

Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации

Владивостокский государственный университет
экономики и сервиса

**АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК:
ПРОБЛЕМЫ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ
В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ**

Хрестоматия
по специальностям
«Международные отношения»
и «Регионоведение (США и Канады)»

Владивосток
Издательство ВГУЭС
2011

Рецензенты: С.В. Мясникова, ст. преп. каф. межкультурной коммуникации и переводоведения;
Е.С. Потехина, ст. преп. каф. межкультурной коммуникации и переводоведения

Анкудинова И.Ф., Беркович Т.А.

А 64 АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК: ПРОБЛЕМЫ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ [Текст] : хрестоматия. – Владивосток: Изд-во ВГУЭС, 2011. – 64 с.

Хрестоматия по дисциплине «Английский язык» включает 4 раздела, включающих аутентичные тексты общественно-политической тематики: история и современное состояние палестино-израильского конфликта; протесты, демонстрации и студенческие волнения в новейшей истории; проблема терроризма и пути ее решения; проблемы прав человека в мировом масштабе. Цель хрестоматии – сформировать навыки чтения аутентичных текстов общественно-политической направленности.

Предназначена студентам по специальностям 350200 «Международные отношения» и 350300 (специализация 350305) «Регионоведение (США и Канады)».

ББК 81.2 Англ.

© Издательство Владивостокского государственного университета экономики и сервиса, 2011

ВВЕДЕНИЕ

Настоящая хрестоматия представляет собой тематически обусловленный сборник текстов. Цель пособия – развить навыки профессионально-ориентированного чтения аутентичных текстов.

Хрестоматия состоит из 4 разделов:

1. Израильско-палестинский конфликт: история и современное состояние.
2. Протесты и демонстрации: история и современность.
3. Проблема терроризма в современном мире.
4. Проблемы прав человека.

Хрестоматия рассчитана на студентов 4 курса специальностей 350200 «Международные отношения» и 350300 (специализация 350305) «Регионоведение (США и Канады)». Она предназначена как для студентов, изучающих английский язык углубленно, так и для тех, кто изучает английский язык самостоятельно.

Материал хрестоматии апробирован на кафедре межкультурных коммуникаций и переводоведения Института иностранных языков.

ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Text 1. The History of the Palestine Conflict

THE CREATION OF ISRAEL AND THE 1948 WAR

To the Jews, the 1948 war proved they were alone in the Middle East, surrounded by hostile populations that would rather kill them than share the Holy Land. The story of how Israel was attacked in 1948 by the combined forces of Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Egypt (just a day after it declared independence) is an important part of the Israeli consciousness.

By the time the 1948 war ended (through a 1949 agreement called the Rhodes Armistice) some 700,000 Palestinians had left their homes, most moving into the area now known as the West Bank and creating the refugee crisis that still exists. At the same time, a similar number of Jewish refugees fled their homes in neighboring areas and other Arab countries because of the turmoil.

U.N. Resolution 194, passed in December 1948, endorsed the right of refugees "wanting to live at peace with their neighbors" to return to their homes or receive compensation for lost land and property. Palestinian refugees were neither compensated nor allowed to return. Arab countries, with the exception of Jordan, refused to absorb them, preferring to maintain the refugee camps for more than half a century as a way of keeping the issue from fading away. Jewish refugees were eagerly absorbed by Israel.

After the 1948 war, Israel possessed approximately 8,000 square miles of Palestine – reducing the Arab lands set up in the 1947 U.N. partition by some 50 percent. Jerusalem was divided, with Arabs on the east side of the armistice line – the Green Line – and the Jews on the west.

