greek mind has in the past given birth to those ideas, how on Earth their descendants believe that with their actions are protecting and promoting Hellenism and “Greekness?” Yes, Greece has an immigration problem that must be solved soon. And indeed people are angry and rightly so, because they were let down by their politicians. But why is that the immigrant communities are used as scapegoats for all the country’s difficulties?

I am also a proud Greek and a bit of a nationalist. I love my country and I want it to shine, to be prosperous and its people to have the same living standards as any other country in Europe. I also want to promote and preserve our culture and heritage, while making Greece an example for other countries to aspire and follow.

Now how can we achieve all the above if we want to close the borders, deport all immigrants and allow such groups like the Golden Dawn to exist? What is the example we give to the rest of the world? Where is the preservation of the Greek culture that these brutes are claiming they are promoting?

Yes Greece right now has too many immigrants and cannot cope with the crisis, the unemployment, the economic collapse and the immigration issue. But that is not a reason for violence or hatred; it is a reason for better and more functioning immigration and integration policies. Why hasn’t the Greek state promoted those, while it relies on those bullies to offer a solution to the problem by promoting a fizzling of the public’s anger?

This can have disastrous consequences for the social order in the future, as well for the country’s reputation in the world; funny how the supporters of the Golden Dawn think that this is what the country needs right now.

When trying to compare Greece with the country I live Ireland, one can draw interesting conclusions. Not that there are not any racism incidents here. But Ireland has managed to attract a right mix of immigrants that come both from poorer developing countries and richer, developed ones. In that way Ireland has managed to benefit more than Greece from its immigrant population.

Socially Ireland changed drastically and it all comes down to one factor: the Irish came in contact with other cultures, either by travelling or by interacting with them at home. When the Irish became wealthier, they started travelling a lot and that was a positive factor.
At home too, many students or immigrants from the rest of Europe, USA, Japan, Australia, Canada and many other developed countries arrived, bringing new ideas and way of thinking with them.

In that aspect Greece is lacking behind. My wish is to create an open country, modern, cosmopolitan and wealthier, both in an economic level but also in a cultural. If we manage to attract the right workers with the right skills and do not use them only as workers and exploit them, but also integrate them totally in our society, the ones who will be benefiting in the long term will be ourselves.

If we become a cosmopolitan society, groups like the Golden Dawn won’t be able to thrive. The old established elites, either the religious or political ones, won’t be able to manipulate or blind us with their outdated ideologies, holding us ransom to achieve their goals and promote their interests. We won’t fall as easy for their propaganda.

And there will be economic benefits as well. When a lot of these immigrants eventually return home, provided of course they have a positive experience in our country, they will form strong links with Greece that will ease trade and cultural exchanges. They will become what most of the Greek Diaspora have become: ambassadors of Greece in far and away places. If we beat them up and abuse them of course, that will never happen.

Yes there are challenges to face with immigration and we should learn some lessons of the failures of many other European countries like Britain, France and Germany in integrating their immigrant population. Most of them still have problems. But we should normally have the advantage to learn from their mistakes. Do we have this ability; are we mature enough or we get what we deserve in the end?

Greece is lacking behind for the exact reasons that we have made no effort in benefiting whatsoever from the presence of foreign nationals in our country, apart from exploiting them. And we have made no effort in attracting the right skilful workers, or students from other countries and enrich our culture with theirs and through their active participation in Greek social and political happenings.

And the more we become xenophobic, the more we ruin any chance of ever achieving change and progress in our country. Now I love Greece and I want change and progress. I do not think that these “nationalists” have Greece’s best interests in mind. If fact I am more of a patriot than they are, and I want quite the opposite of what they do. Time to rethink as a nation our priorities I guess!
1. Nationalism is a concept that, within proper limits, is true, but outside those limits, untrue, and the source of half the world’s conflicts.

2. Nationalism reduces the citizen to his or her natural characteristics, and looks inward.

3. Nationalism is, like most religions, apt to get out of hand, overstep its own boundaries and ruin its own proper community.

4. In the current system of nation-states, Nationalism tends to small-mindedness and prejudice.

5. On the other side, Nationalism is unavoidable, since pride in one’s “people” is natural and inevitable.

6. The conclusion is that Nationalism can never be overcome completely, for it is part of the human condition.

Nationalism is such a large topic, such a vague topic, and so dependent upon events that I must limit myself in this essay to a few fundamentals.

The word “nation” derives from the Latin verb nascor, natus, whose first meaning is “to be born” or “to be begotten”. One does not come into this world without belonging to the group that engendered you. In her book, The Human Condition (Vita Activa), Hannah Arendt tells us all this at greater length.

Nationalism is ineradicable, because one belongs to a group of humans of the same nationality, without choosing it or applying for it. Everyone in the world is a member of some group that is consanguineous. One can also belong to groups that are said to be consanguineous, but are really socially constructed. Since the true blood relation is much more common, it usually is functionally much more emotionally powerful than other social relations.

But, in addition to being ineluctable, being a member of a nation is incoherent if one’s folk is part of a larger political group, because others have their own folkways. In preliterate societies folkways are all-important, because the ways of the folk exist in the hearts and minds of the currently living members of the group. This tends to make them relatively unable to be absorbed into larger groups. With modernity there is a much greater possibility of assimilation when the folkways have been nominalized, and persecution is not widespread.

One’s birth status is all important only when there is no more inclusive groups that rivals it. And there are many of such competing groups. Some are: universal religions; imperialism; defeat in war; success in war; and political assimilation.

In what follows I shall consider two dimensions of Nationalism, from the bottom, so to speak, and from the top.

The first is the pure case of nationalism, in which a defined and small group of people decided to live alone among themselves, and eschew relations with outsiders to the extent this is possible.

Such an attitude, best stated in the words “Shinn Fein,” “ourselves alone,” in the Irish tongue, which betrays an attitude of mistrust of foreigners of all descriptions. The only likely candidates for such an attitude are island dwellers, perhaps mountain folk, and sometimes areas of the world where no one desires to visit.

The first topic I will address will be the problem of the pure case of nationalism, which are commonly small nations and isolated nations, and typically, island nations.

The list of such nations is not long, and many of them are island nations, but some are just on the fringes of continents and not particularly far out of the reach of strangers. Certain examples are not true examples, such as Tasmania, which belongs to Australia, and Greenland, which has no permanent population and, in any case, belongs to Denmark.
Let me list a few of the island nations. Vanuatu, located near Hawaii; San Tomé and Principe, located very near Nigeria; the Falkland Islands, very far south along the coast of southern Argentina, with a population under 3,000; the Andaman Islands; the Maldives; the Seychelles; and Malta and Iceland.

Small nations that are performe very nationalistic are, among others, all the Scandinavian nations. Micro states include Vatican City; San Marino; Liechtenstein and Monaco. This is not a complete list, nor is it meant to be.

What I mean to convey is the following: all micro states are subject to pressure from large states, and many must, in order to forestall invasion, cooperate with the larger nation. I shall mention two cases, that of San Tomé and that of Finland.

At the time when amazingly large deposits of the purest oil were discovered in Nigeria, some few decades ago, it was also found in the waters off San Tomé and Principe. Now, Nigeria is the most populous nation in Africa, with over 100 million residents. The two islands have a sparse population and thus the per capita worth of their oil reserves are worth many many times what Nigeria's population would receive. The only way to forestall a takeover of their state was to cooperate with its enormous neighbor, since Nigeria had the power to take over the islands without difficulty. So they agreed to split the proceeds with their much larger neighbor, in an exercise of practical wisdom.

Finland's case is even better known. In 1940, with war in the air, Stalin demanded the right to build a vast naval station on Finland, across the Bay of Finland. The Finns refused, citing national sovereignty, but it availed little, since the USSR was so much larger a nation-state. The Finns resisted doubtfully, but the Soviets won the war and got their naval station.

In fact, if Stalin had not decapitated the officer corps of the Soviet Army in the years before this invasion, the war would have probably gone better for the Russians.

A similar example could be the wars that the USA waged against Mexico, the result of which was not only the expansion to the Pacific all Americans thought was their right, but also a great boon to the slaveocracy of the Southern states.

The lesson taught here is that microstates must hew to a narrower standard of freedom, since the larger states could, if they wished, conquer them. Therefore the phrase that claims that we are "ourselves alone" is not literally true for microstates under most conditions.

For the balance of this essay I will confine myself to the relations between dynastic Empires of the modern age in Europe and their subject populations and to the break up of Empires in the 20th century, and the self-determination of formerly subject populations, such as the "devolution" now practiced in Scotland, still nominally a member of the British Empire, but, so far as the average citizen experiences it, a free nation in all domestic affairs.

Let me begin with one example: what actually took place in France between the years between 1789 and 1815.

Having been for a long time the most powerful state in Europe under powerful monarchs, revolutionary France found itself breaking out of traditional boundaries and at war with all the other European powers, and, under the charismatic leadership of Napoleon this trend accelerated and soon, with wonderful celerity, invading and defeating state after state in a long series. One can say that France under Napoleon went from being a nationalist unit to an imperial one. It was Napoleon who overthrew the Directory (the last of the popular governments) and gathered all power to himself. He had an infinite lust for power, and imagined himself in a Roman toga, rival to the Caesars. Thus he was the primary imperialist of his age. But gradually, despite a long series of victories over German and Italian foes, he found that closure had eluded him. His final push, against Russia, proved his downfall, thus making of Russia a nationalist foe! The exercise was repeated in Spain. The pincer movement of England on the one side and Russia on the other led to Waterloo.

What this means is the impossibility of defining "nationalism" eo ipso. Events dictate these definitions, and there is no telling who will be the imperialist, who the nationalist, in the next phase of history.

It seems that there are three basic models of the relation between a national group that is not able to be assimilated by the dominant group of a nation state.

The first strategy is to claim that the newly conquered peoples will be made into citizens in every sense by the superior power. This was the French model of Imperial expansionism in North Africa. All the Arab schoolchildren are to be treated as though they were born in France itself. Provision was made after 1870 for representation of these newly-minted citizens in the national legislature, it was never a realistic solution for either party, despite some heroic efforts to make it happen. The real reason was that the nations were too much different to assent to assimilation in a foreign land with foreign ways very different from the subject nation's.

The Algerian men who fought in World War II were not likely to give up their idea that they had earned a right to self-determination, a common opinion in nations that had been subject to occupation by French. Moreover, in a moment resembling The Sicilian Vespers, atrocities broke out in Algiers and many surrounding towns, the Algerian population fell upon the pied noirs and cut their throats. Retaliation on the part of the pied noirs was more bloody, if anything, and no solution could ever be found to the dilemma this revealed, even though the governments in Paris tried out all kinds of tactics, from repression to accommodation, to verbal agreements that carried no power with them.
It is fair to say that if too much is expected in the way of assimilation, this is an ineffective formula for keeping the peace of Imperialism.

