

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Duziak

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers”

by M. J. Duziak, PhD

1.

**The PERMA Plan
and a
Proposed Mechanism for Resolution of the Iraq Crisis**

Version 1.0
12.Feb.2003

The PERMA (Planetary Energy Resource Management and Advancement) Plan is introduced as a practical and long-term solution that provides an alternative to the imminent military solution facing the world with respect to Iraq. This plan is offered as a feasible path leading to resolution of the current conflicts in which the United States, Iraq, and indeed the whole of the world are either actively or passively engaged. It is not solely a “peace plan” but an economic initiative, based upon energy resource management, aimed at creating a new international financial structure, and it has ramifications beyond the border of Iraq and the scope of the present conflict situations.

What is the PERMA Plan?

The Plan, originating with private non-governmental sponsors from several nations, offers an economic-based solution to the Iraq conflict, with both short-term and long-term specific objectives and requirements. Specifically, it offers a mechanism by which the security and economic interests of Iraq can be satisfied through the purchase and contractual management of its major oil reserves and production plants by a singular international corporation, the PERMA Bank. This entity will be established by a consortium of nations (including, minimally, the United States, Russia, France, United Kingdom, China, and Germany) and managed by a non-partisan board, appointed by an electoral college structure established by the consortium and shareholders of the PERMA Bank.

The Plan offers a transition process for the acquisition of major oil holdings and contracts within Iraq. In this transition process the Iraqi state and its military infrastructure will be divested of all ordnances, supplies, and design systems pertaining to biological, chemical and nuclear weaponry and by which the present leadership cadre of Saddam Hussein will abdicate in exchange for guaranteed compensation and neutral-status asylum. The heart of this process is based upon the fair and long-term contracts to be established with the successor government of Iraq and its attractive and fair economic value for all current and legitimate stakeholders in Iraq’s petroleum assets. Petroleum assets will neither be seized nor assigned to any one dominant national or corporate group but will be acquired through a massive purchase plan based upon a valuation method and financing measures that guarantee the fair value reaching the Iraqi people and their government and also guaranteeing fair consideration and acknowledgment of prior contracts held by various companies.

The Plan rests upon its ability to satisfy the claims and interests of all foreign parties with legitimate interests in Iraq’s natural assets in a manner that enables the sustainability of a massive and long-term series of projects directed at Iraqi, Middle Eastern (including Palestinian), and Eurasian economic development and advancement based upon the central concept of global (planetary)

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

energy resources being fundamentally the assets and responsibilities of the global community, beyond the scope or ability of any one national or corporate interest group to manage or maintain.

What is the PERMA Bank?

The PERMA Plan calls for the establishment of an international corporation, the PERMA Bank, that is a fully functional for-profit corporation, organized according to international law as accepted by not only the primary sponsor nations but by the collective body of the United Nations – acting as a body of all national entities and not per se as the United Nations organization itself – for the purpose of managing profitably the exploitation and utilization of natural resources (in particular petroleum-based fuel resources in Iraqi territory) and the advancement of substitutes and alternatives for the energy consumption that is presently fed principally by petroleum-based fuels.

The PERMA Bank organization and management may be considered as being analogous to the Federal Reserve Board of the United States or the European Central Bank of the European Union. However, it differs in several respects. First and foremost, it is not an organization “belonging” to any one nation or to a formal group such as the EU. The PERMA Bank is an independent corporation, in which there are a variety of stakeholder and investor relationships with national governments and with private industry. The PERMA Bank will issue bonds and vote-limited shares, for instance, and its shareholders will include both governments and private corporations, notably firms engaged in oil and gas industry. The purchase of the bond and share issuances will be to support a coordinated, multinational and multicorporate effort at reconstructing Iraqi oil production and for creating improved oil and other petroleum storage, transportation, and infrastructures throughout the greater Middle East and Central Asia states, ranging as far north and east as Russia, Kazakhstan, Afghanistan and Iran. Moreover, these funds will be directed at energy and cultural-industrial advancement projects that are bootstrapped from the petroleum industry base and directed at development of new industries including new sustainable energy sources.

Many challenges and difficulties exist in the execution of the proposed PERMA Plan and the establishment of an organization such as the proposed PERMA Bank. However, these difficulties have precedents that have been addressed and solved many times over in both international politics and multinational finance. The challenges are small in comparison with the risks and costs associated with even a conventional, much less out-of-control military conflict that can spill over into mainland Europe and North America.

The fairness insurance by which the Iraqi oil resources as well as the PERMA Bank and its assets do not fall under the control of one isolated bloc will be a major challenge that can be addressed by several mechanisms of functional and legal checks and balances. Analogies may be drawn also to the mechanisms employed in not only the banking industry but among legislative and executive branches of government and corporate management. It is not suggested at this early phase that the Plan is anything short of a major balancing of power requiring extreme discipline and arbitrating skills among all parties that will be involved. However, these tasks are ultimately easier to accomplish than the reconstruction of lives, cities, and civilizations.

What the PERMA Plan offers is not only a way to avoid a major war that will cost thousands, and perhaps millions of lives on all sides including, given the risk of biological epidemics or the side effects of certain chemical or nuclear warfare actions, the loss of millions of lives within nations that are not directly involved in any portion of the disputes. The PERMA Plan alone among suggested

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

resolutions to the present conflict provides a vehicle for the defusing of the entire terrorist *raison d’être* and its infrastructure, enabling as part of its economic plan the social, agricultural, educational, and industrial development of a vast region of the earth spanning from North Africa through Iraq and Iran and into the former Soviet republics of Central Asia.

The Plan offers the means for energy resources to be managed in a manner that is fair and “ecosymbiotic” – economically and ecologically supportive of mutual groups and interests, a financial and social synergy that is not possible through a continuation of the past methods of approaching energy, especially oil, and especially the Middle East petroleum resources. The PERMA Bank will, as a for-profit institution, be managed for economic growth of its stakeholders and shareholders including the subcontractor companies, including the major world leaders in the petroleum industry. A central focus of the PERMA Plan and the PERMA Bank as an institution is the advancement, as well as management, of energy resources. This includes the deliberate consortial and consensual planning, design, development, and implementation of substitute fuels and alternative energy systems, not to the detriment of the petroleum industry but to its complement and extension over the coming decades and indeed centuries. This is something that must be done and the time for it to be undertaken in a major, global initiative is now, at a time when all of the elements of the corporate and governmental scenario are in place, to either move forward into war or into progressive new directions without war.

The advancement programs that the Plan will support and manage are varied but are focused upon principles of constructive synergy, with respect to national and ethnic interests, regional requirements, and the logical steps that will be most economical for the development of stable energy resources for the whole planet in the long and open future ahead. Several initiatives are suggested by the originators of the Plan, including the development of agricultural, residential, manufacturing, and transportation in the Middle East and Central Asia nations, all founded upon a philosophy that aspires to increase services, resources, and financial profit synchronously.