THE SUEZ CRISIS, 1956: THE U.S. GETS A FOOTHOLD

In 1956, Egyptian leader Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, which had been run by a private British-French consortium, and closed the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping, cutting off the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel's only link to the Red Sea. And, Nasser had been supporting violent guerrilla raids from the Sinai into Israel. Britain and France, fearful of losing their oil-shipping lane, plotted with Israel to wrest control of the canal from Nasser. On Oct. 29, 1956, Israel invaded the Sinai Peninsula, driving the Egyptians all the way to the west side of the canal. The plan was for Britain and France to then drop troops into Egypt to "defend" the canal. But the plan unfolded differently. The United States intervened. President Eisenhower threatened to withhold a \$1 billion loan to Britain, and on Nov. 2, the United States sponsored a U.N. resolution demanding Israel's immediate withdrawal from Egypt. It was overwhelmingly approved. Within a year, the borders had

returned to their previous arrangement and Egypt regained the canal. The incident was the first direct U.S. involvement in the affairs of the region.

THE SIX-DAY WAR, 1967

In the spring of 1967, Egypt ordered U.N. peacekeepers out of the Sinai and again closed the Strait of Tiran to Israeli ships. Belligerent talk and Arab alliances made it evident that Egypt, Syria and Jordan were planning to attack Israel. In response, Israel launched a pre-emptive strike on June 5. Over six days, Israel captured the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria, and took control of Jerusalem. The fighting stopped June 10. U.N. Resolution 242, which dealt with the new boundaries, has become the basis for negotiations between Israel, the Arab states and the Palestinians. An Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza now would result in the creation of a Palestinian state, not a return of the lands to Jordan and Egypt. Resolution 242 called for "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." To the Arabs, this has always meant that Israel must return to its pre-1967 borders. For Israelis, "withdrawal... from territories occupied in the recent conflict" meant something less than a full withdrawal. Resolution 242 reaffirmed the right of Israel to exist peacefully amid its Arab neighbors. Also, the resolution reiterated the message of Resolution 194 by calling for a "just settlement of the refugee problem," which was exacerbated by the 1967 conflict.

THE YOM KIPPUR WAR, 1973

After its stunning military success in the 1967 war, Israel appeared the dominant power in the region. It became more confident, holding onto the conquered territories and saying it was waiting to return them in exchange for peace negotiations. What came, instead, was another war. On Oct. 6, 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. The attack caught Israel off guard. It was Yom Kippur, the holiest day on the Jewish calendar, and most of Israel was shut down for the holiday. After suffering heavy losses (more than 2,500 Israelis would die and some 3,000 would be wounded in the 18 days of fighting that followed) Israel appealed for help from the United States. At first, the U.S. was reluctant to aid Israel. It did not want to upset Arab states on which it had become increasingly dependent for oil. And it did not want to raise tensions with the Soviet Union, its Cold War adversary and patron of Syria and Egypt. But after learning that the Soviets were airlifting huge amounts of weaponry to Egypt and Syria, President Nixon decided the U.S. had to act. Eventually, Israel was able to turn back the Syrian and Egyptian armies and even pursue them into their own territories. The battle between the Israelis and the Arabs raised the tensions between the superpowers considerably, and on Oct. 22 the U.S. and Russia moved to halt the hostilities by proposing U.N. Resolution 338, which called for an immediate end to the fighting and the resumption of efforts toward peace under the guidelines set

out in Resolution 242. The resolution passed unanimously. The war left Israel as the Mideast's dominant military power once again, but it also established the Arab states' ability to inflict heavy damage on Israel.

RISE OF THE PLO AND INVASIONS OF LEBANON: 1970s AND 1980s

The Palestine Liberation Organization was created in 1964 with the dual aims of creating a Palestinian state and destroying Israel. Not a key player in the region at first, the organization gained strength with the failure of Egypt in the Six Day War in 1967. Though the PLO's stated aims were to change radically with the 1993 Oslo accords, for nearly 30 years the PLO and its leader, Yasser Arafat, supported guerrilla warfare and terrorism as a primary means of promoting the Palestinian cause. Kicked out of Jordan in 1970 because of its destabilizing effect, the PLO soon became ensconced in Lebanon, where hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees lived in generally miserable conditions. From its new position just north of Israel, the PLO supported guerrilla attacks on Israeli territory – attacks that in 1978 provoked an Israeli response. Israel invaded Lebanon in March 1978 in an attempt to crush the PLO guerrillas. The operation was brief and of limited success. In 1982, Israel again invaded Lebanon, this time with the intent of fully crushing the PLO. The invasion reached all the way to Beirut and succeeded in crippling the PLO and exiling Arafat to Tunisia. But the operation also turned into a quagmire for Israel that lasted three years, cost the lives of more than 650 Israeli soldiers and wounded almost 4,000 others. Scores more Israeli soldiers were killed before Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak in May 2000 ordered a complete withdrawal from Lebanon, saying: "This 18-year tragedy is over."