A second model of assimilation, if it is permissible to use that word, is the one practiced by the Austro-Hungarian Empire after the first World War. Having been reduced from the Holy Roman Empire to a state with two dominant groups, there was no other way to succeed in keeping it united than to give equal legislative power to both, with separate organs of government.

A similar idea was arrived at by the Bolshevik insurgents in Russia a little earlier. In a work written by Joseph Stalin at the request of Lenin, he outlined the proper relations between national groups that had long residencies in various regions of the far flung empire. National language, religion and customs were to be preserved, but as citizens the populations of these regions had to defer to the national government that would arise in all matters that transcended local interests, such as foreign policy and transregional projects, such as the roads and railroads. Later, after World War II, many nations in East Europe were subjected to a remaking of their governments along Stalinist lines. This certainly contradicted Stalin’s original, generous proposal of three decades before.

The experience of the Nazi invasion had shown that most non-Russians could not be trusted. The tide had turned against persuasion, both in the East and in the West.

It is not an afterthought, but Bolivar and others liberated all the nations of Latin America in imitation of both the American and French revolutions. It is sad to say it, but even to this day these nations are not true democracies, since the population lives under the rule of aristocrats who do not want to have more than a few trappings of democracy. After 1945, in the midst of the “Cold War” this lack of development was caused by the interference of the United States, and sometimes of Great Britain.

A third model is that of the United States of America, which has always been expansionist and assimilationist. In the beginning, the lands of the Americas were severely underpopulated, and immigration was encouraged by all the governments in the Americas. To be an “American” is to swear loyalty to a set of ideas, and one’s birth has nothing to do with it.

Another line of argument would contrast the kinds of empire that are built on a nationalist basis. It ranges from that of Napoleon, who found himself Emperor of a nation-state, and, since there was so little resistance from neighboring powers, he decided to become a new Caesar, and unify all of Europe.

A most brilliant military tactician, he won battle after battle, until he found himself in 1812 at Gibraltar in the south, with all Europe at his feet all the way to the borders of Russia. By this point his nationalism had transmuted itself into imperialism.

But the war was far from over. The English supported guerrilla warfare in Spain, and the Russians retreated further and further until he found himself in possession of Moscow by default. Here he stewed, for no plenipotentiary appeared to sign a treaty of surrender. The Russians knew their own country, and waited for General Winter to do his work.

Napoleon realized too late that he was caught in a trap, and in October he escaped by fast sleds all the way back to the Louvre, but his army, the greatest army in the world, more than 650,000 strong, with all the latest tactics and battle gear, was virtually eliminated in the snows of late 1812.

This sad end was condign, and by 1814 Napoleon had to surrender to his adversaries.

In 1815 the Congress of Vienna plotted the future of Europe, and it looked to be monarchist, reactionary, and counter-nationalist. Reaction was the order of the day, but revolutions in France in 1848 and 1870 heralded the fact that a modern nation had been built by Revolutionary France in the 1790’s.

France had gone from the most powerful state in Europe as a monarchy to a revolutionary democracy, built on Roman and Greek notions, to a settled nation-state with overseas possessions, and, after the Putsch that overthrew the Directory to an expansionist power, paying no attention to nationhood, to that of a great power, to defeat, all in a few years.

An opposite case is provided by the history of the United States of America. Beginning as an English colony on the Eastern shores of the continent, the lust for land caused all manner of men to move west, where land was for the taking. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had foreseen expansion, setting rules for the creation of local governments of the United States under specific conditions, and land sales made states like Ohio, Indiana and Illinois the first “breadbasket” of the new nation by 1820.

At this time the notion of “Manifest Destiny” took hold, meaning that the nation had a divine right to expand all the way to the Pacific Ocean. The Mexican War of 1845 was predicated on this belief, and all of the Southwest was ceded to the new nation. In “America” there has always been a very proud and nationalistic citizenry.

But after the 1820’s the nation turned sour, for the slaveocracy in the southern states believed (on the basis of the “labor theory of value”) that its economy was more efficient and productive than that of the Northern states. Since the Northerners also believed in the labor theory of value, they saw the new aggressive slaveowning class a distinct threat to them. Various compromises were worked out, but by the 1850’s open conflicts broke out. In the late 1850’s the Supreme Court declared that slavery could not be restricted in any way throughout the length and breadth of the land, and war was inevitable, inevitable because the small farmer, who constituted the majority of the population felt threatened for his family, whom he assumed would be driven to the level of the Negro slaves.

The war lasted exactly four years, and after 1865 the Southern regions were backwaters compared to most of the rest of the nation.
Soon the USA had become an imperialist nation in the common sense of the term. Alaska was purchased in 1867; Hawaii and the Philippines and Cuba and Puerto Rico were annexed as colonies in 1898, as the result of the war with Spain. Other possessions were picked up by the bye, such as the American Virgin Islands and American Samoa.

The Spanish colonies and nation-states began to call the USA “the Colossus of the North”. And it is obvious that the USA had become a world power by 1900.

Three chapters followed. Interventions in World War I and II, and, third, a long series of peripheral wars in many places on the globe, in order to “contain” regional powers that the US was hostile to, usually on an ideological basis. In all these endeavors the US was partly successful, and suffered little in comparison to the other nations in these conflicts.

What a lucky nation it is! A documentary film I saw some years ago contained the following scene. A French woman in her 40’s or 50’s speaks into the camera. She relates that under the German occupation from 1940 to 1944 the people of her town were universally miserable, and were treated very hostilely by the occupiers. Her mother consoled her with the thought, “don’t worry, the Americans will come and liberate us.” And it came true.

This is a remarkable fact. In both of the greatest wars in all history, the USA was not initially a party to the conflicts. While the other powers wore one another out, the Americans refused to enter the war, partly out of a sense of superiority and partly out of a strong legalistic bent. When they did enter these wars, the effect was to inject a vast new and fresh army into the conflict on one side, and tip the scales in their allies’ favor. Casualties were comparatively light.

In 1945 the USA strode the world, except where Stalin strode the world, and later where Mao Tse Tung strode the world. The Cold War that ensued caused a serious change in the nation’s psyche. Now it was the leading reactionary power, and all the many wars it engaged in soured many of the citizens, and corrupted the judgment of the military and political leaders. First it was Korea, then it was Vietnam, then on and on, until an entire apparatus of spying and manipulation dominated the many departments and agencies of foreign policy, always with the aim in view of manipulating the small developing nations to be agents of US desires, no matter how injurious to the ally. Usually the game is to aid and comfort every rich and reactionary elite in any given nation, no matter how unworthy of power the elite may be.

Even to this day there has been no end to this. Kissinger and Nixon murdered so many idealists that they actually ruined all the nations concerned. Everyone who was a reactionary, or a Fascist, could rely on support from these doctors of death. As a result the resurrection of aristocratic Fascism rose as from the dead in all the peripheral regions, from Greece to Argentina and Chile to parts of Yugoslavia and Iran. A very grim record indeed. And all of it justified by the slogan of “freedom”!

It is difficult to say which of these cases is the happier one. Nations sometimes grow into empires, and empires generally have devious and surreptitious means of control. The extent of the security bureaucracies commanded by the US government grows every ten years to greater and greater degrees, which also means to more and more absurd degrees. No babushka in Siberia can go out at dawn to milk her cow, that a satellite hovering overhead will record the fact, all in the pursuit of security for the dominant power in the world. No one could have predicted this paradox in previous generations: the world’s most secure power, whose ideology is “freedom” and nothing more, spends its substance anticipating every move of every suspected, possible, sub rosa, and fictitious enemy. Since none of these suspect states is comparable to the USA in power or wealth, it is not a mission worthy of a great power.
With structures that have accommodated masonic activities still standing today in major cities in the Western World, we are often reminded of the existence of a secret society that is believed to have controlled the political and financial events of modern history. A famous speech, delivered by President John F. Kennedy in 1961, underlining the dangerous power of such an active fraternity “in a free and open society,” confirms the evil nature of an “efficient machine” that is equipped with military, diplomatic, scientific, economic, and political enterprises and is supported by unelected, elite intellectuals and private financial bankers. In a time when the Federal Reserve, the central banking cartel owned by such wealthy bankers as the Rothschilds and Rockefellers, held a firm partnership with the American government to which it loaned large sums of money with interest, the concern of Kennedy evoked an older concern expressed by the papal authority during the Risorgimento period in Italy. As the former was left with the heavy burden of publicly informing his people of their eternal debt to an illegitimate enterprise, Pope Pius IX, whose “divine” order was threatened and eventually became disenfranchised by the masonic movement in revolutionary Italy, reacted with the same Kennedy urgency to the anti-clerical “propaganda” spreading like a forest fire in his time. If masonic activity was necessary to undermine the power of the papal state which was believed to hinder the process of unification in Italy is not a thesis that is easy to develop. The insufficient documentation that exists at our disposal limits our understanding of such concealed masonic encounters, marking a great disservice to the pursuit of truth. From what is available for public scrutiny no one can confirm with certainty that the Italian underground was solely based on a genuine patriotic desire to unite Italy. Declarations of the masons’ mysterious inclination toward Satanism and occultism render the society’s activities suspicious. Moreover, the involvement of united Italy’s official national poet, Giosue Carducci, in an established masonic allegiance, helped shape a new literary tradition, tainted by radical convictions. Providing a cultural and literary rhetoric for the secret society, the poem “Ode to Satan” is a perfect reflection of “New World Order” visions which were interpreted as being serious threats to the Old World Order. The pope’s reaction to the masonry, whose doctrine of NWO spirituality may have inspired the early poetic sensibility of Carducci, discloses the serious implication the clandestine operation was deemed to have had on a changing Italian society.

Today, with the benefit of hindsight, stating that a secret society composed of a tight group of the powerful gentry was responsible for world wars, political divisions, global Ponzi schemes, economic crashes, and 9/11, would not be considered as being highly speculative or unlikely. Even in risorgimentale Italy, Pope Pius IX, in an effort to preserve his absolute power, realized the harmful effects such a society would have on the supremacy and duration of his reign. Lilith Mahmud, a researcher published by the University of California, concedes that the practice of discretion was what made and what still makes the...
This brings a person to ask a million dollar question: Was the existence of secret societies necessary to build the nation-state of Italy? Discovering that an underground society, which deviates from the norms of the state and challenges decisions made by the current ruling command who hold the population in disregard, launches a concerted effort to oppose the unjust state of affairs may offer some relief to the oppressed. However, this coercive way to incite change in society or to develop a cultural identity may not be the right solution to existing or future political and social dilemmas. It would be a naïve oversimplification to assume that the secret society, under a mandate issued to itself, could singlehandedly protect the population from ambitious sovereigns of the state and the church. Questions regarding how they were funded and if their vision was in line with that of the majority of the population who were not members keep arising when discussing the “possible” legitimacy of the group. Citizens will not likely be patriotic toward a nation-state that is built on ideals and values that are not shared among and approved by the majority of its citizens. Since the majority of people are out of the exclusive circle of secrecy, it would be difficult for them to identify with and understand masonic practices, even if they were to be based on a patriotic agenda. By the mere principle of exclusion, a population is left in the dark regarding the fate of the territory that is shared. Apart from the reality of secrecy, what concerned the Vatican the most was that Satanism was openly and proudly practiced as a form of spirituality by Freemasons. Considering inhabitants of Italy believed in one Christian God throughout many centuries before the Risorgimento period, they would find it hard to digest that a crucial period in their cultural history, which had been largely shaped by Christian principles, was assembled together under a demoniac spell casted by freemasons.