One of the most challenging aspects about the PERMA Plan is the very notion of a for-profit corporation that is international in origin and roots and which behaves trans-nationally and objectively without advancement of the interests of no single nation or bloc of nations as its explicit or implicit goal. This can only be achieved by a unique confluence of individuals who have the willingness, ability and spirit of self-sacrifice to take upon the tasks, plus the support of the respective nations and corporate groups behind the Plan. Such resolve, agreement, and consensus can only come about in times of great demand and necessity, when leaders and populations alike realize and accept the necessity to solve the problems at hand immediately and with minimal risks. These are the present times and there is no better time for such consensus and acceptance to occur. This may be one of the last chances when the international governmental and financial community has such an opportunity for a successful new move that transcends prior behaviors, expectations, and imaginations of what is realistically possible.

As extreme and radical as the PERMA Plan may appear at first glance, it is not as radical as the alternative, which is a war that may be far deadlier and catastrophic than any single war, or perhaps all wars, in all of human history. This is the somber reality that must be the backdrop for careful yet prompt thought about whether or not to pursue the PERMA Plan as a realistic alternative.

This summary does not go into details. Separate documents are available and there is constant round-the-clock preparation of materials that detail and support the plan.

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

The plan is by no means offered or suggested as a final work. To implement the plan will take the full cooperation and collaboration of many nations and corporations. However, the clock is ticking and the time is running out. Humanity is close to what could become its ultimate nightmare. Everyone has an image of how out of control things can become in the event of the outbreak of war in Iraq. We are, as a planet, days at most away from the brink of what could be far worse than the classic nuclear exchanges imagined during the Cold War years.

The PERMA Plan is presently only a beginning but it is a plan that needs to be considered by all nations and powers involved. It cannot trigger or hasten the outbreak of war but can only be one more rational and calming force to bring humanity from the brink of a catastrophe.

Please give consideration to the PERMA Plan. It is offered without association of specific authorship or ownership, in the hopes that a collective response by members of world governments involved in the conflict can bring a plan such as this into reality, before it is too late.

2.

An Unsurpassable Opportunity to Attain a Transforming Peace For More Than Our Time

Martin Dudziak
CORESE
1.March.2003

The argument has been raised that to negotiate with Saddam Hussein and to back off from a military intervention led by the United States of America will be tantamount to surrender and no different from backing off to Hitler over the Alsace and the Sudetenland.

The case has been made that war is the only option and that Saddam must go.

The case has been made that there are intolerable weapons of mass destruction manufactured and hidden in Iraq and ready to be deployed against any number of targets and that Iraq's government and infrastructure is aiding and supporting a worldwide terrorist network that is capable of, threatening to, and making plans to wage additional acts of terrorist warfare against the United States and other countries and institutions.

In a matter of days or weeks the world could be embroiled in a war of unprecedented and totally unpredictable proportions and consequences that will leave no country, no people, no economy, no industry unaffected.

There are alternatives discussed and offered by eminent world leaders, by dignitaries, by religious leaders, by the famous and well-known, the learned pundits and by any and all who have managed to obtain or be called upon to speak, before the United Nations, before councils, before the media.

What is presented here is unsolicited and comes from no embassy, no formal council, and from no official government source. However, you are reading it and listening to it because you believe that there should be a way to avoid this war, to avoid further armed conflict in the Middle East and throughout the world, and to obtain the gains of justice and fairness that you yourself believe to be due, even if at the moment you like the majority of people everywhere believe that such an equitable solution is unattainable.

There is no easy solution but there is a solution that is better than all of the alternatives that have yet been promoted. Indeed, aspects of what is presented here can be found in many of the more private and less publicized initiatives sponsored by several diplomats and organizations. What is here is something that goes further and dares to suggest that we have a way out of the dilemma that all sides can live with but it is going to take more than a few circles of diplomats to achieve - which is not to devalue or demean the activities of any individual, group, or nation, but to simply emphasize the gravity of the situation.

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

The problem we face is going to take the commitments of thousands of persons such as yourself, starting with the commitment to be willing to think seriously about the plan outlined herein. It is in the opinion of some a situation where mass action - not in the streets, not in a physical sense, and not in a contrary but rather a dramatically constructive and proactive sense - is the only way we are going to be able to really solve what has been created over decades and longer and not, indeed, by politicians, nor diplomats, nor armies, nor "oil barons."

The PERMA Plan is a viable plan than can address and solve the problem in the near-term and in the long-term for Iraq and the Middle East. It is not an American plan, nor French, nor Russian, nor from any Muslim state nor from any political or economic special interest group. It is not the invention or artifact of one person nor of one small cadre.

Signifying "Planetary Energy Resource Management and Advancement" (PERMA), the plan is now only in the beginning stages of refinement but one that is as feasible to implement as the armament and defense of Iraq has been feasible over a twenty year period even under extraordinary challenging conditions and as also is the deployment of an invasion force to render neutral that country's military arsenal and its present government.

Here you will not find the details of this PERMA Plan (they are available in other documents) but only the brief remarks necessary to urge you on your path to take a step that is profound, bold, and more than has been asked of you in the past, not in the way of physical strength or courage or emotional conviction, but in the way of a common sense gut-level faith that one plan can be engineered that is different from all the previous ones that are unacceptable and leaving the world in a stalemate.

The PERMA Plan aspires to establish nothing less than a fully functioning and profit-oriented global energy corporation, organized along the principles of a bank, multinational in nature, serving to preserve the natural rights of ownership and contractual relationships established, in place and/or understood and accepted by international law, regarding oil and other petroleum energy resources of Iraq and extending gradually to other resources. This bank will have fiduciary responsibilities to its stockholders and shareholders who are to be numbered in the millions and more, indirectly, through the representative boards and management that will be established.

The plan and the resulting manifest bank corporation will not belong to one country or interest group but it will preserve and sustain first and foremost the integrity of a world about to be shattered by war and it will be an effective pillar for the healing of relationships across the board between peoples and their governments East and West. To argue that this is not possible and merely idle idealism is to argue that there should be war or a status quo that is unacceptable to all parties including the people and government of Iraq which has been pushed deeper and deeper into a volatile condition through the events from 1991 to present.

The status quo cannot remain and it will not. The question is how it will change and what and who will be left after the next few weeks and months. There is a way out that does not involve war and the question of who and by whom the people of Iraq govern themselves is not one to be answered from outside.

It is clear and evident that the present crisis did not evolve over a short period of time nor did it happen unilaterally. That there have been extreme measures developed by the Iraqi government with unacceptable weapon systems is a matter that appears to be beyond doubt. That there have

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

been contributing forces from not only the United States but many other countries which led to those types of reactions and developments is also something that appears to be beyond doubt.

Now is not the time to engage in further blamesmanship over the past. It is war or a sensible and mutually acceptable alternative and - there are no further options and - the clock is ticking fast to a midnight without any clear indication of what can be beyond.

The PERMA Plan is not finished nor can it be really undertaken until there is an agreement on all sides to step into a closed room with no option of leaving until a solution is achieved. This is, of course, not meant to be taken literally, although it has been suggested by some that such literalism might enhance the process. However, no two parties, much less the United States led coalition and on the other side of the table Iraq and its supporters, will step toward any room or table, much less given any consideration to an outside "newcomer" plan, unless there is serious and credible "clout" behind it such that both sides cannot fail to see a possible "win" and a really viable attention from the other side.