THE INTIFADAS: 1987 AND 2000

The Arabic word intifada means "shaking off," and is used by Palestinians to describe periods of extended conflict with Israelis in the occupied territories and, more recently, in Israeli cities. The first major Palestinian intifada began in 1987 in Gaza with Palestinian youths disillusioned by two decades of Israeli occupation. The tactics were far less violent than those seen in confrontations these days; Palestinians threw stones and Molotov cocktails, and Israelis fired rubber bullets in response. Strikes and boycotts were also used. The fierceness and widespread participation of West Bank and Gaza Palestinians in the first intifada caught Israel by surprise. The intifada ended in 1993 with the Oslo accords, and Palestinians believe the power of the intifada, along with the worldwide attention it generated, pressured Israel to begin negotiating seriously with the PLO. The second intifada began in September 2000 after years of failed peace negotiations. Continuing to this day, the second intifada is far more violent and bloody than the first, with Palestinians employing suicide bombers and guns. Israel contends the autonomy granted

Palestinians after the Oslo accords requires the Palestinian Authority to put down the current uprising.

Text 2. Gaza Strip

Gaza was part of Palestine when it was administered by Britain in a mandate granted by the League of Nations after World War I. In fighting after Israel declared its independence in large areas of Palestine in 1948, the Egyptians captured the Gaza Strip. Palestinian refugees from the coastal cities to the north took refuge there. They or their descendants still live in UN camps in Gaza. Israel captured it in the war of 1967 and eventually moved about 8,000 settlers there, but all Israeli settlers and soldiers left in 2005. Gaza has a population of 1.4 million of whom about some three-quarters are registered with the United Nations as refugees. It is 40km (25 miles) long and between six and 12km (4 and 8 miles) wide.

How did Hamas come to control Gaza?

Under the Oslo peace accords signed in 1993, Gaza was turned over to the newly created Palestinian Authority, to form one wing of a nascent Palestinian state, along with the West Bank and a potential land corridor between them. Yassir Arafat, the president of the authority and leader of the Fatah movement (which, unlike Hamas, thinks that a final agreement with Israel for a two-state solution – Israel and Palestine – can be made), ruled both areas. But as the years passed, it became clear that the Fatah party had less of a hold on Gaza than on the West Bank. Hamas became steadily more popular in Gaza, both because of the social services it provided and because of its more militant stance. In September 2005, the Israeli prime minister at the time, Ariel Sharon, unilaterally withdrew all Israeli settlers from Gaza, making it the first territory completely in Palestinian hands. Israel, however, kept tight control over all border crossings and continued to conduct raids. In January 2006, after Arafat's death, Hamas won a surprise victory in the Palestinian parliamentary elections, ousting the Fatah government, but not Arafat's successor, Mahmoud Abbas, who had succeeded him as Fatah leader as well as president. A unity government between Hamas and Fatah was then formed in March 2007 but the Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas subsequently dissolved the government. In June 2007, Hamas, claiming that Fatah forces were trying to launch a coup, took control of Gaza by force, but not the West Bank territories. The brief war ended with the rout of Fatah. Hamas was boycotted by the international community, which demands that it renounce violence and recognise Israel. Israel, which like the United States considers Hamas a terrorist group, clamped down on the area's borders, restricting access and supplies. Militant groups in Gaza fired rockets at Israeli border towns, with Hamas's approval.