According to Enrico Nassi’s book on freemasonry, they believed in ideologies and “rhetoric that kept people divided” (24). From the Pope’s perspective, Satanism was not a legitimate premise on which any society that wanted to penetrate the political, economic, and social systems should depend. However, for important intellectuals like Cavour, who was one of the main leaders of the Risorgimento movement, the strategic support from a secret lobby was not only deemed crucial to the success of the nationalists’ project, but was sought after so that it would be efficient and successful.

Militarily, while Giuseppe Garibaldi and his thousand men army established a revolutionary government in central and southern Italy at the beginning of the early 1860s and declared Victor Emmanuel as king of a united nation, Carducci was writing his blasphemous anti-clerical poem. As Garibaldi failed during many occasions to liberate Rome from the clutches of papal absolutism, which was preventing these regions from taking part in the unification, Carducci’s poem was published, first in 1865 and then in 1869. As the eternal city was only liberated when the French garrison pulled their defence of it to invest in France’s war against Prussia in 1870, giving Italians the chance to reclaim their city, Carducci was writing his first works during a time when republican, anti-clerical sentiment was high. Providing a cultural rhetoric to support and fuel a political agenda, Carducci first read the poem as a toast at a masonic dinner party. A resource concedes that even the most liberal of republicans seated among his masonic fellowship were uncomfortable with Carducci’s radical way of opposing the Pope. It is important to keep in mind that Satan was chosen by the poet to symbolize modern progress because of his intimidating, evil, and powerful status. As the clergy experiences great discomfort with any mention of Satan, trying throughout their holy lives to ward off his evil ways with exorcist oils, the poet calls upon the devil to challenge the old-fashioned mentality of retrogrades. Satan is a hero for modern Italy because he is not easily influenced or easy to control. He rebelled against the word of God as Lucifer and built his own dominion over which he rules as king. However, beyond his biblical role, Carducci gives Beelzebub a leading part in Italian history as he comes to represent sensuality, beauty, liberty, pleasure, joy, intellectual innovation, and technological progress. In addition, he symbolizes the qualities of fearlessness and ferocity that Italy should gain moving forward into the future. It should not regress with old traditions and papal absolutism, but should break free from the chains of limited thought. The symbol stands for liberty of thought and the poet’s radical way to impose it on a repressed population. Since the church was guilty of exporting propaganda and violence to the Americas and of oppressing its
followers throughout many centuries, any credibility it still may have had had finally been defeated by human reason. Incarnating Reason, Beelzebub leads the modern nation that was formerly plagued by the sentimentality and irrationality of the church. There is a certain vulgarity about Satan that serves as shock value, too. Clearly with the intention of instigating the Church into reacting to his poem, the poet refers to many intellectuals in the religious sphere who were considered heretics and were executed by the Church for following a rational pattern of thinking. Among these rebels, Martin Luther is listed, a historical figure whose doubts about the authenticity of the Catholic Church led him to found what is known today as the Protestant religion. The poem ends with the image of the steam engine, an invention of the devil, promising Italy prosperity, defeating the backwardness of the Church, carrying the united nation into the modern world, and leaving behind a trail of steam to cloud its Christian past so that it would fall into oblivion. Satan, the active rebel with his own personal agenda, was used as a tool to provoke conservative minds into thinking about Italy’s future in a modern world.

Could the legacy of Carducci have existed if he were not affiliated with masonry? Carducci himself found his alliance with masonry necessary to prove his love for his homeland, to push the nationalist agenda, and to undermine the power of the clergy. He was not discreet with his belief that the Christian establishment served as an obstacle for the consolidation of the divided Italian regions. If the question “Was it necessary for masonic society to exist in order to unite Italy?” was posed to him, Carducci would have probably responded “yes.” Carducci was initiated in the Loggia Galvani of Bologna and also became a member of Propaganda, another masonic lodge in Rome in 1886. However, Angelo Martelli’s book reveals that in many letters Carducci discloses his faith in the existence of God and that masonic membership did not demand an allegiance to the masonic association was a powerful force in Italian society. He addressed the evil powers that destroy the providence of the Church: “By the efforts of many, particularly those who hold power in Italy, the venerable commands of God and the sacred laws of the Church are completely despised.” He refers to those in power as “the rebels of God,” the men who walk in impiety and fight under the standard of Satan.” Defiling the word of God, they are compared to “ravenging wolves panting after their prey, they spill blood and destroy souls with their grievous scandal.” The Pope deemed the situation as threatening to the centralization of the Church: “They plan to raise the standard of lies in this beloved city of Ours, before the very Chair of Peter, the center of Catholic truth and unity.” A successor to Pope Pius IX, Pope Leon XIII also addressed and condemned masonry throughout his administration. He opposed credos and practices that were allegedly related to freemasonry such as naturalism and extreme secularism (a state that does recognize or is not modelled after God’s word), [2]

dated 1867, the Pope expressed his concerns for the rising anti-Christian sentiment, urging his fellow brothers “to grieve at the evil abominations which now defile unhappy Italy.” This stands as proof that the masonic association was a powerful force in Italian society. He addressed the evil powers that destroy the providence of the Church: “By the efforts of many, particularly those who hold power in Italy, the venerable commands of God and the sacred laws of the Church are completely despised.” He refers to those in power as “the rebels of God,” the men who walk in impiety and fight under the standard of Satan.” Defiling the word of God, they are compared to “ravenging wolves panting after their prey, they spill blood and destroy souls with their grievous scandal.” The Pope deemed the situation as threatening to the centralization of the Church: “They plan to raise the standard of lies in this beloved city of Ours, before the very Chair of Peter, the center of Catholic truth and unity.” A successor to Pope Pius IX, Pope Leon XIII also addressed and condemned masonry throughout his administration. He opposed credos and practices that were allegedly related to freemasonry such as naturalism and extreme secularism (a state that does recognize or is not modelled after God’s word), [2]
The expansion of the financial crisis in other European countries, apart from Greece, led to a social disruption, decline of living standards and poverty in most parts of the wider population.

But even in the cases where the crisis has not hit the door of parts of the European society yet, fear of expansion and, above all, fear of unemployment now permeates more and more European citizens.

Fear reinforced towards every foreigner/stranger that possibly can rob elements which currently help maintain the prosperity of the European citizens. And the dominant element in this fear is work. This is where xenophobia finds a comfortable ground. Foreigners, citizens of other countries, from Asia or Africa even from Europe, are increasingly flooding the EU member countries’ market seeking for work or taking the work from locals; volunteering to work with much lower wages.

This situation reinforces extreme nationalist tendencies and opinions on national purity, even though for long many felt that the fall of Nazism after WWII would lead to its elimination or at least to an easily controlled reduction, a microscopic minority in the political spectrum.

The revival of nationalistic tendencies is definitely not related to patriotism; the natural innate love for the country that pervades every healthy citizen of a nation/state, with common elements, history, language and culture. Obviously related with the fear of some foreigners coming to the fatherland with their presence deprive part of the welfare of the indigenous peoples.

You can sense the surreal of the situation while Greece syndromes xenophobia prevalent in much of the population and have even found political expression through fascist parties, the same time Greeks working in Germany alone in 2012 grew by 11%, taking apparently work from the respectively German citizens and strengthening the country’s xenophobia mainly based on job loss.

The expressers of this fear are trying to put under an ideological base on a different basis, beyond the old dividing lines between left, centre and right, but as the phobic feelings transcend ideologies and parties. Besides, the expressers of this new nationalism formed in Europe, know that healthy nationalism as a worldview rather than ideology and answers to existential questions not based in ideologies such as fascism, socialism or communism. Instead, ideologies exploited nationalism to consolidate. For the same reason the neo-nationalists today seek to exploit the inability of the European politicians to respond convincingly to the existential questions that European citizens asking regarding their future in the union.

The new nationalism which is shaped in Europe does not attempt, however, to answer the question of securing the future of its citizens with active policies but with defensive actions stockade citizens in their national shell while presenting simultaneously their political activity as an expression of patriotism.

There is, however, one key difference: Patriotism can help bridge different views for the sake of prosperity in the common homeland; contrary to nationalism which cannot accept compromises raising walls and divisions even between citizens of the same country, the same state, let alone among the European citizens.

To converge the concepts of nationalism and patriotism there is respect to national peculiarity, land and history of each nation so these elements can become a foundation to activate the forces of the people and a source to develop spiritual values, and always not at the expense of others. If i.e. patriotism is not degenerate into trading and expel imperialistic nationalism syndromes and despotic tendencies towards other people, there can be some kind of convergence.

However and depending on the era, the concept of nationalism takes different dimensions; nationalism can give a liberating aspect to the people (Greece 1821) or resistance to totalitarian systems (Yugoslavia - Greece 1940).
The pioneer of Socialism in Greece, Alexandros Papanastasiou (prime minister in 1924), considered nationalism as something pure, stressing that: “Nationalism is a form of manifestation national sentiment. And again has its roots in the sociological instinct becoming a superior manifestation of this.”

Ion Dragoumis, one of the greatest figures in the struggle for the liberation of Macedonia from the Turks and the Bulgarians; identified nationalistic activities with the active support of the homeland. “To live means log into my Nation. Affiliated with the Nation I’m becoming stronger, channeling all my strength there, that to the end,” he said.

Nowadays unfortunately the interpreters of the neo-nationalism do not gamble in activating patriotic forces of a nation but by activating fearful emotions. Activating conservative syndromes and hysterical emotions that lead, ultimately, to the perception of the Nazi obsession about “racial purity” - certainly not acting aggressively as the Hitler’s Nazis - but guarding – always according to them - ‘national’ achievements.

The difference with the healthy patriotism lies in the fact that real patriots show loyalty to the constitutional contract that binds the citizens with the state and the whole; that triggers any positive power and virtues, while showing abnegation to anything personal against the good of the society sacrificing i.e. the “I” to “we.” Real patriotism also displays love for the country and freedom and puts the common interests and rights of the citizens living under the same constitutional framework - regardless their origins - over of private, or the interests of a group; defending universal values as freedom, equality and justice, essential components of democracy.