We are talking about a "win-win" outcome indeed, because there is no viable alternative - there is no "win-lose" in this endgame, only "lose-lose." This is what both sides need to understand first of all, and next, that there is indeed a "win-win" which is in fact to build the independent corporate enterprise suggested by the PERMA Plan and to use it as the leveraging force to tackle what has been at the heart of all the problems - stability of the Middle East region's economy, energy, and its own enterprises and institutions.

There should be no question that the present Iraqi government can answer what motivated its military programs and what motivates its stalwart refusal to participate fully and openly in the mandates of the United Nations. There are concrete reasons, and there can be no doubt that they have much to do with perceptions of security, integrity, and economy, and at the heart of this is what drives every economy but particularly those of the Middle East region, energy resources including oil and gas. Ultimately these factors underlie anything and everything about territory and boundaries and national sovereignty and thence social structure, independence, education, and human rights.

There should be no question that there are also reasons for each and every action and plan undertaken by Al Qaeda and other organizations as part of its military campaigns against the United States and other countries. There are concrete reasons, and again these are inseparable from the same factors just described. First and foremost all these reasons must be accepted - not in agreement or consensus - for what they are, motives that have moved people to sacrifice and to take actions that were not made on a whim or without deliberation. When those commitments can be understood, when a sense of the motivating forces can be understood, then practical steps of a constructive and reconstructive nature - economically and politically and without military conflict - can begin to really take shape.

So how is there a "win-win" out of all this? How are we to believe that there can be any kind of reversal in mid course to what seems like a fateful momentum that can only end in a literal Armageddon?

The solution lies in you, personally and collectively. You, the individual reading this can make a difference, and it is your responsibility to at least give solid consideration as to how this may be the

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

case and how you can make a difference, even if you do not agree 100% or even 50% with anything that you have read thus far.

How can such a bold statement be made and what right does anyone have to make such an assertion?

It is this simple. You are a member of this human race, an educated member of this society, and you have grown up with your own efforts and with the hands and labor of everyone around you, before you, and in lands that are seemingly a million miles and years apart. You are not powerless. You have made effects on others, in business, in politics, in your personal life. Your reach is not limited to the space in which you have acted thus far or in which you feel most comfortable. You have intelligence, you have common sense, you have brought yourself to some point of personal and perhaps familial and professional success. You do "count" because even if your individual voice and power cannot be felt and cannot move the decision makers in both Washington and Baghdad to follow a different course, you and ten thousand or a million more can make a controlling difference in a way that has not been contemplated or attempted before.

The "how" is all about conviction and using resource-power that is understood by those on all sides who are about to clash swords because they do not see a viable third alternative.

In the past and even during these months and weeks there have been demonstrations, there have been letters, there have been polls and statistics. To speak against is merely that, to chant "No!" and express yourself, in a frustrated sort of way, but for the most part it yields no alternative solution, nothing practical, nothing viable to do instead.

Here and now before you is an opportunity to participate in an action expressly for a constructive solution, namely the creation of a very real and actual international banking corporation. Along the guidelines of the PERMA Plan, this bank will be dedicated to not only the management of petroleum and other resources but to the application of parts of its resources, certainly its profitable returns, and by all means its political voice and clout, for making dramatic forward steps in the construction and reconstruction of Iraq and neighboring countries.

The economic and social reconstruction of Iraq does not need a war to happen before it can begin. The funds that the United States and other countries are prepared to spend in both war and post-war activities can begin to be applied now, for a constructive effort in which the Iraqi people and their government can directly participate.

So what about you and your role? Where do you fit in and what is being suggested?

You are not being asked to write a letter, nor to demonstrate, nor to take any overt steps. You are also not asked to give or send money. Not now, and not in any traditional sense ever. The PERMA Plan is not a philanthropic non-profit venture. It is all about profit, but in a different manner than has been executed before by any private or public sector enterprise.

You are asked to make an expression of willingness to consider a commitment of support, including hopefully a commitment to give serious thought to making an investment of your resources or those you may influence or control, into something like a PERMA Bank, if and when it will be manifest.

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

You are asked to take a step as one among many and to do so in order to assist in building the only constructive and sensible demonstration that makes sense in these times, namely that there can be a non-military and "win-win" solution and not only for Iraq but for the Middle East as a whole including Palestine and Israel and other regions.

You are not asked to make a legal commitment or enter into a contract, but to express yourself in a manner that spells out what has been described thus far. There is not one single way and you can define how that expression will be if indeed you see to agree sufficiently with the points and arguments presented herein and backed up by other documents and explanations.

You may express yourself through a letter of intent or in more active measures, understanding that a letter that carries intention to put personal backing and resources into a future venture is one that together with many others can carry a lot of weight.

This is certainly radical. But radical steps are needed for radical problems grown out of hand. The usual idea of a radical solution is one that involves force, violence, and - no surprise - some type of militant action. On the contrary, this form of radicalism is far different and, its proponents would like to believe is understood, superior. It is constructivism 100% and a capital investment plan that has the two most important forms of collateral and payoff - people and energy.

The precise value of so doing - making a concerted group intent that has evidence of being backed up by capital and not only human feeling and emotion - is in our being able to make a progressively louder and clearer statement, with such backing, that there is a different way to solve this crisis and the larger Crisis and Conflict of the past fifty years and more.

When we can show that there is a real potential for private and institutional funding and backing for a PERMA Bank, that there are billions of dollars potentially available for this kind of action, then we have something that is a force to be reckoned with by all parties in the conflict. Money is not going to solve the problems, but it speaks louder than a crowd of 100,000 or 500,000 because it is focused, concrete, and can be used to accomplish something. When the world is looking down the wrong end of a gun barrel as it is today, seeing that several billions of dollars can be spent in one month for hostilities that can only push off further a solution of the fundamental conflict issues, when billions are available on both sides for preparations and arrangements to conduct a war, when millions can be applied to terrorist training and campaigns, then certainly it is reasonable to make every effort to redirect both sides to spending their billions and tens of billions upon reconstruction and new construction - socially, educationally, industrially, and otherwise - and for both sides to put aside the missiles and mortars.

There is only way that both sides are going to seriously listen, and that is when there are not merely voices and placards or just plain silence but when there is a clearly expressed alternative, with billions of dollars, euros, yen, pounds sterling, roubles and other currencies and equivalents to match. The PERMA Plan is such an alternative, and the PERMA Bank may be the very best and most significant investment you could make in your life. It may in fact help to save your life and that of the next generations. Now that is a return on investment that cannot be easily put aside and overlooked.

3.

Rights, Ownership, Responsibility and a Categorical Imperative for Our Times

Martin Dudziak
Planeta Znaniya, Moscow, Russia
March.2003

I have been given the opportunity to speak tonight on a subject that is sensitive to each person as an individual, as a member of a corporate body, and as a member of society. I welcome this chance to speak before such a distinguished and culturally diverse audience. My topic concerns rights, ownership, and responsibility, but I have given a hint of the direction in which I will be heading by including in the title the provocative phrase, "a categorical imperative for our times." I do not plan, however, to talk about Immanuel Kant nor much at all in philosophical terms but rather about some specific situations we are facing together in the present times, some on the very clear global front and others no less significant even though much less known to the news media general public.