In the summer of 2008 a six-month ceasefire was brokered by Egypt. But while the level of rocket fire fell, it never ceased entirely, and Israel made only minor changes in its border policy. After the truce lapsed on Dec. 19, 2008, Hamas stepped up the firing of rockets and mortars. On Dec. 27, Israel responded with a devastating air and ground campaign that left at least 1,300 Palestinians dead by the time a cease-fire was unilaterally declared by both sides on Jan. 18, 2009. Much of the region's civil infrastructure and many homes were left in ruins.

The Israeli government's stated war goals were relatively modest: to reduce Hamas's ability and will to fire rockets and to change the security equation in the south. The extent of the destruction wrought by the Israeli military was breathtaking. Bombs pulverized the Parliament and cabinet buildings, the Ministry of Justice, the main university and the police station, paralyzing Gaza's central nervous system and leaving residents in a state of shock. Thousands dragged belongings from ruined homes.

Support for the invasion was nearly unanimous among an Israeli public long frustrated at having to endure rocket attacks from what they regarded as an implacable foe. But the fighting drew widespread international criticism, particularly as only 13 Israelis were reported killed to the 1,300 or more Palestinians, especially civilian casualties. The conflict also strained relations between Israel and the United Nations, when Israeli mortars hit a school run by the United Nations, killing more than 40 people.

The invasion has effects beyond Gaza as well. Many Palestinians living in the West Bank expressed disgust with Fatah, which was widely seen to have been weakened by Israel's brutal use of force. And the Arab community was split in its reaction to the conflict. Qatar and Syria supported Hamas – as did non-Arab Iran – while Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia sought to help the Palestinian Authority of Mr. Abbas. Opinion in Arab countries appeared to be firmly on Hamas's side, further deepening rifts between governments and their populace. Despite the cease-fire, Palestinian militants have sporadically fired rockets into Israeli territory, and Israel has retaliated with limited air-strikes against smuggling tunnels and with other small-scale raids. But a tenuous calm remains.

PRECONDITIONS FOR PEACE

Egypt has been holding separate talks with Israel and Hamas. In return for a cease-fire lasting a year or more, Hamas is demanding the lifting of Israel's 18-month economic embargo on Gaza and the opening of the border crossings for regular commerce. In the months that followed the conflict, Israeli officials remained skeptical of opening the borders. Many believe that their war served as deterrence and note the drastic reduction in rocket fire as evidence. They fear that steel or cement will be siphoned off by Hamas for arms. But they are feeling pressure from the Americans and United Nations,

and they are discussing a pilot project. The aim of the blockade is to keep Gaza at subsistence and offer a contrast with the West Bank, which in theory benefits from foreign aid and economic and political development. Hamas supporters will then realize their mistake. The plan has not gone well, however, partly because the West Bank under Israeli occupation remains no one's idea of paradise and partly because Hamas seems more in control here every year, with cleaner streets and lower crime, although its popularity is hard to gauge.

GAZA TODAY

In May 2009, at the time of President Obama's first visit to the Mideast, Gaza was suspended in a state of continuing misery that fell somewhere short of catastrophic. While Israel and Egypt were both still blocking Gaza's borders to squeeze Hamas, Israel allows a daily shipment of rations and other aid, while the United Nations does an efficient job of running schools and clinics. One of the wars appears to have been a decision by Hamas to suspend its use of rockets and shift focus to winning support at home and abroad through cultural initiatives and public relations. In June 2009, a total of two rockets were fired from Gaza, according to the Israeli military, one of the lowest monthly tallies since the firing began in 2002. But the decision to suspend the use of the short-range Qassam rockets that for years have flown into Israel, often dozens a day, has been partly the result of popular pressure. Increasingly, people in Gaza are questioning the value of the rockets, not because they hit civilians but because they are seen as relatively ineffective.