The neo-nationalism however dominated by fascist attitudes cannot tolerance any of those values. Phobias cannot thrive in freedom, equality and justice. Patriotism is based on love for the country while neo-nationalism in hatred for others. It was the French President De Gaulle who eloquently has said it, “Patriotism is when you put above all the love for your country. Nationalism is when you put above all the hate for the other.”

Love for our country can be expressed mainly with actions, activating the citizens and not entrench their operations and lead them to extreme behaviors or thoughts. Jokingly I could say that for me, as Greek, “nationalist is everybody who seriously believes that their country is better than Greece.” The same of course could be said by French, an Italian, a German, etc.

The difference is that a patriot is the one who strives to give to his homeland to help her to become better. For example, a Greek patriot is the one who strives, offers and make personal sacrifices for Greece so that Greece can do better. And they do so without caring if he is the only one even if his very neighbor Greek does not do the same. This behavior motivates him more because as citizens of this country we mobilize to a positive, creative direction. The more activated the better our country will do for all the people who live in it.

If we all act in our collective patriotic sense, the common good then surely there will be no room for either phobic or for hostile and alienating syndromes which are the source of fascist activities under the cover of a poorly understood everything nationalistic.

The cover of the 24th issue is a combination of the semantics that consist the meaning of the world “nationalism” – at least how I saw them.

There is a chess board with all the semantics this game of strategy and minds carries and then there is blurred in the back a hand moving a pawn. The arm behind it is dressed into a military uniform.

While everything is in colour the caricatures of Hitler and Mussolini – the other side of nationalism and patriotism – as in black and white, caricatures ridiculing all that they represent both in comic attitudes.

Finally on the top next to the Ovi log is a detail of an old cartoon showing where blind nationalism can lead.
Nationalism could bite China back

THE territorial dispute between China and Japan over a group of islands in the East China Sea continues to worsen, with United States Secretary of State Hillary Clinton warning Beijing over the weekend not to try to change the status quo in which the uninhabited islands are under Japanese administration and the Chinese responding that Clinton’s words would embolden right-wing forces in Japan and lead to further tension.

That’s an interesting charge. There is general agreement that nationalism is on the rise in Japan, witness the election of Shinzo Abe, a right-wing politician, last month. Who is responsible for pushing Japan to the right? To a degree, both the Chinese and Japanese governments are responding to growing nationalism. However, there is little doubt that rising nationalist sentiments on both sides are being driven by China.

The American scholar was in Beijing for the launch of the Chinese edition of his book Deng Xiaoping and the Transformation of China, a biography of the Chinese leader.

Deng, he said, knew it was in China’s interests to have good relations with all countries, including the US and the Soviet Union as well as its neighbours, Japan and the countries of Southeast Asia. In fact, the paramount leader wanted a strong cultural basis for cooperation with Japan and imported Japanese movies and TV programmes and promoted youth exchanges.

Vogel recalled that, through the 1980s, the Chinese people’s attitude towards Japan was not hostile.

Things started to change, however, after the Tiananmen Square uprising of 1989, which culminated in a military crackdown. This represented an existential threat to the Communist Party, which realised that faith in Marxism had evaporated in the wake of the party’s embrace of market principles. The abandonment of world revolution and class struggle by Deng after the death of Mao Zedong left many to lose faith in Marxism.

In searching for another rationale for the party’s monopoly on power, the party decided on the use of nationalism, with such sentiments to be inculcated through ideological and political education -- not just of students but of the people in general. We didn’t tell them enough about the need for hard struggle, about what China was like in the old days and what kind of a country it was to become. That was a serious error on our part.

The party decided that, in addition to delivering economic growth, it needed a greater dose of nationalism. Almost inevitably, the party’s Propaganda Department emphasised China’s humiliation by foreign powers from the mid-19th to mid-20th century, beginning with the Opium War and focusing on the Japanese invasion of China in the 1930s and 1940s. The Communists understood well how the Japanese invasion infected the people of China and created nationalism as a force in the country, transforming it from what the late revolutionary leader Dr Sun Yat-sen called a tray of “loose sand”.

In fact, in 1972, when then Japanese prime minister Kakuei Tanaka visited China to establish diplomatic relations, he started to apologise for his country’s aggression but Mao Zedong cut him off, saying it was the Communists who should thank Japan because without the Japanese invasion Mao and his followers could never have won power in China.

While Mao was grateful to Japan for helping the Communists win power, from the 1990s on the Communists have been using the Japanese invasion to help them remain in power. But the party did not reckon on the cumulative effect it would have on Japan.

Not surprisingly, it fanned the flames of right-wing forces in Japan. As Vogel said in his speech, “The Chinese have created their worst fears.”

Today, anti-Japanese sentiment is high in China and the government has become a prisoner of its own propaganda as the Internet multiplies the impact of public pressure on the authorities. Chickens hatched by the party have come home to roost.

This is clearly documented. On June 9, 1989 -- five days after tanks rolled into Tiananmen Square -- Deng addressed officers in command of the troops enforcing martial law in Beijing.

He told them: “During the last 10 years, our biggest mistake was made in the field of education, primarily in ideological and political education -- not just of students but of the people in general. We didn’t tell them enough about the need for hard struggle, about what China was like in the old days and what kind of a country it was to become. That was a serious error on our part.”

The party decided, in addition to delivering economic growth, it needed a greater dose of nationalism. Almost inevitably, the party’s Propaganda Department emphasised China’s humiliation by foreign powers from the mid-19th to mid-20th century, beginning with the Opium War and focusing on the Japanese invasion of China in the 1930s and 1940s. The Communists understood well how the Japanese invasion infected the people of China and created nationalism as a force in the country, transforming it from what the late revolutionary leader Dr Sun Yat-sen called a tray of “loose sand”.

In fact, in 1972, when then Japanese prime minister Kakuei Tanaka visited China to establish diplomatic relations, he started to apologise for his country’s aggression but Mao Zedong cut him off, saying it was the Communists who should thank Japan because without the Japanese invasion Mao and his followers could never have won power in China.

While Mao was grateful to Japan for helping the Communists win power, from the 1990s on the Communists have been using the Japanese invasion to help them remain in power. But the party did not reckon on the cumulative effect it would have on Japan.

Not surprisingly, it fanned the flames of right-wing forces in Japan. As Vogel said in his speech, “The Chinese have created their worst fears.”

Today, anti-Japanese sentiment is high in China and the government has become a prisoner of its own propaganda as the Internet multiplies the impact of public pressure on the authorities. Chickens hatched by the party have come home to roost.


‘Corrosive English nationalism’ driving EU debate

“Corrosive English nationalism” is driving the debate on Britain exiting the EU and such a move would be a “disaster” for the Welsh economy, Wales’s first minister Carwyn Jones has said.

Scotland was also worried about the uncertainty the issue caused as “threatened tens of thousands of jobs”, Nicola Sturgeon, Scotland’s deputy first minister, told a conference of the British Irish Chamber of Commerce in Dublin yesterday.

Irish firms in Wales “The question is why it is taking five years to resolve this question,” Mr Jones said, referring to British prime minister David Cameron’s announcement this week that a referendum on the issue would be held before 2018.

He said 500 firms in Wales exported to the EU with 150,000 jobs dependent on that trade.

There were 50 Irish firms based in Wales which generated 2,600 jobs with some of the major firms including Glambria, Kingspan and Smurfit Kappa, he added.

Ms Sturgeon said the UK could be on a “collision course” over its EU membership but “that is not a journey Scotland’s government wants Scotland to take”. An independent Scotland was vital to avoiding these decisions in the hands of the Westminster government”, she added.

Scotland could then use taxes to encourage research and development and tackle inequality. Independence would also boost economic links and trade with Ireland.

Ireland “wrote the manual”

An independent Scotland in the EU would enable the country to protect its national interests. Ireland “wrote the manual” on how small nations could advance in the EU while protecting their interests and the author of that manual was Garret FitzGerald, she said.

Minister of State for European Affairs Lucinda Creighton said Mr Cameron’s speech was a “pro-EU speech” since it set out the case for the UK’s continued membership of the union.

While Ireland had no right to tell the UK what to do, it had “every right” to say what the impact would be for the Republic and the rest of the EU.

http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/finance/2013/0126/1224329299387.html

Nationalism not a monopoly of state, says apex court

New Delhi : The Supreme Court Friday said that nationalism was not the monopoly of the state and it could not point fingers at those who question the conduct of its counter-insurgency operations in Manipur.

“Nationalism is not a monopoly of the state. Simply because you represent the state, you don’t have the authority to impute motives on others questioning your actions,” said an apex court bench of Justice Aftab Alam and Justice Ranjana Prakash Desai.

The court’s observation came when senior counsel Ranjit Kumar, appearing for the Manipur government, asked the petitioner association whether it opposed the demand for the cessation of Manipur from India.

While the parties are being driven by China.

Justice Desai told Ranjit Kumar, “You talk about insur- gency but don’t point fingers at them.”

Making it clear that the court was aggrieved about the loss of life be it that of security man or police personnel or a common man on street, Justice Alam noted that though India had lost a prime minister (Indira Gandhi) and a former prime minister (Rajiv Gandhi) in terror attacks, the attackers were not lynched.

Referring to the “horrendous” 26/11 Mumbai terror attack, Justice Alam asked: “Do we lynch them (the terrorists responsible)?”

“So long we are here and have rule of law, no one can be shot in an unlawful manner,” he added.

http://twocircles.net/2013jan04/nationalism_not_monopoly_state_says_apex_court.html
Hichem Karoui: Islamism, internationalism, nationalism

The question of the link between Islamism and nationalism has come back to the limelight since the Arab spring. After 9/11, the American reaction emphasized the notion that this was a “war against America”, who could declare wars but nationals of other countries, even if they were pariahs and mercenaries?

The point is that Al Qaeda leaders never hid an internal agenda in their pretensions. However, as they found refuge in varied countries outside their own birthplaces, and as they masteredminded operations that crossed borders and continents, the observers were struck by the international aspect of this activity which they labelled “international Islamism”, “international jihad”, and “international terrorism”, while the regional and local aspects became secondary. Such views have been issued for example, by – but by no means exclusively – Israeli analysts, who, while confronted with violent operations executed by Hamas and al Qaeda activists, have been keen on promoting a picture where local Palestinian fighters would be part of “an Islamist International”. The United States and the Western states have adopted such views. Nevertheless, this picture does not stand to the analysis, at least because the Palestinian Islamist activists have never executed any operation outside what they deem to be a field of conflict: Israel itself and the Palestinian territories.

For Reuven Paz, for example, (Is there an Islamist International?), the term Global Jihad marks and reflects the solidarity of a variety of movements, groups, and sometimes ad hoc groupings or cells, which act under the auspices of a variety of movements, groups, and organizations. In the Middle East examples are Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and to some extent Hezbollah. On the international scene, one can see this in the case of the Egyptian, Pakistani, Kashmiri, Algerian, Jordanian, Yemeni, and Sunni Lebanese groups.”