The reason I bring up a "categorical imperative" will become more clear as we proceed, but the reason should be stated from the outset in no uncertain terms. When I examine through history what people have said, done, and implied about such things as civil rights, ownership (be it of tangible property and assets or something intangible such as "intellectual property"), and civil responsibility, I find two recurrent voices and one recurring statement of evidence. The one voice is that of privacy and self, asserting the right to various freedoms for me and mine, the right of self-expression, free speech, ownership of property, retention of what has been earned and owned and inherited, and in general all centered upon I-me-mine. The second is that of restraint, sacrifice, and responsibility for others and something almost intangible but always there, the "whole" of which we are as individuals or companies only parts.

"Don't tread on me" was the motto, below the poised-to-strike viper, on an early American colonial flag that saw its time during the Revolutionary War with the British. It certainly reflected something about the colonies as a group, but first and foremost all the issues about liberty and freedom had their roots in the desires and determinations of private individuals to "do their own thing." If taxation, perceived to be without fair representation, was one of the triggers for raising this flag and others in revolt against England, it was not the only trigger and by far not the only cause, since the voice of individual self-determination and personal liberty was a dominant force in the decisions of many persons and families to take leave of England, France, Netherlands and other countries in the first place for the unknown territories of North America.

"Self" has always been with us in every culture and we find talk of its nature, its positive qualities, and its limits and dangers, in the writings of every culture that thankfully survive with us today, from the Vedas to the Bible and Koran and virtually all religious and philosophical traditions. Today, however, we have magazines and literature, even college courses, dedicated to the development of a strong self-determination and the cultivation of a will to assert over others competitively. The awareness that we can do something opens up incredible possibilities for personal, community, and organizational development, but it also provides some stimulus to forget

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

about limitations, bounds, and responsibilities, something that needs to be a constant reminder and refresher.

This voice of individualism and expansion has been a major force in the championing and the successes of modern capitalism. It has fueled the growth of private companies and small industries into powerful multinational conglomerates that are in some cases more expansive, wealthier, and more powerful in resources and manpower than many sovereign states. It is a voice that gets stronger by acquisition and competition, by building and retaining, merging and acquiring further. It is not something that we propose to stop or quench even if we could dream of doing so, for it would be not only impossible but it would be fighting against the waves of the sea - it is in our nature and we all have this impulse and this voice. However, we can see that as with any voice that becomes too dominant and overpowering in a chorus, disharmony and imbalance can result.

The second voice is one that has often been confused, especially by its most ardent supporters and champions, with being a call to dismantle or at least subdue the first. This is the voice calling for the individual and the community to take care of those who have needs, who are disadvantaged, who are poor. It is a call for sharing and distribution of assets, for working with an aim of putting the greater good of all ahead of one's own objectives and desires. This voice has been loudly espoused by many philosophers, politicians, and is by no means new to the 20th century or even to the 19th. The confusion about how to responsibly and effectively set right imbalances of wealth and opportunity for living and pursuing meaningful and happy lives is what has been the tremendous debate of centuries and the theme of revolutions and calls for revolution since the Middle Ages when debates raged in the halls of monasteries and in the chambers of the Vatican.

These two voices have yet to achieve a harmony although many today would like to believe that we are already "there" or almost "there." This is nice, that we can pat ourselves on the back about our progress, yet this is precisely where the recurring "statement of evidence" comes into the picture. First of all, the loudest statements about our progress in bettering the world and the human condition have come since the beginning of the 20th century and in parallel with a period of escalating war and carnage that makes all prior wars and periods seem quite peaceful in comparison, even after some normalizing and adjustments for the numbers of populations involved over different centuries.

The key to understanding what has been going on and how there may be a solution if we as a people and not just as isolated individuals and small groups are willing to accept it, is in the word, "responsibility." What does it really mean, because the general implication in many peoples' minds is that it is something to do with blame, fault, obligation, and onus? The English word "responsibility" literally means *response ability* - the ability to respond, to act, to do something if and when it needs to be done. It is a pointer to something about power, potential to exercise power, possession of knowledge, resources, and a host of other attributes that are or can be necessary in order to accomplish some form of response to a situation or a calling for action.

When we examine the processes of wealth and growth of wealth, alongside those of social action for correction, for progress, for repair and setting things aright, whether in the physical and economic senses or in the moral and political senses, the evidence shows that there is a heightened and special *response ability* by those who have gained and grown the most for those others who have provided the tools and fabric for such growth. Those that have gained and that possess the most have the greatest *response ability* to manage prudently that which is in their sphere of influence, not simply because there are others who need and do not have but because they are the ones who have the most means, the most energy and wealth to make the greatest effects with their resources. Admittedly,

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

the real resources - the brains, the brawn, the sheer "muscle power" literally or figuratively in the form of euros and dollars and labor - may be coming from any number of other people, but the ones who can most effectively motivate, inspire, coordinate, facilitate, and in general lead some development - some response - from concept to completion are those who have the greater resource controls of media and money and the influence that comes from being in politically visible and influential positions, generally because of the media and the money. This may be a very cut and dry way of looking at matters but it is basically how things operate and that is neither good nor bad, it is simply one of the "laws of physics" for social organization and the "body politic." He who can do the most is response-able to be the most active and productive for the greater good. And with that comes the other sense or senses of responsibility, namely the duty and obligation to act when one does have the authority (implicitly or explicitly given) and ability to take action. However this is precisely what often does not happen.

What does happen is that self-interest and self-fulfillment for the individual and the group, particularly for the corporation and the nation-state, all very natural and not to be denied or discouraged, becomes confused with the competitiveness and separatism that is also a very natural part of the corporate and national life. This competitiveness and assertiveness is essential in proper measure for each entity's proper growth and sustenance. I maintain that it is essential also for healthy synergy and symbiosis among individuals and organizations including states. However, it can get out of control or go out of bounds. This is to what I refer to as a confusion about self-interest which does not imply always putting oneself first or ahead.

This confusion cuts into the response-ability and necessity to act on that ability for what I venture to name as a "categorical imperative" for each entity - corporation, nation, union of nations, and even individual - to make constructive actions for the greater good of the whole to which the entity belongs. It is categorical because it applies to a type or category of action, namely actions that are concerned with relationships between members of some group toward each other and towards the whole to which they all belong and cannot be separated. It is imperative because there is a requirement that is more than a strong suggestion or directive - it is something that cannot be done without.

Rather than to argue from the abstract as to why there is a real imperative, a mandate that cannot be relinquished, for corporations, states, and also individuals or power and means to respond to the needs of the whole and of the lesser advantaged parts of the whole to the best of their abilities and means, including not only economical but political and social means, I want to simply bring up some concrete examples. Most of these are from the very recent past and from contemporary events for which the outcome is still undecided. I refer to Rwanda, Bosnia, Kosovo, Chechnya, and Iraq, and in mentioning only these five places I do not intend to leave out Yemen, Sudan, Afghanistan, Israel, Palestine, Northern Ireland and, unfortunately, many others.

4.