Text 3. West Bank

The West Bank, so named for its location on the western shore of the Jordan river, is a Palestinian territory under military occupation by Israel since the end of the Six-Day War in 1967. The Israeli population of the West Bank, not including East Jerusalem, has tripled since the Israeli-Palestinian peace effort started in the early 1990s, and it now approaches 300,000. The settlers live among 2.5 million Palestinians in about 120 settlements, which much of the world considers a violation of international law, as well as in dozens of outposts erected without official Israeli authorization. Israel argues that the settlement enterprise does not violate the law against transferring populations into occupied territories.

Along with the Gaza strip, the smaller, poorer territory along the Mediterranean coast, the West Bank is controlled in part by Israel and in part by the Palestinian Authority under terms negotiated during the 1993 Oslo accords. Rivalry between Palestinian political organizations Hamas and Fatah has further divided the area, with moderate Fatah in control of the West Bank and supported by the United States, Europe and Israel as the only workable

Palestinian government, while the more radical Hamas holds power in an increasingly isolated Gaza. For the first time since the second Palestinian uprising broke out in late 2000, leading to terrorist bombings and fierce Israeli countermeasures, a sense of personal security and economic potential is spreading across the West Bank as the Palestinian Authority's security forces enter their second year of consolidating order. In coordination with Israeli defense officials and with funding from the U.S. and the European Union, Palestinian troops and police officers have taken over from Israeli soldiers much of the patrolling in the West Bank cities of Jenin, Nablus, Bethlehem and parts of Hebron.

American and European policy in the region aims to stitch Palestinian politics back together by strengthening the Palestinian Authority under the presidency of Mahmoud Abbas, which favors a two-state solution with Israel, while weakening the Islamists of Hamas in Gaza. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu says it shares the goal of helping Mr. Abbas, which is why it is seeking to improve West Bank economic conditions as a platform for moving to a political discussion. The biggest object of those potential discussions remains the continued expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank (Israel unilaterally withdrew all settlements from Gaza in 2005). While every American administration has objected to Israeli settlement building in occupied lands, the Obama administration has selected it as the opening issue that could begin to untie the Gordian knot of the conflict.

American officials hope that by getting Israel to freeze settlement building on land where the Palestinians expect to build their future state, they can then press Saudi Arabia and other regional powers to offer Israel concessions like low-level trade or tourism. In addition, stopping the construction would remove a major concern of the Palestinians that their land is slowly disappearing under settler housing. In his Cairo speech in June 2009, the president again called for an end to the settlement building.

Text 4. New Jerusalem settlement hits peace process

By Catrina Stewart in Jerusalem

Monday, 17 January 2011

Israel is moving ahead with a project to build 1,400 new homes in predominantly Arab East Jerusalem, a development that critics claim will deliver a death knell to the already faltering peace process.

The controversial plan drew furious condemnation from the Palestinian Authority and threatened to dash any prospect of a revival of the US-sponsored peace talks, which collapsed last year over the issue of Jewish settlements.

Saeb Erekat, the Palestinians' chief negotiator, said. "This proves the Israeli government has chosen settlements over peace." Plans for the expansion, expected to be presented to Jerusalem's planning commission this week, were also criticized by Washington as "counterproductive" in efforts to get the two sides back into negotiations.

The international community last week condemned the demolition of an historic hotel in east Jerusalem to make way for 20 apartments for Jews, prompting a defiant declaration from Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu that Jews should be free to live where they like in the city.

This latest project would extend the existing Gilo settlement, a large neighborhood in East Jerusalem built on lands captured by Israel in 1967 after the Six-Day War, and later annexed. All settlement construction in the occupied sector is regarded as illegal by the international community. The homes would be built on what is currently a picturesque hillside on the other side of the valley from the Cremisan monastery, a popular picnicking spot for Palestinians from the West Bank.

Campaigners opposed to the project fear the expansion of Gilo would lead to an unbroken ring of settlements stretching from Jerusalem to Gush Etzion, to the south of Bethlehem, effectively ensuring that that part of the West Bank is never handed back in a peace deal.