Seemingly, there is some confusion in Paz’s perception of the Islamist phenomenon.

First point, one would ask: what is the link between Wahhabism and Takfiri? Were the Wahhabis – who are still a majority in Saudi Arabia – takfiris, they would never have been able to maintain any relationship with other Sunnite Muslims who do not share their principles and who are the majority in their respective countries. After all, who launched the idea and founded the quite acknowledged “Islamic Congress Organisation” acting on behalf of Islamic states, but the Wahhabi Saudis? Takfiri is an exclusionist notion that deems the “others” as non-believers, and as such, they deserve to be considered as foes of God. The clearest example of such an endeavours is that of the Egyptian extremist group, labelled al takfiri wal hijra, which “executed” President Sadat on these same grounds (not for political reasons).

Second point, what Paz figured out to be a “shift in the struggle”, was rather a parenthesis, imposed by two factors: a) the violence of the repression against the Islamists – notwithstanding their moderation or their excesses; and b) the calling for Islamic solidarity at the time of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Many Mujahideen thought that an experience in an armed struggle would be useful on the day they return home to deliver the ultimate fight. That is exactly what happened.

Third point, if we take a close look at the groups Paz mentions, we would see that each one of them is related to a determined country and a localised struggle inside that country. If there is some kind of solidarity between them, what is more normal? All political organisations from the right wing to the left have some foreign connections. Yet, it is too much exceeding the real facts to deduce that because they are Islamists they are necessarily similar in their programmes and aims, and as such, they are – necessarily – involved with terrorism.

However, 9/11 has set the clock on the Islamist bundle, not without some good reasons, though. It was the first time since the wars of decolonisation that notions like “jihad” and “holy war” were broadly used. In addition, the idea that some of these Islamist trends were marked by nationalism started getting some ground. Today, many examples show that some of those who formed Al Qaeda networks came back with national ambitions. If they changed tactics in course of their activity and aimed at international targets (outside their countries), nothing proves that they rejected their initial goal: to overthrow the local elites from power and take over. They have had for instance a heavy hand in the Algerian civil war after the failed elections of 1992, and in Iraq since the collapse of the Baath regime, and in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan… as well as in post-Gaddafi Libya, and in Egypt and Tunisia after the January 2011 revolutions.

Michael Savage, one of the nation’s most prominent voices in talk radio, said today America is “absolutely” ripe for a third party, in part, because the two largest parties in the U.S. have pulled a “charade” on the American people.

“You have the rudiments of a new party in this country called a tea party. They need to restructure their party. They need a charismatic leader, which they don’t have. When you say, ‘Tea party,’ no one knows who the leader is, because there is no leader. No man has stepped forward who can lead that party – no one who is an articulate speaker, a charismatic mover of people.

“The tea party is the rudiment of the new nationalist party,” Savage explained. “Somebody has to bring them all together, unite them like King David did the ancient tribes of Israel. And there is no King David out there. Who’s the King David? Tell me who is going to do it?”

What about Savage himself?

“I could do it if I was 20 years younger. I would do it right now,” Savage told Klein. “But I’m not 20 years younger, and I don’t have 20 years left in me. This is going to require enormous resources and enormous energy. I can guarantee you, Aaron, if I ever did this I could raise probably $100 million within three months easily. “There are people so frustrated by the democracy that is gone in this country, the structure that has replaced our democracy is what I meant to say, that they would claim to be the new nationalist party,” Savage said.

Savage also pointed out the term “nationalism” needs to be redefined, as it’s too often associated with Hitler and the National Socialist Party, the Nazis, of 1930s Germany.

This association, however, Savage claims is simply the design of the “internationalists” in the ranks of the left and leftists media who desire to “dissolve the sovereignty of nations.”

“Borders, language, culture has been my motto in radio and television; Borders, language, culture has been my motto in radio and television.”
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Welsh, Scots concerned at EU exit talk

“Corrosive English nationalism” is driving the debate on Britain exiting the EU and such a move would be a “disaster” for the Welsh economy, Wales’s first minister Carwyn Jones has said.

Wales faced five years of uncertainty about its future since Britain’s prime minister David Cameron announced a referendum on EU membership earlier this week, Mr Jones told a conference of the British-Irish chamber of commerce in Dublin.

“The question is why it is taking five years to resolve this question,” he said. He also questioned which powers Mr Cameron wanted to take back from the EU, warning that some powers had already been devolved to Wales and “we don’t want to see them moved back from Cardiff to London”.

He said 500 firms in Wales exported to the EU and there were 150,000 jobs dependent on that trade. There were 50 Irish firms based in Wales which generated 2,600 jobs with some of the major firms including Glanbia, Kingspan and Smurfit Kappa, he added.

Minister for Europe Lucinda Creighton said Mr Cameron’s speech was a “pro-EU speech” since it set out the case for the UK’s continuing membership of the union.

While Ireland had no right to tell the UK what to do, it had “every right” to say what the impact would be for the Republic and the rest of the EU. She said for Britain it would result in disruption to trade and investment, isolation on the world stage and the souring of relations with other states. She said such a scenario gave “genuine cause for concern”.

The UK had contributed greatly to the EU and was one of the staunchest advocates of the single market. But the union was not just economic but also political, she added.

The UK could be on a “collision course” with the EU over its membership and “that is not a journey Scotland’s government wants Scotland to take”, Nicola Sturgeon, Scotland’s deputy first minister said.

“We’re not going to be able to trade with Europe so we will lose 60% of our GDP,” she said.

Meanwhile, Americans celebrated lower gasoline prices during the holiday season, forgetting that gas costs more than $1 per gallon compared to a year ago.

Bilderberg and the TC are composed of international financiers, such as David Rockefeller and the Rothschilds of Europe, heads of state from Europe and high officials of the U.S. government and congressional leaders. Because the U.S. president’s every moment is accounted for, he is unable to attend publicly. But President Obama has been positively identified as having attended at least one such meeting under cover of darkness. These secretive groups see a global recession as a means of gaining public support for a “world treasury department” under the United Nations, a giant step toward world government.

Three such proposals are pending before the UN, but covered up by the controlled press.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel, a Bilderberg leader, said Europe has far to go to recover economic growth and stressed the need for the ECB to take full control of the economy “to save the euro.”

The continent should evolve into a “United States of Europe,” functioning as a single nation, she said.

http://americanfreepress.net/?p=8052

Growing Global Nationalism Sparking ‘Deglobalization’

There is a growing threat to globalization that is being caused by “a frightening rise in nationalism,” according to David Smick, Bilderberg messenger boy, market consultant and editor of The International Economy, a monthly magazine that is popular among internationalist elites.

It’s gotten so bad, writes Smick, that “deglobalization” is starting to happen. Trade and international money flows are slowing and, in some cases, declining.

What’s unclear, Smick says, is whether this will produce “prolonged economic stagnation and rising nationalism” or will make the world economy “more stable and politically acceptable.”

For some Americans, Smick says mournfully, “deglobalization will seem delicious.” He called globalization “the proverbial goose that laid the golden eggs” but “it has weakened and “there’s no new model to replace it.”
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German Chancellor Angela Merkel, a Bilderberg leader, said Europe has far to go to recover economic growth and stressed the need for the ECB to take full control of the economy “to save the euro.”

The continent should evolve into a “United States of Europe,” functioning as a single nation, she said.

http://americanfreepress.net/?p=8052

Ultra-nationalism threatens economy

Muslim businessmen and corporate leaders expressed concern and disappointment over being targeted by the radical group ‘Bodu Bala Sena’, warning that it would have an adverse impact on the economy as the country struggles to mobilise both domestic and foreign investment.

While Ireland had no right to tell the UK what to do, it had “every right” to say what the impact would be for the Republic and the rest of the EU. She said for Britain it would result in disruption to trade and investment, isolation on the world stage and the souring of relations with other states. She said such a scenario gave “genuine cause for concern”.

The UK had contributed greatly to the EU and was one of the staunchest advocates of the single market. But the union was not just economic but also political, she added.

The UK could be on a “collision course” with the EU over its membership and “that is not a journey Scotland’s government wants Scotland to take”, Nicola Sturgeon, Scotland’s deputy first minister said.


“Businesses run by Muslims have increasingly come under various smear campaigns in the recent past. The allegations, such as the sweets, are baseless and designed to create doubt in the minds of consumers. We are interested in doing business, not religion nor race. We serve people from all walks of life, race and creed. They trust us and keep coming to us because of our products and services,” one Muslim businessman said not wanting to be named.
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“Our economy depends on oil exports from the Muslim world, and if not for their credit lines where would we have been? West Asia is also fond of our tea. This government cannot and should not lay back and watch what is happening. The consequences would be too severe for all communities if things are allowed to go out of hand.”

Another corporate leader said it would not be in the best interests of Muslim-owned businesses to press charges against those spreading rumours and false information.

“This would only aggravate the matter. But the government should step in and play a more active role. Protect the peace; be fair by all; that is all the government should do,” he said not wanting to be named.

Business Chamber of Commerce Secretary General Jagath Savanadasa says ultra-nationalistic impulsive behaviour would hurt the entire country, not just its economy.

“This kind of behaviour is very bad. We should, together, uplift the country’s economy and not bring it down by creating enmity. Even during the worst of times during the decades long conflict there was no enmity between Sinhala and Tamil businesses, so it is shocking that the Muslim community is being targeted.

“We should maintain healthy relationships with the Muslim community in Sri Lanka because we are all, after all, Sri Lankans. If there are any accusations against this community it must be examined first before ultra-nationalistic impulsive behaviour gets the better of us. This would also send bad signals to the international community. We trade heavily with the Muslim world and how can we survive without them? A little nationalism is good, but ultra-nationalism is a very dangerous thing and would do a lot of harm. It is saddening to note the merging trends. We can only hope sanity would prevail,” Savanadasa said.


“We must maintain a healthy relationship with the Muslim community in Sri Lanka because we are all, after all, Sri Lankans. If there are any accusations against this community it must be examined first before ultra-nationalistic impulsive behaviour gets the better of us. This would also send bad signals to the international community. We trade heavily with the Muslim world and how can we survive without them? A little nationalism is good, but ultra-nationalism is a very dangerous thing and would do a lot of harm. It is saddening to note the merging trends. We can only hope sanity would prevail,” Savanadasa said.

there is a claim currently circulating the EU, both cynical and misleading: ‘multiculturalism is dead in Europe’. No wonder, as the conglomerate of nation-states/EU has silently handed over one of its most important debates – that of European identity – to the wing-parties, recently followed by the several selective and contra-productive foreign policy actions.