Bombs into Bulldozers: Transforming Military Production into Terraforming and Eco-Energy Farming for Peace and Profit

Martin Dudziak

Center for Collaborative Research and Education in Sustainable Energy
Moscow, 16.March.2003

The streets of the world's cities and the front pages of all newspapers are frequently filled with outcries for peace and an end to military conflicts. No one can be found to speak out in favor of deliberately taking a military solution instead of alternatives, if such be agreed to exist, for any given conflict situation. We have today and for the past several months a situation, imminently to become a major armed conflict, that has made it clear that millions do not want war, even those who feel compelled that the circumstances dictate the need for such action. Hundreds, if not thousands of different non-governmental organizations and foundations spend millions of dollars on public relations campaign against arms trafficking and the increase of weaponry and ordnances of not only mass-destruction capability but of conventional types as well. This is a pattern of activity that has been continuous, unrelenting, and that has earned through direct or indirect action on this behalf the majority of Nobel Peace Prizes since the prize's inception in 1901.

Nonetheless, here we face a war of proportions and risks that the world has not seen since perhaps Korea or World War 2, and the "causus belli" has been precisely the build-up of armaments and arsenals out of proportion and containing a variety of extreme and menacing forms of weaponry. The focus is on Iraq and Saddam Hussein but the same buildup and dissemination of rampant armaments is to be found all over the Middle East and throughout the world. Sept. 11, 2001 was not the beginning, if we remember Nairobi and the USS Cole and a seemingly innumerable number of pizza parlors, buses, malls, and streets full of pedestrians and children.

With the continued growth of not only military budgets but arms exports and the growth of armed conflict around the world, primarily within but occasionally among sovereign states, it should be obvious that something is missing from the equation. This something is not all that easy to identify and it may be that the majority of readers and listeners here will disagree with what I have to say. This missing ingredient is also something that is not a "fault" or "blame" placed at the feet of all those individuals and organizations that have been striving to achieve a more peaceful and less militant world. Furthermore - and here I will clearly be stepping on a lot of feet and offending a number of sensibilities - the finger is not pointed chastisingly at those who have been wielding and waving all the guns.

I want to ask you to step back for a moment, not in time but in perspective. For at least the "purpose of argument" try to look at the matter of world military processes - armaments, defense, production, purchases, deployment, indirect use as a threatening and very potent lobbying tool and direct use in confrontation - in what I will dare to call a more holistic and comprehensive viewpoint. Try to imagine seeing things from the vantage points and dispositions of many different players in the

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

Game - citizens of countries with incredibly different cultural and economic standpoints and values, heads of multinational corporations and banks, heads of small and medium sized companies and institutions, leaders of countries large and small.

When we think of the range of countries and their influence today, alone as one parameter to our "vision" of the world, we see a spectrum that ranges from superpower status (often given in the popular press to the United States of America but not without reason for dispute for a number of points) down to what many people would call "don't count" status of small nations that to date have not been sources of major conflict nor of substantial products, energy, natural resources, or people. And through the entire bandwidth of this spectrum we notice that there is not a single country, for instance, that can be unilaterally and absolutely cast in a firm position as to its importance - or its membership as a "don't count" state - regarding world politics and military importance. Prior to certain conflicts, few people ever heard of much less gave thought to the Falklands, Grenada, East Timor or Diego Garcia. Likewise people have, prior to the outbreaks of hostilities and cataclysms of human suffering and destruction, rarely thought much about the military arsenals and build-ups within Rwanda, Uganda, Nigeria, Ivory Coast, or to shift continents, to Iraq and Iran. Yet, as events in slightly over two decades have shown, and mainly with in the past five years, an unwatched and untended kettle on even a small camp stove can start the kitchen on fire.

If we start to put ourselves in the position of people in different organizations, like private companies, including companies that have built up large infrastructures around the design, production and marketing of military systems, we also start to see that it is not so easy to typecast and characterize everything according to simple formulas. I am not going to target even for discussion any particular companies - we all know some names - because my point is not to point fingers and not to give the wrong impressions. In fact, I want you to be willing to look at the perspectives of a company that is in the arms manufacturing business explicitly, just like I want you to look through the windows on the world of a country that is buying guns and planes and tanks. I don't want you to take sides but I want you to imagine how things get to be that way and how we may need to take a different approach toward reducing the impulse to buy, load, aim and fire.

When I chose the expression, "bombs into bulldozers," I did it knowingly thinking of the much older and oft-used phrase, "from swords into plowshares." We have all heard it, we all admire it in some fashion, and we all know it is not working well at all. In fact, let's face it - the efforts to disarm and pacify our backyard have been fairly seriously unsuccessful and it is about time that we admit this if we are going to be able to figure out together a better solution.

All sorts of people can raise their hands and voices to point out the great successes of the past century and especially following 1945. Yes, a number of very serious and potentially world-catastrophic outbreaks of full nation vs. nation war have been avoided or brought to a close. Many internal conflicts including ethnic cleansing and genocide-driven conflicts such as in Rwanda and the Balkans have been - well, hardly cured or finished, but at least reduced, curtailed, subsided. And who knows how many other Milosevics have held back or been held back by the realization that some form of military and economic intervention would be heading their way.

Yes, we have had a lot of progress, but we need to examine what are some of the reasons for the failure to attain more solid and stable progress in demilitarizing the planet. That is really what is at stake and at issue. We need to demilitarize Planet Earth. That is the first step to having some type of lasting peace, the kind that only a few regions of the globe seem to have been able to experience for any duration more than a couple of generations. In fact, step one is realizing that this is not a

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

world society with some 50+ conflicts going on, spread out mostly thinly across the globe and also, with the exception of growing movements such as Al Qaeda, not integrated or organized with one another. Instead, we are living Inside a chronic War, and it just so happens that some of the more glaring and flashy battles have subsided and certain regions and economies have been left alone for the most part.

Today, with what has opened up across the world explicitly since Sept. 11, 2001, and which now has been culminating as a conflict involving the whole world at the negotiating tables and diplomatic offices if not (hopefully, still) on the field of battle, we have to ask what is the different approach we can take that will be more effective than the peacemaking and disarmament logic we have been using thus far. What can we do differently? What have we been missing?

I believe the answers start back in the ways we look and do not look at the making, selling, buying and ultimately using of weapons and armies. We have to "get into the heads" of arms makers, arms dealers, generals, soldiers, politicians, farmers, factory workers, scientists, and everybody else, and not the ones we know or think we know from the circles we keep but those with whom we have little contact and little in common.

Isn't this asking too much? Isn't this an impossible exercise? And where can it lead, constructively, as far as developing new policies and strategies? What can we do differently and gain from such exercises that will change the minds, policies, and ultimately the manufacturing and marketing and purchasing behaviors of the countries and non-governmental factions that make our World War Continuum to go on and on without abatement?

First of all it is not asking too much when we are in the situation where we are today. We have no choice but to make some big changes planetwise and substantially so in the near future. It does not take a prophet - and I certain do not mean to speak in that fashion - to see that we cannot just go on like this. Soon defense, security and counter-terrorism will dominate our economies and our behaviors and we will be a world that lives and works in order to maintain a military-security infrastructure that will eat up GDPs and cut drastically into not only our opportunities to advance culturally but our psychological health to simply live and enjoy the seventy to eighty-plus years that many, statistically, can hope to have. Furthermore, with each year that passes without some way of seriously redressing the problem of global unrestricted warfare (aka terrorism) and its underlying causes, we grow closer to unleashing a Domsday catastrophe of biological or nuclear mechanism that if it is not sufficient alone to set us back into the Dark Ages or an even darker cavern, can also trigger an economic and social collapse that will finish off the task.