Meir Margalit, a Jerusalem councilor from the left-leaning Meretz party, said it might be years before the houses are actually built, but that the political repercussions could be immediate. "If there is any chance of the peace process being renewed, after this it's clear it will not happen," he said. "The Palestinians cannot live with this kind of provocation. If [US President Barack] Obama still believes the US can do something to bring peace in the Middle East, this is the time to do it."

The Palestinians have opposed settlements on the grounds that Israel cannot negotiate in good faith as long as it is building more settler homes on West Bank land that the Palestinians hope will form the basis of their future state. The Palestinians also covet East Jerusalem as their future capital and fear that Israel is attempting to predetermine its "indivisible" status.

But Israel remains unrepentant, arguing that there is an understanding that Israel will never hand back the Jewish areas in East Jerusalem.

"In every peace plan put forward over the last two decades, the Jewish neighborhoods of Jerusalem remained part of Israel in a final status [agreement]," said Mark Regev, the prime minister's spokesman. "The Palestinians have unfortunately adopted a position where they refuse to engage."

Israel's announcement that it would build 1,600 new homes in east Jerusalem during US Vice-President Joe Biden's visit last March soured relations between the two countries for several months. Washington, meanwhile, is seeking ways to bring the two sides back to negotiations, but

the Palestinians appear now to favor a plan to seek recognition in the United Nations.

Text 5. More controversial construction on track for Jerusalem, official says

From Shira Medding, CNN

January 16, 2011

Jerusalem (CNN) – Israeli officials could approve plans for building more than a thousand houses in a disputed neighborhood of Jerusalem, a city councilman said Sunday.

The Jerusalem municipality's planning commission is set to consider the construction of 1,400 more housing units near the neighborhood of Gilo, a large Jewish community on the southern outskirts of the city.

Meir Margalit, a Jerusalem city councilman from the left-wing Meretz party, said plans to build the units will be presented to the planning commission January 24.

"Even though it will take years before the construction begins, this action is beyond the last nail in the coffin of the peace process," he said. "After the peace process has already been killed they are firing a few more bullets into it, to make sure it's dead."

The spokesman's office for the Jerusalem municipality said Sunday that the planning commission is obligated by law to discuss any plan presented to it.

"When the plans reach the commission, they will be reviewed to see if they meet the professional criteria for city plans," the office said.

"There has been no change in the planning policy in Jerusalem in the last 40 years. The Jerusalem municipality continues to advance construction for both Arabs and Jews according to the city plans," the office said. "New construction in Jerusalem is necessary for the development of the city."

Chief Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erakat told CNN, "We condemn this Israeli decision in all possible terms. It is time for the United States administration to hold Israel responsible for the failure of the peace process. In view of that, we seek to the United Nations Security council this week a resolution declaring all Israeli settlements illegal."

The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs considers Gilo an Israeli settlement built on Palestinian land.

Palestinians want East Jerusalem to be the capital of a future Palestinian state. Israel, which annexed the eastern part of Jerusalem in 1967, considers the entire city to be its sovereign capital, a claim not recognized by the international community.

The Obama administration and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have been at constant odds over plans for construction in disputed areas of Jerusalem.

In November 2008, the United States strongly opposed a plan to build 900 housing units in Gilo. And a plan to build 1,600 houses in Ramat Shlomo, announced during U.S. Vice President Joe Biden's visit to the area last March, caused a major rift between Israel and the United States.

Settlement construction remains a divisive issue in Israel.

American-sponsored talks between Israelis and Palestinians fell apart in September when Israel resumed settlement construction in the occupied West Bank after a 10-month freeze.

Erakat told CNN that was the reason Palestinians would not return to the negotiating table.

"The Israeli government had the choice between settlements and peace and they chose settlements," he said last month.

Text 6. Dmitry Medvedev restates Russian support for Palestinian state

On visit to the West Bank, Russian president backs Palestinian demands for Israel to renew freeze on settlement building

Dmitry Medvedev today reiterated Russia's endorsement of an independent Palestinian state, amid mounting concern in Israel over a push for wider international recognition.

The Russian president, on a visit to the West Bank, stopped short of explicitly recognizing a Palestinian state based on 1967 borders but repeated the position the then Soviet Union adopted in 1988.