Europe’s domestic cohesion, its fundamental realignment as well as the overall public standing and credibility within its strategic neighborhood lies in the reinvigoration of its everything but institutions transformative powers – stipulated in the Barcelona process of the European Neighborhood Policy as well as in the Euro-Med partnership (OSCE).

***************

By correlating the hydrocarbons with the present political and socio-economic landscape, scholar Larry Diamond revealed that currently 22 states in the world, which earn 60% or more of their respective GDP from oil (and gas) are a non-democratic, authoritarian regimes. All of them with huge disparities, steep socio-economic cleavages, sharp political inequalities and lasting exclusions, not to mention poor human rights records. These represent nearly half of the countries considered by the Freedom House’s annual reports as ‘not free’ – the very same that are predominantly held accountable by the western media for domestic and regional insurgences, int’l. armed conflicts, famines as well as for terrorists harboring and financing. Hence, as many as 9 of the 11 top crude exporters are usually labeled as the dictatorships and/or despotist monarchies by the leading academia. Prof. Diamond calls it democratic recession. If so, there is not a single economic or political indicator at the MENA (Middle East – North Africa) region to imply any ‘Spring’ happening lately, but only a severe, lasting recession.

Indeed, modern history is full of examples where the crude exporting countries’ development was hindered by the huge revenues. Far too often, the petro-cash flow did not assist but delayed or derailed necessary economic diversification and political reform. It also frequently paved the way up for the elites, domestically felt as predatory, and externally instrumented as – to use CIA jargon– ‘useful idiots’. Conveniently though using revenues to buy and otherwise subsidize social peace, those regimes (of rentier states) were/are actually creating self-entrapment – ever stronger psychological and political dependence on hydrocarbons. Therefore, a real ‘Arab Spring’, for the Middle East and rest of us, will only come with a socio-economic decoupling and diversification, socio-political horizontalization, with a decisive de-psychologisation of and departure from oil-dependence. By no means, it would ever come by a pure cosmetic change of the resident in the presidential palace.

Fearing the leftist republican pan-Arabism and Nasserism, the US encouraged Saudi Arabia to sponsor the existing and establish a new large network of madrasah all over the Middle East – Prof. Cleveland reminds us in his capital work: A History of the Modern Middle East. In the last three decades, this tiger became ‘too big to ride’, as Lawrence Wright points out in his luminary book on Al Qaida: The Looming Tower. Wright states that while representing only 1.5% of the world’s Muslims, Saudis fund and essentially control around 90% of the Islamic institutions from the US to Kazakhstan/ Xinjiang and from Norway to Australia.

By insisting on oversimplified and rigid, sectarian Wahhabi-Salafist interpretations of religious texts, most of these institutions along with their indoctrinated clerics are in fact both corrupting and preventing an important inner debate about Islam and modernity. Self-detained in a limbo of denial, they largely (and purposely) keep the Arab and non-Arab Muslim world in a dangerous confrontational course with both itself and the rest of the world. To end this, there is a claim currently circulating the EU, both cynical and misleading: ‘multiculturalism is dead in Europe’. The sort of Islam Europe supported (and the means deployed to do so) in the Middle East yesterday, is the sort of Islam (and the means it uses) that Europe gets today.
Why and how?!

Young generations of Europeans are taught in schools about a compact unity (singularity) of an entity called the EU. However, as soon as serious external or inner security challenges emerge, the compounding parts of the true, historic Europe are resurfacing again. Formerly in Algeria, Egypt and Lebanon, then in Iraq (with the exception of France) and now with Libya and Syria; Central Europe is hesitant to act, Atlantic Europe is eager, Scandinavian Europe is absent, Eastern Europe is bandwagoning, and Russophone Europe is opposing.

The 1986 Reagan-led Anglo-American bombing of Libya was a one-time, head-hunting punitive action. This time, Libya (and currently Syria) has been given a different attachment: The considerable presence of China in Africa; successful circumventing pipeline deals between Russia and Germany (which will deprive Eastern Europe from any transit-related bargaining premium, and will tacitly pose a joint Russo-German effective pressure on the Baltic states, Poland and Ukraine); boldness (due to a petro-financial and strategic emancipation) of Iran; and finally the overthrows of the EU friendly, Tunisian, Yemeni and Egyptian regimes - all combined - must have triggered alarm bells across Atlantic Europe.

Thus, in response to the MENA crisis, the EU failed to keep up a broad, consolidated agenda and all-participatory basis with its strategic neighborhood, although having institutionalized and institutionalized its own perspectives and discredited its own transformative power’s principle. It did so by undermining its own institutional framework: Barcelona Process as the specialized segment of European Neighborhood Policy (EU) and the Euro-Med partnership (OSCE).

The only direct involvement of the continent was ranging between a diplomatic de-legitimacy (by Goebbels-izing the media to instrument it for) and punitive military engagement via the Atlantic Europe-led coalition of the willing (Libya, Syria). Confrontational nostalgia was evoked again over dialog (instruments) and consensus (institutions).

The consequences are striking: The sort of Islam that the EU supported (and the means deployed to do so) in the Mideast was merely a cheap and credibly, ineffective and politically irrelevant and credibility to do so – as it did before at its home; by silently handing over one of its most important questions, that of European identity, to escapist anti-politics (politics in retreat) dressed up in the Western European wing-parties. Eventually, Europe embraced its own perspectives and discredited its own transformative power’s principle. It did so by undermining its own institutional framework: Barcelona Process as the specialized segment of European Neighborhood Policy (EU) and the Euro-Med partnership (OSCE).

1. However, a corrosive influence of big money (an upper hand of silencing) in politics and human rights groups is so high, that any discussion about Saudis is one of the strongest taboos of our time.

2. Undeniably, there were ideological complementarities between Soviet communism and the anti-colonial, leftist, egalitarian and republican pan-Arabism. Still, the post-Soviet and post-communist Russia remains on the same position, following its geopolitical rationale. Pan-Arabism is the most obvious alternative to Islamism, an alternative to the Wahhabism-powered (or newly arriving, neo-Ottoman-powered) Islamism.

3. Hereby we are not discussing the disastrous image of Muslims, created by the Saudi-Qatari financed Sturm Phalanges holed in Afghan caves and their conductor, Saudi Rasputin/Wahhabite Houdini, recently located in Pakistan and retired.

4. It is anticipated that Iran (and Syria) on the Russian south-west flank serve as a pivotal security buffer. Indeed, Tehran is in constant need of diplomatic cover from Moscow. In return, it refrains from its own Islamic projection on and it has very little strategic argument. In fact, the Al Qaida construct is only a radicalized and weaponized ideology of Wahhabism – of a sect that originates from the 19th century peninsular Arabian tribes on its Southern Arabian frontier and back-dated by that time Imperial Britain – finally demolished the centuries-long Caliphates-Ottoman Ummah. With religion per se, it has very little to do.

5. Additionally, the announced reductions of the American military engagement via the Atlantic Europe-led coalition of the willing (Libya, Syria). Confrontational nostalgia was evoked again over dialog (instruments) and consensus (institutions).

6. The Gulf OPEC states and Libya have -by far- the lowest costs of oil extraction thanks to the high crude ‘parity’ (measured by overall properties such as a state of aggregation, evaporation gravity, viscosity, weight, degree of sulfuric and other conta-

ments) which is simplifying and cheapening the refinement process, as well as the close proximity to open warm seas for a fast and convenient overseas shipments. Hence, the costs of a barrel of crude for Libya and the Persian Gulf states are under USD, for other OPEC states below 10USD. This is in a sharp contrast to countries such as the US, Russia, Norway, Canada and many others that bear production costs of several tens of USD per barrel – according to the Intl. Energy Agency (IEA). Thus, although commercially very affordable, Europe presently pays a huge political price for the MENA crude imports. Of this, often hidden, price, European consumers are largely unaware.

7. While the cacophony of European contradictions works more on a self-elimination of the EU from the region, Turkey tries to reinsert itself. The so-called neo-Ottomanism of the current (Anatolian, eastern rural power-base) government steers the country right into the centre of grand bargaining for both Russia and for the US. To this emerging triangular constellation, PM Erdogan wishes to appoint its own rhythm. Past the ‘Arab Spring’, neither will Russia effectively sustain its presence in the Middle East on a strict pan-Arab secular, republican and anti-
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Author/Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There is no flag large enough to cover the shame of killing innocent people.”</td>
<td>Howard Zinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Imagine there’s no countries It isn’t hard to do Nothing to kill or die for And no religion too Imagine all the people Living life in peace You may say that I’m a dreamer But I’m not the only one I hope someday you’ll join us And the world will be as one”</td>
<td>John Lennon, Imagine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nationalism is an infantile thing. It is the measles of mankind.”</td>
<td>Albert Einstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If one harbors anywhere in one’s mind a nationalistic loyalty or hatred, certain facts, though in a sense known to be true, are inadmissable.”</td>
<td>George Orwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“France bleeds, but liberty smiles, and before the smile of liberty, France forgets her wound.”</td>
<td>Victor Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A nation’s not a child, for God’s sake ... It’s like a wild horse you tame by breaking it. Or a fiery woman you slap till she sees sense and warms your bed.”</td>
<td>David Hewson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If the future remains uncertain, we know the past history of nationalism. And that should be sufficient to encourage a habit of watchful suspicion.”</td>
<td>Michael Billig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There is a peculiar pathos in the extinction of a nation.”</td>
<td>Homer B. Hulbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“People who enjoy waving flags don’t deserve to have one”</td>
<td>Banksy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Patriotism is when love of your own people comes first; nationalism, when hate for people other than your own comes first.”</td>
<td>Charles de Gaulle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nationalism is our form of incest, is our idolatry, is our insanity. “Patriotism” is its cult.”</td>
<td>Erich Fromm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“An idolatrous worship.”</td>
<td>Erich Fromm, “Imagining”</td>
</tr>
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<td>“All nationalisms are at heart deeply concerned with names: with the most immaterial and original human invention. Those who dismiss names as a detail have never been displaced; but the peoples on the peripheries are always being displaced. That is why they insist upon their continuity--their links with their dead and the unborn.”</td>
<td>John Berger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There is no national science just as there is no national multiplication table; anything that is national is not scientific.”</td>
<td>Anton Pavlovich Chekhov</td>
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<td>“A nation’s not a child, for God’s sake ... It’s like a wild horse you tame by breaking it. Or a fiery woman you slap till she sees sense and warms your bed.”</td>
<td>David Hewson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If the future remains uncertain, we know the past history of nationalism. And that should be sufficient to encourage a habit of watchful suspicion.”</td>
<td>Michael Billig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There is a peculiar pathos in the extinction of a nation.”</td>
<td>Homer B. Hulbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“People who enjoy waving flags don’t deserve to have one”</td>
<td>Banksy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“France bleeds, but liberty smiles, and before the smile of liberty, France forgets her wound.”</td>
<td>Victor Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A nation’s not a child, for God’s sake ... It’s like a wild horse you tame by breaking it. Or a fiery woman you slap till she sees sense and warms your bed.”</td>
<td>David Hewson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If the future remains uncertain, we know the past history of nationalism. And that should be sufficient to encourage a habit of watchful suspicion.”</td>
<td>Michael Billig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There is a peculiar pathos in the extinction of a nation.”</td>
<td>Homer B. Hulbert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If I close my eyes and count to a 100, 35 children are dead.