This is not doomsday talk. It is basic elementary Logic 101. We all know that certain probabilities may individually be very low, but we also know that in the "real world" there is a good chance that something of low probability will happen. And to cast things in the most simple and everyday analogy - when you have a beautiful glass vase, you understand that reasonably cared for it will be safe and intact but if it does crash to the floor, it can never be simply put back together. Babies are resilient and strong, too, and yet we take extra strong and above-probability precautions to prevent babies from falling down stairs, knowing the irreparable injuries or death that can result from one of those slight, slight low probabilities.

My point is that this planet, our world, is in the same condition as a small baby crawling around the edge of a long flight of stairs. We need to find a better solution than to be always running across the room to catch the baby from tumbling down the stairs to death or massive injury, catching her just-

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

in-time. This is how we have been handling the world's growing conflicts and consequent ever-growing militarism.

In 1945 we had Little Man and Fat Boy. We obliterated two cities and some 88,000 lives in a flash. Those were not highly populated cities. Then we went on to build 20-megaton H-bombs that can obliterate, today, millions in a blinding flash.

Today we have MOAB - the Mother Of All Bombs. It only looks like a nuclear blast when it goes off, but it may as well be for all that it can do. What's more we have the means to spread any number of a variety of unrestrained viral or bacterial epidemics across the planet within a matter of several days, and to do the same to food and water supplies.

So. Things being so bad, and if they have not worked out right before, how should we proceed? On top of that, who am I to suggest that a new solution will work when others offered and engineered by many with higher credentials and qualifications have not yet succeeded?

First of all, forget about the author and speaker. Frankly, if something works, it works because of the validity of the concepts and because people who can implement, who do have credibility, who have connections and power, have decided to put their weight, muscle and resources into making the effort. Secondly, as I said earlier, we really have no choice - we have to find a working solution, so we must take on an attitude that we cannot fail. That does sometimes help to give an extra boost and source of inspiration!

Now to the alternative plan that is the real subject of this paper.

Let's go back to to people who make and trade and buy the bombs. Suppose we consider this notion of transforming "bombs into bulldozers". What does it really mean and how can we actually enlist the support and resources of the bombmakers and bombtraders and bombwielders into the cause of peace and activities such as are suggested by my title, "terraforming and eco-energy farming for peace and profit"? How do we change the dynamics so that instead of Us trying to convince All of Them to stop doing what they have been accustomed and trained to do and about which they may firmly believe that they need to be doing, and instead start doing activities that are radically different?

Think about it. What has been going on has been beautiful and rational work towards pacifying the planet but it has not been very successful at convincing arms makers to make bulldozers instead of bombs, or arms traders to be dealing in solar panels instead of land mines, or governments to buy windmills and maglevs instead of F-16s and MIGs, or generals to become project managers instead of planning the next first strike.

What has been left out of the all-important Equation for Peace is the part where we actually apply the energy and resources including not only money-power but people-power and mind-power for the outcome we are trying to achieve. This part is where the terraforming and eco-energy farming come into the picture.

What is the biggest and most profitable and long-lasting business opportunity ahead of us as a planet and as one people and one market? It is not telecommunications and information technology. It is not automobiles. It is not any particular consumer product or service. Bigger than any business with bombs is the business of energy and power applied to transforming large parts of the planet

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

from being useless to useful for one or more of the many things we do as humans - live, work, farm, build, travel, recreate, pray or simply beautiful and leave for posterity. Bigger than war and longer-lasting are the pyramids and the equivalent of what we are talking about - mega-projects that can reshape significant parts of the planet from the standpoint of economic and social utility - are those ancient pyramids and structures like them.

I am not suggesting that we apply the armies and military complexes of the world to build pyramids and monuments - although even that would be better than what we are doing now with a lot of our people and resources. Instead I am arguing for an economic plan that is more ambitious than any that has ever been conceived before in history and that encompasses multiple nations, contractually and in binding commitments through investments and securitization far beyond the scope of any deal undertaken by any of the banks and investment houses to date. A trillion -dollar deal at minimum - and to think of it, that is not much more than combining a couple of the biggest petrol corporate mergers of the past five years, so we are not far away from doing such things in the convention corporate sector

We need to retool, not close down the military production and deployment systems of the world because simply trying and pushing to shut them down - or reduce their infrastructure and economic life - will only meet with resistance. We need to have something with which to replace the ordnances and equipment, a concrete plan that is not just a turning off or turning down. It is much easier to get someone to change - for instance, to choose something different from a menu if the item that person wants is not available or you would rather for some reason have them pick a different offering - when you can give them a choice of an alternative. "Take B or C or D" is likely get a better response from the person who picked A, when there is a choice of something else. But if all we are doing stays along the lines of "stop doing A because it is not humane or it breeds further conflict" and we are not suggesting a B or C that is meaningful to the person or company or nation-state we are trying to influence, then we don't make much progress, as contemporary history shows us straight up and in our faces.

The alternative paths that are going to be most influential are those that are perceived as soundly offering economic and political attractors. Money and power paths for the people who already are on money and power paths with arms. Is this a worthy trade and aren't we perhaps inviting some further disaster by "courting" those who do not share in the same vision of global synergy and mutual dependency and growth? What kinds of projects would really be sufficient attractors and what will be good enough for people and governments to want to reduce drastically the money and attention spent on weapon systems of all types including conventional forms, which happen by the way to be the way we kill thousands and millions of ourselves each year?

This is where the terraforming and eco-energy projects come in again. We have a planet that has vast tracts of land, not to mention ocean space, unused and undeveloped, and no one would argue to leving it all as-is and barren, if there is an opportunity to engage in ecologically sound projects to create more arable and habitable land. We have vast reaches that can be used for the generation of sustainable and renewable and virtually "free" energy from solar, wind, and tidal sources, and despite the present lower yields and economic inefficiencies of some forms of such systems when compared to the cheaper and quicker burning of petroleum fuels or the slower consumption of nuclear fuels, the fact remains that we can, today, generate enormous outputs of electricity alone from these sources. It is amazing to consider that the highest concentration of human life in history known to be present in certain stretches of western and southern Iraq have been and are likely to be those of modern armies competing in the hot sun in battles over mainly military targets in an area

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

that with appropriate retooling and redeployment of the military "Machine" could be sources of power, islands of agriculture, and homes to people who are otherwise cramped or impoverished.

Look at the areas of the globe that have had the attention of the United Nations and its several relief and sustenance organization - UNHCR, UNICEF, WHO, UNESCO, for instance - and also NGOs like Medicine sans Frontiers, ICG, Relief International, and the Red Cross. Moving east to west for a change - Indonesia, Cambodia, Bangladesh, India, Tibet, Afghanistan, most of the Central Asian former Soviet republics, Iran, Iraq, the Balkans, Somalia, Ethiopia, virtually all of Central and West Africa, and most of Latin America. Now look where most of the arms from the USA, France, Russia and China have been exported. Now flip the page in your mind and look at where all the oil and gas deals are getting hot and hotter and where either "production" or "pipeline" is in every other headline of or byline that deals with those areas.