"Russia's position remains unchanged," he said. "Russia made its choice a long time ago... We supported and we will support the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to an independent state with its capital in East Jerusalem."

His comments will boost a Palestinian drive to win recognition of a state based on all territory in the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem occupied by Israel in 1967.

In the past two months a string of Latin American countries have recognized a Palestinian state, including Brazil, Argentina and Ecuador. Palestinian officials, frustrated at the stalled peace talks, are considering submitting a resolution on recognition to the UN Security Council – a move that would be vetoed by the US.

Israel has publicly dismissed the recent spate of endorsements, but some officials are concerned that it reflects growing sympathy for the Palestinian cause. More countries are expected to recognize a Palestinian state ahead of the UN general assembly in September. Israel has warned that a unilateral

declaration of statehood would be a harmful step and that a Palestinian state can only be achieved through negotiations.

Medvedev's comments carried additional weight because Russia is a member of the Middle East quartet of peacemakers, which also includes the US, the UN and the European Union. The Russian president backed Palestinian demands that Israel renew a freeze on settlement building before talks can resume.

At a press conference in Jericho with the Palestinian president, Mahmoud Abbas, Medvedev said: "We discussed the conditions for resuming talks with Israel, which include continued self-control and strictly abiding by commitments and, before anything else, freezing all Israeli settlement activities in the West Bank and East Jerusalem."

Abbas said: "There are two options, either peace or terror and violence. We shall not choose terror and violence."

The Palestinians claim that continued settlement activity is fast making a viable state impossible. There are around half a million Israelis living in settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, which are illegal under international law.

In 1988 the Soviet Union backed a declaration of statehood by Yasser Arafat, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, a move that gained little traction outside the Soviet bloc.

The planned Israeli leg of Medvedev's trip fell victim to long-running industrial action by staff at the foreign ministry over pay. As a result, the Russian president entered the West Bank across the historic Allenby Bridge from Jordan, which was shut to normal traffic.

PROTESTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Text 1. When politics takes to the street

IRAQ WAR PROTEST

Saturday 15 February 2003 saw what is considered to be the largest public protest in British history.

An estimated one million people marched in London in opposition to the impending war against Iraq, although organisers claimed the true figure was double that. The official police tally was 750,000 plus. The Stop the War demonstration, mirrored on a smaller scale in Glasgow and Belfast, was part of a worldwide weekend of protest with hundreds of rallies and marches in up to 60 countries. Following a three-and-a-half mile route through central London to rally in Hyde Park, participants cheered, shouted, banged drums and waved banners with anti-war slogans. Despite the scale of the protest – which attracted contingents from about 250 cities and towns across the UK – parliament voted a month later to go to war.

MAY DAY PROTESTS

Thousands of anti-capitalist campaigners have taken to London's streets for May Day protests since 1999, as part of worldwide demonstrations against globalisation. In 2000, what had been billed as a peaceful protest ended in mayhem as a core of protesters smashed up chain stores and restaurants, and defaced a statue of Sir Winston Churchill and the Cenotaph. Dozens were arrested. The following year 6,000 officers were drafted in – outnumbering the 4,000 demonstrators – to contain the protest to London's Oxford Circus for several hours. Police denied claims they had over-reacted. Many businesses around Oxford Street lost an estimated J20m in revenue after closing for the day because of the threat of violence.

RURAL MARCHERS

Large scale street protests need not necessarily result in violence. The Countryside Alliance's Liberty and Livelihood march, in September 2002, brought together more than 300,000 marchers in London. The main focus was opposition to a ban on hunting with dogs in England and Wales but the demonstration also reflected a wide range of other grievances from rural communities. Only one arrest was reported on the day, of an anti-hunt demonstrator at a rival rally.