Who’ll play football with me when 21 friends die every minute?

21 children die every minute?

How can I play hide & seek when 21 children die every minute?
This is what I have to say. Do not reply on thinking. Thinking is a labyrinth. Do not reply on belief. Belief alone but rarely saves in face of clear and present danger. Even less when danger is everywhere.

Turn your guns into medicine bundles. Animals do not need for you to hunt them. And the wild ruins are in need of healing. Turn your greed into global banqueting. Quench thirst; satisfy hunger. Stop rape and stop killing; bring closure and an end to war. Abolish, once again, the criminal disgrace of slavery, wherein, in our troubled time, whole generations of women and children suffer exploitation, debasement, brutal treatment, and inhuman life.

This ground here—this is sacred ground. Everywhere there is the longing for liberation. This Earth here is a living holiness. Do not keep freedom and the democratization of creation denied by bloodshed.

Live in reverence, respect and honoring. Do no more continue to turn this habitation of the beauty way into a waste place and sewer of death. No more continue to be as we have been too long. Reach, as if in regression, into a future beyond all memories except for the memory of origin.

This is all I can say now. My words are wounds and nails. Yet my words are akin to little runnels of light; they are similar to hands reaching out. If you are listening, those who hear will be heard. If you are looking, those who see will be seen. If you are calling out, your voices are collected on petals of the cosmic rose and your names are spoken on flutters of twilight.

And if you feel, as one feels who is touched, you have already the feeling of grace and know that sanity is possible. And that even in the late, or final, hour, you, in your courage, in your soul of roses, will embody one awaited miracle.
Tony Zuvela

Berserk Alert!

Tony was born way back in the crazy, far out, groovy sixties; '62 in fact... That’s him over to the left. He currently lives with the four people inside his head, somewhere in Australia. His hobbies are Arthritis and Medication. Was once in the Television Industry as a Camera-man/Editor for 24 years. Cartooning and Drawing is something Tony’s been doing naturally on-and-off ever since he could walk, but nothing professional, just doodles for Family and Friends; that is, until in 2004 he decided to give Cartooning a full-time red-hot go (the silly fool!), and he’s never looked back; partly due to the Arthritis in his neck.

Articles

Article
I can’t remember how many times I’ve been asked about One Child Policy, at the moment people learned I’m from China. Indeed, you wouldn’t understand it if you never lived there. According to all the questions I was asked, I have to say, the world is very confused on this issue. Well, as an only child in a regular Chinese family, today, I’m going to talk about how is One Child Policy really like.

It’s such a big question, what is the reason behind the policy? It is known to all, China has the largest population over the world. At the end of 2011, the total population of PRC is 1,347,350,000 persons (released by National Bureau of Statistics of China). Any government would do something get it under control for sustainable development. To find the reasons, we have to get back to the middle of last century, while two great Baby Booms swelled the population in China.

The first one occurred between 1950-1955, known as postwar births. The country finally walked out of the haze of war. Social and political environment was stable, at the meanwhile, economy was growing gradually. People were finally able to settle down and the standard of life was improved. During the period, 94% of women had 3 children and more than 50% of women had 6. With a very large population base, there were 20.88 million of babies born each year.

The second Baby Boom was from 1962 to 1971, which lasted for 10 years long. It happened for so many reasons including economic recovery after the three years of great famine, poor entertainment during the Culture Revolution and so on. There were 27.952 million of new born each year and the population jumped to 852.29 million by the end of 1971, it was 1.573 times of 1949’s (541.67 million). The second baby boom had affected China in all aspects and its influence lasts until today.

Productivity couldn’t catch up the speed of population growth, therefore, in the 1950’s and 1960’s, the baby boom hit an antiquated and inadequate school system and medication system. Life standard was much lower than expectation. To provide better life with limited resources, slowing down the population growth is the only way. The country introduced population control policy at the end of 1970’s. It restricts urban couples to only one child, while allowing additional children in several cases. Including twins, ethnic minorities, and remarried couples with one child in family and so on. Since then, the fertility rate fell from 2.63 births per women in 1980, to 1.61 in 2009. It highly reduced the demand of nature resources, maintaining a steady labor rate, and reduced unemployment. That’s one of the reason how China could become the world’s fastest growing major economy.

Well, born in late 1980’s, I am the only one my parents have; it feels awesome in the first 18 years of my life. I never had to worry that mommy and daddy would love someone more than me. I got everything I wanted as long as it’s reasonable, nobody argued or fight with me for sharing anything. My parents provided all the best material benefits as they can. My childhood was one thousand times better than my parents’. I grow up like a princess while they didn’t even have enough food on the table (my parents both had 4 and 5 siblings). Actually almost all my generation was like that, we rarely see kids with siblings at my age (expect for minorities and special cases). Being honest, I never thought about how would it be if I’ve got a brother or sister, a family consists of 3 people is like a formula in my mind. (family = mother + father + 1 child ). Until one day, I came out of the country and see almost everyone around me has siblings, and it feels like I’ve missed something in my life. Of course, some of my friends always complained, you never wish you had a brother or sister, they quarrel over small matters all the time, but no matter how badly they fight, they will get over it. They may not like each other at times, but they love each other unconditionally. Siblings are someone like friends but much more than friends, they are family, they share everything and even the same blood.

Then, I remembered, I never shared my toys with anyone when I was little, I owned them all, and I had nobody to play with neither. My childhood was pretty lonely indeed. Actually, all of us are. That’s how it develop a very serious problem among the young generation, everyone is a little emperor. We became the spoiled generation and we didn’t experience the joy and headache of sibling rivalry. Our parents did everything for us to grow up happily, and certain percent of us can’t live on our own even after 20s. Our life is too much depended on our family.

However, spoiled kids can grow up and learn to be mature eventually, it is not unsolvable. But not all the parents are lucky enough to bring up their only child. It is so sad when aged parents lost their only child for any reason. They become so lonely and they are too old to have another one. At some point, all our parents are facing the same situation. Sometimes we travel too far and we barely see them once in few years. If we had any siblings, it would be much easier for both parents and kids.

The good thing is, the first batch of “spoiled generation” has entered their 30s/20s, started from 2011, couples who are both only child themselves could have a second baby. As we can see, the One Child Policy is getting more and more complete for both human needs and society needs. Hopefully, I will have two babies in the near future!
Old Europe was once a grouping of feudal societies that occasionally interacted with each other. As transport and communication developed, many of these feudal societies amalgamated to form larger societies known as nations where strings of alliances to preserve their interests developed.

If we fast forward to the end of the 19th Century, Europe began to become dominated by two main groupings, the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy, and the Entente Cordiale between England and France. This was supplemented with the Franco-Russian Alliance, and the Anglo-Russian Entente.

These alliances formed two military camps on European soil and hastened the process to all-out war when the Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria was assassinated in Sarajevo on 28th June 1914. Again in 1938, aggression across Europe led into bloodshed, pain and suffering destroying a major part of Europe. And after the Second World War, Europe was partitioned with an iron curtain that once again divided the continent.

The narratives within Europe were once full of delusions of racial and religious superiority, imposed dominance, and cultural diversity. Some pockets of Europe today still hold these kinds of beliefs, where groups are still expressing aspirations for independence.

In Europe, there was a desperate need to find a way to co-exist, otherwise future conflicts would have devastating consequences similar to what has been witnessed a number of times throughout European history. The union had to unite a divided Europe of different histories and then stretch it’s arms out to most of Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Soviet Union with an almost unbelievable transformation which other regions of the world like the ASEAN Economic Community will find very hard to emulate.

We can see that the spirit of these old alliances are preserved not for war that dragged Europe into destruction, but this time to bail out a member Greece in the quest to save the union, although the decisions to do this put extreme pressure upon the individual members of the Union.

Today many fundamental questions are arising as new challenges. Youth unemployment, freedom of domicile within the union, the influx of migrants, the Euro-crisis, soaring health costs, rising petroleum prices, food shortages, and terrorism are all concerning Europeans deeply. The answers don’t appear to be there and this is leading to great uncertainty.

The European phenomena is still incomplete. We had the political revolution symbolized by the blue European Union flag flying above European land and institutions under flickering with the winds that once blew through a divided Europe. The second revolution is an economic one, symbolized by the common regulation and the Euro currency. This is currently presenting great challenges as we are still finding that common regulation is not as easy as anticipated due to the cultural diversity and situational issues that persist within the union member states. The Euro and uniform financial regulation had unforeseen consequences. The perceived strength of the union, a common currency also had a paradoxical weakness in that it severely limited the utilization of monetary policy, as the EU has now found. Relying almost solely on budgetary mechanisms for fiscal control along Keynesian philosophies is not enough for member states.

Undoubtedly the European Union Economic approach needs another mechanism. The Euro currency is not the “Higgs Boson” particle that everybody anticipated, and another mechanism to financially drive Europe is needed. But the answer may come in a similar manner to scientists at CERN who discovered that quantum mechanics is extremely complex to truly understand, and the deep fundamentals are within the individual parts, rather than the whole.

There is another revolution that is needed to create the great EU as originally dreamed about. And this revolution is the hardest of all to achieve. It’s a mistake to believe that this revolution will come from the committee rooms of the European Parliament. No revolution ever comes from a legislature.

This revolution is a spiritual one about vision for a new Europe and it must come from the streets of Munich, the streets of Paris, villages in Romania, and towers in Barcelona...
and so on. The vanguard of this revolution will be the same people who were involved in the Arab Spring, the uprisings in Burma and Iran, and the Occupy movement in the United States, the youth of Europe.

The European Union must find the right balance between debate and consensus on an overall vision. That vision must permeate into all aspects of society. Without this vision Europe cannot progress and may actually decline. The people of Europe need a new identity that carries both meaning and a sense of excitement about the future.

And what must be borrowed by the European Union, once discarded in an attempt to create a pan-Euro culture is the “hotch potch” of cultural diversity that exists within the member states. Uniformity does not bring strength, diversity brings strength which has been unrecognized. Diversity is what makes Europe and the Commission has over the years tried to create a Europe of the lowest common denominator (LCD). Europe has actually been stripped of its very strength. The answer is not in the pan-Euro approach but engaging the diversity within the Union, something many, if not the majority feel in their hearts. A Euro-culture should take in both national and pan-Euro traits and slowly evolve into a single Euro-identity.

Just like the Euro-debt crisis, the Euro-cultural crisis is the result of legislators believing that regulation is not the solution to everything. New approaches outside legislative frameworks are required here.