We can do something different, we need to, we must, and we have no choice. We need to radically demilitarize these regions to begin with and then proceed through the rest of the world. We have to stop focusing all the attention on demilitarization and disarmament on the big powers, although that is not to say they should maintain their status quos, nor that we should omit our concerns and efforts about stopping nuclear, biological or chemical weapons proliferation in countries like North Korea, and we need to focus more on demilitarizing these global-beltline states. And the only way we can hope to be successful in the near term and in a substantive and lasting way is by giving good, solid alternatives that are very economically attractive to the people who will make the choices and enforce them.

We have to produce profitable deals to replace the bombs and the deals that will be most profitable, secure and lasting are those having to do with land and energy because ultimately that is what drives everything and which creates, sustains, and pushes forward other business development and other forms of profitable growth. These are cold hard facts. After land and energy are in place there start to be opportunities for a lot of things to take root and grow - human rights, civil reforms, education, sexual fairness, political freedom, and the whole nine yards of what so many people want to see happen and often push for too hard, too soon, in the misguided spirit of liberation and goodness of the heart.

Land and energy first, because that is what people stand on, where they build their houses, and later their schools and theaters, and it is what they use to cook food and keep themselves warm. Today we are seeing that these are the fundamentals, but still we have been pushing things that come from mainly intellectual sources - the philosophies of freedom and advanced human rights. We have to start with elementary human rights - the right to be alive and not swept up in one war after another, the right to be free of constant invitations to cheaply exterminate your neighbor or your former neighbor, the right to not be caught in the middle of internecine ethnic rivalries that would not possibly be so exacerbated were it not for the fact that it is so easy to buy rifles, ammo and grenades.

We can be turning bombs into bulldozers pretty easily from an industrial and economic standpoint. Remember how quickly in the ancient sixty-plus years ago world of the Second World War that countries like the United States and Great Britain were able to shift from Packards and Rolls to Pattons and P-39s. Remember how the Soviet Union of 1941-43, less advantaged than her allies, was able to pack up and move production into the no-man's land of Siberia, unpack, and start producing for her fight against the Nazi invaders. It is definitely not an issue of things being too difficult or challenging especially in a day when we have such incredible advances in communication and information processing. We just need to believe that we need to get ourselves

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

into gear with the same fervor and determination as people did around the world in 1940 - 45. We just need to want to do it and we will be able to do so.

My intuition says that we will undergo some more hard lessons, maybe in the not too distant future right smack in the middle, center stage, with Iraq and the Middle East environs around Iraq. If not there, then somewhere else, perhaps North Korea. We are a stubborn lot, us humans, and it has not been sufficient to kill off some tens of millions of ourselves in the space of a few years, nor to have the most grueling scenes of torture and suffering to unarmed and non-fighting families, women and children put before our collective eyes, for getting us to be sufficiently primed and motivated to finally do something about the problem. However, if we begin to think in terms of working toward a practical profit-oriented economic initiative that can really attract people toward an industry of peace instead of an industry of war, we may be able to see some solid results in an amazingly short period of time.

Let's examine the ways in which an economic plan that has land, energy, agriculture, transport and new industry can assist in removing the guns from the streets and the bombers from the skies. A major part of the conflict between Israelis and Palestines is over specific definite turf - sites, towns, streets. A lot of the conflict is also over something less tangible. It has to do with regions but it is not always about specific coordinates. If there was more arable and attractive land the conflict would be mitigated. That alone would not solve everything but it would take some of the steam and punch out of both sides of extremists who do not want to work out an equitable settlement because they have or think they have too much at stake, namely miniscule chunks of land and neighborhood that are decent for living or working, beside which is only desert and scrub.

When the only good water is from a handful of wells, the value of a vast Dead Sea is negligible. Were there to be for instance a dual pipeline system, stretching from the oil fields around Muzaf and Tikrit in the north and carrying both oil and equally precious water to regions in Jordan, Syria and the West Bank, we might be opening up several thousand square miles to a new generation of people who will find such a new "Imperial Valley" more attractive than certain specific regions that have been a battleground since 1948 lines were drawn in the sand. I am not talking about areas that have special cultural bonding and roots going back centuries. I am talking about turf that is now and for the past three generations a battleground littered with corpses of children because it has been the only turf worth fighting or talking about. Nobody wants empty desert with nothing developed. However, take a look at what was accomplished through the irrigation of the early 20th century in parts of Arizona and southern California alone. Before there are too many shouts, I want to point out that in 1900 and 1920 and 1930 there was nothing comparable in terms of technology and organization to what there is today. The big machines did not exist, the advanced modern concrete and construction materials did not exist, nor the power generation, pumping, piping, and other necessary technologies. We did not have the industrial and organizational skills and prior experience to launch such a massive embarkation as the construction of a trans-Iraq irrigation network. And we certainly did not have the information and communication technology.

Look at Osaka Airport. Look at the Alaska pipeline. Look at how a massive 250,000+ armed force has been deployed at the border of Iraq, in the middle of the desert for all intents and purposes, complete megasystems for not only putting 250,000 people to work day after day but to launch a war and to deal with casualties, hospitalization, and a human relief effort that must, all acknowledge, begin almost immediately and simultaneously with the launching of any attack, to serve the needs of perhaps 15 million people or more of the 23 millions in Iraq alone who will be pushed to the brink of starvation, thirst, and disease.

We can do all that we do in the name of war, and we can do it in the name of large-scale economic development for the things that we have become accustomed to understand to be important and necessary, such as getting oil and gas out of the ground and into our factories and furnaces and automobiles.

We can surely do a similar but less-stressed and less-rushed effort and with less risk and cost to build another economic development, one that will be equally or more profitable than any of the things to which we have become accustomed, but which is simply different and new to our thinking because we have historically put such types of projects out of mind and into an artificial category of being unrealistic, utopian, impossible.

Why is it not utopian and not unrealistic to recreate and extend a Fertile Crescent, to fashion a new Imperial Valley, where now there is scrub and brush, no water and virtually no people? Why is it practical to think that such a project could be economical and could attract the interests and support of tens of thousands - no, millions, who would need to give this their backing with heart and soul - and I really mean that, because they are going to have to put down their weapons and tactics, both sides now, and take an approach which is really very different from everything they have seen, felt, breathed, and heard for most or all of their human lives.

It all comes down to this, a kind of "catch-22" situation. It should be easy to see the economics and the profitability of such an undertaking or anything like it, provided one can put aside for a moment, call it "for the purposes of argument," all the hesitations and look twenty, fifty, one hundred and more years down the road. Picture a network of fertile, verdant settlement regions - not just small towns, but clusters of residential, agrarian and soft-industry developments, spanning from the Negev to the Al Qirah and to Tikrit. Picture rail and highway links but primarily fast light rail as the main transportation network. (Why? The question is rather, why build old-style when one is starting from scratch. All around it will be more efficient and convenient. But this is a design issue that we don't need to argue today.) Picture sufficient energy through gas, solar, wind and thorium-based nuclear plants. (Again, hold the hot sauce - there are arguments pro and con on that last point but not for now.) Picture communities with good jobs and good schools and good entertainment and leisure.