There is great risk that the metaphor of blue may become a sea that lacks the ability to have foresight and vision. The EU Council is fast becoming a transactional rather than transformational identity as it started out to be. The bureaucrats have replaced the dreamers and philosophers setting into motion processes that inhibit rather than encourages growth in diversity and richness.

Blue is also symbolic of authority and the EU must be aware of the need to develop an environment where the Commission is not seen as top down regulator but truly concerned with what it’s citizenry thinks and feels about issues. The citizens of the EU must be encouraged to develop a sense of ownership in the whole process once again.
January 14th was the anniversary of the birth of Albert Schweitzer and a special day at the hospital that he founded at Lambaréné. Alsatian wine would be served at lunch, and conversations over lunch would last longer than usual before everyone had to return to his tasks. In 1963, when I was working for the Ministry of Education of Gabon and spending time at the Protestant secondary school some 500 yards down river from the hospital, I was invited to lunch for the birthday celebration. As the only non-hospital person there, I was placed next to Dr Schweitzer, and we continued our discussions both on the events that had taken place along the Ogowé River and his more philosophical concerns.

I was interviewing Gabonese staying at the hospital on what they thought of schools, of school teachers, of their hopes for their children. When Schweitzer was not busy writing, I would go sit with him and discuss. Since many of the people who came from Europe or the USA to visit him would always say “Yes, Doctor, I agree”, he had relatively little time for them. But since I would say, “But no, you also have to take this into account…” he was stimulated and we had long talks. On his basic position of reverence for life, I was in agreement, and I have always appreciated the time spent on the river’s edge.

As Norman Cousins has noted “the main point about Schweitzer is that he helped make it possible for twentieth-century man to unblock his moral vision. There is a tendency in a relativistic age for man to pursue all sides of a question as an end in itself, finding relief and even refuge in the difficulty of defining good and evil. The result is a clogging of the moral sense, a certain feeling of self-consciousness or even discomfort when questions with ethical content are raised. Schweitzer furnished the nourishing thoughts and convictions of men today, and reaching a state of fresh hope and fresh determination.”

He was looking for a basic principle that would provide the basis of the needed renewal. That principle arose from a mystical experience. He recounts how he was going down river to Ngomo, a missionary station with a small clinic. In those days there were steam boats on the Ogowé, and seated on the deck, he had been trying to write all day. After a while, he stopped writing and only watched the equatorial forest as the boat moved slowly on. Then the words “reverence for life” came into his mind, and his reflections had found their core: life must be both affirmed and revered. Ethics, by its very nature, is linked to the affirmation of the good. Schweitzer saw that he was “life which wants to live, surrounded by life which wants to live. Being will-to-life, I feel the obligation to respect all will-to-life about me as equal to my own. The fundamental idea of good is thus that it consists in preserving life, in favoring it, in wanting to being to its highest value, and evil consists in destroying life, doing it injury, hindering its development.”

Erfüllt für das Leben, — reverence for life — was the key concept for Schweitzer — all life longs for fullness and development as I do myself. However, the will to live is not static; there is a inner energy which pushes on to a higher state — a will to self-realisation. Basically, this energy can be called spiritual. As Dr Schweitzer wrote “One truth stands firm. All that happens in world history rests on something spiritual. If the spiritual is strong, it creates world history. If it is weak, it suffers world history.” The use of Schweitzer’s principle of Reverence for Life can have a profound impact on how humans treat the environment. Reverence for Life rejects the notion that humans can use the environment for its own purposes without any consideration of its consequences for other living things. It accepts the view that there is a reciprocal relationship among living things. Each species is linked to many others. Aldo Leopold in his early statement of a deep ecology ethic, A Sand County Almanac, makes the same point. “All ethics so far evolved rest on a single premise: that the individual is a member of a community of interdependent parts…The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soil, water, plants, and animals, or collectively, the land.”

War and the potential of the use of nuclear weapons is the obvious opposite of reverence for life. Thus, in the mid 1950s, when the political focus was on the testing in the atmosphere of nuclear weapons, Schweitzer came out strongly for an abolition of nuclear tests. Some had warned him that such a position could decrease his support among those who admired his medical work in Africa but who wanted to support continued nuclear tests. However, for Schweitzer, an ethic which is not presented publicly is no ethic at all. His statements on the nuclear weapons issue are collected in his Peace or atomic war? (1958). The statements had an impact with many, touched by the ethical appeal when they had not been moved to action by political reasoning. These protests led to the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which bans tests in the atmosphere — an important first step.

Schweitzer was confident that an ethic impulse was in all people and would manifest itself if given the proper opportunity. “Just as the rivers are much less numerous than underground streams, so the idealism that is visible is minor compared to what men and women carry in their hearts, unreleased or scarcely released. Mankind is waiting and longing for those who can accomplish the task of untying what is knotted and bringing the underground waters to the surface.”

The moral response for Schweitzer was “reverence for life”. Schweitzer had come to Lambaréné in April 1913, already well known for his theological reflections on the eschatological background of Jesus’ thought as well as his study of Bach. As an Alsatian he was concerned with the lack of mutual understanding, the endless succession of hatred and fear, between France and Germany that led to war a year later.

Since Alsace was part of Germany at the time, Schweitzer was considered an enemy alien in the French colony of Gabon. When war broke out he was first restricted to the missionary station where he had started his hospital and later was deported and interned in France. He returned to Gabon after the First World War, even more convinced of the need to infuse thought with a strong ethical impulse. His reflections in The Decay and Restoration of Civilisation trace in a fundamental way the decay. He saw clearly that “the future of civilization depends on our overcoming the meaningless and hopelessness which characterizes the thoughts and convictions of men today, and reaching a state of fresh hope and fresh determination.”
Indianapolis Museum of Art
Large Matisse exhibition

“Matisse, Life in Color” includes paintings, sculptures and works on paper by the artist, who rose to prominence in Paris during the early years of the 20th century. The exhibition is scheduled for Oct. 11, 2013, through Jan. 12, 2014.

IMA director and CEO Charles Venable said it represents an array of significant works. “Henri Matisse’s strong use of color and pattern was incredibly influential among avant-garde artists of the 20th century, and his work remains a touchstone for many artists working today,” said Venable, who unveiled plans for the exhibition during a Thursday event at the Artsgarden.

Art Gallery of South Australia
Islamic Art

This new display in Australia’s only public gallery space permanently dedicated to Islamic art explores the rich history of artistic exchange between Chinese ceramic artists and the Muslim world. A major impetus for Chinese potters to develop blue-and-white porcelain was the demand for the decorated wares among markets that stretched from the Middle East to Southeast Asia. As early as eight hundred years ago, Muslim merchants exported cobalt oxide mineral from Iraq to China for use in the manufacture of the blue-and-white porcelain still popular today but which was then called “Mohammedan blue”.

The Morgan Library Museum
Drawing Surrealism

January 25 through April 21, 2013. Bringing together more than 160 works on paper by such iconic artists as Salvador Dalí, Max Ernst, Leonora Carrington, and Joan Miró, this is the first major exhibition to explore the central role of drawing in surrealism, one of the most important movements in twentieth-century art.

Once considered a minor medium, drawing became a predominant means of expression and innovation among surrealist artists in the first half of the twentieth century, resulting in a rich array of graphic techniques including automatic drawing, collage, decalcomania, exquisite corpse, and frottage. Drawing Surrealism will offer multiple new perspectives on the emergence, evolution, and influence of this revolutionary movement.

Tate Modern London, Lichtenstein: A Retrospective

21 February – 27 May 2013 Tate Modern London, is proud to present a retrospective of one of the great American artists of the twentieth century. Lichtenstein: A Retrospective is the first full-scale retrospective of this important artist in over twenty years. Co-organised by The Art Institute of Chicago and Tate Modern, this momentous show brings together 125 of his most definitive paintings and sculptures and will reassess his enduring legacy.

Lichtenstein is renowned for his works based on comic strips and advertising imagery, coloured with his signature hand-painted Benday dots. The exhibition showcases such key paintings as Look Mickey 1961 lent from the National Gallery Art, Washington and his monumental Artist’s Studio series of 1973–4. Other noteworthy highlights include Whaam! 1963 – a signature work in Tate’s collection – and Drowning Girl 1963 on loan from the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Berlin Museum of Modern Art
Art in Berlin 1880-1980

The Berlinische Galerie collects art produced in Berlin since 1870. From now on, the museum will be presenting internationally acclaimed works from the fields of painting, graphic art, sculpture, photography and architecture in exhibition architecture designed by the Berlin architectural office of David Salk. The chronological presentation of our masterpieces in an area of 1,500 square metres reflects the interdisciplinary orientation of the collection and communicates an exciting dialogue among different artistic styles: Art around 1900, Expressionism, Berlin Dada, the Eastern European Avant-Garde, New Objectivity, Art in the National Socialist Era, the New Beginning after 1945 and Positions of the 1950s.
The world is in a state of turmoil today. We have a situation where people elect representatives who don’t represent them. All the people of goodwill and honesty would like to improve this situation which causes continuous wars, famine, degradation to the environment, destruction of cultures, traditions, eroding the very base of life. Very few of us have the insight to see that the question is not that of improvement, because there is no reason to improve something which works perfectly well. Globalization including the free movement of trade and capital works perfectly well and all the problems that people complain about and suffer from, e.g., pollution, war, global warming and crimes etc., are considered by the masters of this problem as collateral damage.

Who are the masters of the world and how they control it? This is the question and it’s not the governments.

Our mission is to map the system design, information, control and feedback of this world today. How has it evolved and where is it going. We don’t have the answer but there is a direction where we can point to find the right answers, and this requires engagement with a group of people who can go on a journey to seek the truth.

Ovi magazine invites you to participate in this study/research “who rules.” Write essays and articles about your countries and who really rules. This way we can create a world atlas starting a dialogue that only positive results can have and perhaps find some answers that might surprise us all in their similarities.
Leah Sellers
A Young Boy/Man’s Rage, and A Knife He Wanted to Be a Gun
A school shooting. Somebody who has gone through the feelings, because the feelings are what makes an insider, and can describe acts and reactions. Read this story. If possible read it to young adults or give it to them to read it. A hard lesson to learn and a wish to never happen again!

David Sparenberg
Life In The Age Of Extinctions
Part I
A collections of thoughts and ideas inspired from the Earth Spirit.

Abigail George
All about my mother
A collection of short stories published for Ovi magazine

Prof. Emanuel L. Paparella
Europe beyond the Euro
A collection of articles written for Ovi magazine about the European Union and Europe.

Thanos K & Asa B
2nd Opinion - The Book of Insults
A certain very unique character has inspired Asa and Thanos to create this character and the 2nd Opinion cartoon-strip series.

http://www.ovimagazine.com/cat/56