Now where is this going to be profitable to the countries and corporations that are going to back the venture of building all this and where is the guarantee that hundreds of thousands of people are going to want to live here this way and in the process, from the outset, put down the rifles and the grenades? Getting back to our original point and the title of this paper, where is the path from the bombs to the bulldozers?

The convincing answers are not going to come from my remaining sentences and paragraphs nor from a few 200-page special analytical reports. But I am going to try to sow enough seeds of conviction to gain your confidence that this is not only a reasonable way to go but perhaps The only reasonable way for us to get out of our hole of death and to transform the bombs into the bulldozers.

The popular support is going to be from the concrete, visible, believable economics. When people see things happening - even before the first spade of earth is lifted, so to speak - when they can really believe that it is not more hype from Washington, New York, and the West, frankly, and when they see that they have a real say in what is going on, and when their leaders are involved as much as the people in suits, then there will be changes. When there are key people from all the factions put to work on planning projects and working out what it should all become, instead of having

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

things done and talked about for them in distant cities and with a complete disconnect between what is in the streets and what is the talk from UN headquarters or Brussels or Riyadh for that matter - then there will be some changes for the better.

There needs to be something concrete and realistic for the future, not just about agreements to stop fighting and sit down. There needs to be a vision and right now there is none. The only vision is to stop fighting and let the other side get something that your fathers and mothers and children have sacrificed and died for. The only vision is to give up ad lose homes and homelands, and to have one house or neighborhood or the other demolished and torn down. What kind of peace plan is that? Stop fighting, and we will bulldoze your settlement or your neighborhood and draw some more lines in the sand. Do you really expect people to lay down their arms just for more lines in the sand?

When people really understand and believe - when they feel within their blood and bones - that they have a vested interest in something new and real, that they have a say in things and that there is a practical economics being put together that will be good for their children and their children, then you will see real interest and progress like never before. And with the interest comes the energy - I mean, the people-energy, the spirit that moves the wind and fans the flames, now for work and construction, of ideas and of reservoirs, roads, pipelines and communities.

Every pipeline project in the Middle East has been about oil and gas for Some Place Else. The West. With some money coming back in exchange, and that's about it. We are talking here about a pipeline that goes nowhere but to the people who are going to be building it. We are talking about investments that can make the business of petroleum the smaller part of the economy for the countries involved. It is not going to be a five-year or ten-year return, that is for certain! But the world has been financing things for longer returns for a lot longer time than the mania for immediate ROI has been spread like an epidemic from the Wall Street of the early Nineties, thanks in big part to what I call the "Mad Dot.Com Disease."

There are ways to finance this that will be profitable from the point of view of the financing process and certainly for the long-term yield from the industries and commerce that will evolve. We are not talking generations but really a matter of a few decades to the point of seeing good returns. It is obvious what will be the consequences of building houses, offices, transportation networks, agribusinesses, and power systems. Is there any member of the Global Fortune 1000 that will not see a good chunk of change coming their way from these projects? Certainly the companies that might feel they will lose the most with a reduction in the arms trade will actually be among the winners because with modest retooling they will be able to participate profitably in many aspects of the enterprises. Furthermore, some incentives can be provided to both governments and corporations for such retooling. Let's not talk about disbanding anyone's armies, either - let's talk about putting them to work. What is the difference between a construction crew of GIs building berms and barriers and trenches versus building channels for irrigation ducts and pipes or landscaping for solar panel farms or residential areas? Nothing, except that you are not expecting to have to kill or be killed in the trench you are digging and at the end of the day you are not cleaning your rifle but your shovel.

Besides, being real heroes does not mean that ultimately one has to die with a sword in hand. We need more who make the sacrifice of self during their lives by building something. The sacrifices are no less sometimes.

Excerpts from "The PERMA Papers" by Martin J. Dudziak

This is the message for the world financial community and the world leadership circles - there is a very straightforward way to transform our military production into more profitable economic developments, and it is so attractive that it is ridiculous to not be pushing for such transformations. The wrong way is to think of just stopping and standing still, all the bombs and guns put away or melted down. The wrong way is to persist in thinking in terms of regional development by "foreign aid" and piecemeal haphazard awards and distributions. The wrong way is to be approaching all this still as a collection of many countries and organizations including multinational corporations that are all acting separately.

We need a major, mega-sized joint venture and it is definitely not a United Nations agency or committee. We need a financial structure, a management structure, an executive organization that has control and mandates and objectives which ultimately are to generate a serious profit for its investors and shareholders out of everything that will follow. The investors and shareholders are governments and corporations. Ultimately things are answerable to some other sets of voters - the people who are the citizens of several or many countries and the people who are the shareholders of the different corporations that will participate financially.

We need to form such a venture soon because time is running out for Camp David Meetings and special get-togethers in other polite settings far removed from the streets of Gaza, Bethlehem, Haifa and Tel Aviv. We absolutely need to make something that is realistic and convincing to the people who are doing the fighting on both and all sides. First we need to understand from the economic perspective that what can be done will be profitable and then we need to argue that with conviction to those who are not sure. Arguments based primarily on the virtues of stopping the fighting and taking better care of the human condition through humanitarian relief and foreign aid packages are not going to work sufficiently. Don't get me wrong - they have been essential, they have helped immensely, they are still necessary especially during any transitional phase. But they are not enough, were never enough, and will not suffice to build a stable and lasting Real Peace in the Middle East. Peace will come when it is profitable and believably so to enough of the people in the picture on all sides and so far that hasn't happened. The only way to make it more profitable than war is to address the big picture of the environmental and energy infrastructure and to start there for building the economic engines of communities, agribusiness, manufacturing, transportation, and education.

As I complete the finishing touches to this paper I realize that we are poised for what everyone in the media is saying is an inevitable Iraq War. It may have already started this morning, and if not then perhaps tomorrow. I will be surprised if the fullscale outbreak can be avoided. Either way, we have to make a big change about what we have been doing about handling conflict and not only in the Middle East regions. In fact, I have focused upon that area of the planet only because it is such a major and constant source of conflict and military action, but we all know there are a score of other fires that need being put out and with some measures other than by soldiers, planes and bombs. We know we that the only lasting way to stability is through projects that reshape and reform the physical and social environment in such manner that there are homes, schools, shops, offices, factories, and farms. That is physical. That is tangible. That is what people can walk on, live in, work in. That makes the difference. If such projects require building trans-desert pipelines and aqueducts, reservoirs, power plants, rail lines, and entire cities and neighborhoods, it is something we are very well equipped to do and we have proven ourselves historically over and again that we can do such big works.

Excerpts from “The PERMA Papers” by Martin J. Dudziak

We just have to convince ourselves that it is not only noble, just, and good but that it is the most economically sound and sensible initiative before us on the table and far more attractive than the option of maintaining our collective and dead-end arms race.

Thank you.

**{{ END OF EXCERPTS
Contact Aletheia Press to obtain the full version}}**