1998 BIRMINGHAM G8 SUMMIT

Some 50,000 protesters travelled to Birmingham in 1998 to pressure G8 leaders to cut debt for the world's poorest nations. The demonstrators formed a seven-mile human chain around the city centre and carried out a noisy pro-

test, combining church bells, car horns, drums and voices to create a two-minute cacophony. Leaders of the world's eight richest nations agreed some measures on debt relief but failed to meet campaigners' demands. About 30 environmental activists were arrested after clashes with police.

POLL TAX RIOTS

An anti-poll tax rally in central London on 31 March 1990 erupted into the worst riots seen in the city for a century. What began as a peaceful protest by an estimated 100,000 people flared into violence as a minority clashed with police, leaving a trail of smashed windows and looted businesses in the West End. The demonstration – which had been preceded by many smaller rallies across the country – resulted in 400 arrests and a bill of J400,000 for damaged property. The unpopularity of the poll tax contributed to the downfall of Margaret Thatcher, who resigned in November 1990.

ANTI-NUCLEAR PROTESTS

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) attracted widespread popular support in the 1980s, when the Cold War was at its height. Hundreds of thousands joined demonstrations in London against the nuclear arms race, with the largest march in 1981 attended by about 250,000 people. Attention also focused that year on Greenham Common, in Berkshire, where three dozen women marched from Cardiff to set up a peace camp outside a US air base, in opposition to plans to site cruise missiles there. By the mid 1980s, more than 1,000 women had moved to Greenham Common, and many tens of thousands more came for weekends and to lend part-time support. Scotland's Faslane nuclear submarine base on the Clyde has seen a series of protests since the decision in the 1970s to replace Britain's Polaris fleet with Tridents. Hundreds of arrests have taken place as demonstrators staged blockades of the base, and a series of activists broke in through security cordons.

1958 ALDERMASTON MARCH

On Good Friday 1958, thousands of people gathered in Trafalgar Square to demonstrate against Britain's first hydrogen bomb tests. Some 10,000 then set off on a four-day march to Aldermaston, in Berkshire, where peace activists had discovered a secret atomic weapons plant was being built. The event became an annual pilgrimage in the 1960s, with more marchers traversing the 50-mile route every year to what became the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Research Establishment.

Text 2. Vote on political protests

There have been many popular protests over the years in which ordinary people have challenged governments and changed the course of history.

No 1 – Stop The War

Britain's biggest ever protest march in February 2003. And the issue still haunts the Prime Minister.

No 2 – Mahatma Gandhi

Mahatma Gandhi was nominated by several people including Rahul Mahajan, Bhup Heer and D Cresswell. Gandhi was the man who believed in non-violent direct action. He led the peaceful resistance against Britain rule in India in the 1920's and 1930's.

No 3 – Paris 1968

In May 1968 Paris witnessed a massive revolt by French university students. The protests nearly brought the government down, and the riots between police and demonstrators lasted for several days.

No 4 – Rosa Parks

Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat to a white man on a bus triggered a mass black boycott of buses in 1955. Her stance against the segregation laws in Alabama made political history.

No 5 – Berlin Wall

These memorable scenes following the Fall of the Berlin Wall started with a pro-democracy demo in East Berlin's main square. Within days of the protest, the East German Government resigned and thousands streamed into West Berlin.

No 6 – Battle for Seattle

Six years ago tens of thousands of demonstrators from 87 countries descended on Seattle. Protesters were calling for the reform of the World Trade Organisation which was meeting in the City.

No 7 – Gdansk Strike

In 1980 the name of one man became synonymous with the most potent threat to Communism in years. Lech Walesa's leadership of workers at the Lenin shipyard in Gdansk and the formation of Solidarity Polish rippled out across the world.

No 8 – Poll Tax Riots

The poll tax riots of 1990 were nominated by Phil Harris, Roger Bannister and Beryl Archer. There was a mass demonstration in central London of 31 March, which turned very ugly. The result? The infamous poll tax was consigned history.

No 9 – Suffragettes

In 1918 British women were finally given the vote, thanks to this woman... Emmeline Pankhurst. Pankhurst led the Suffrage Movement and it was the first time in Britain that women had used militant means to fight their cause.

No 10 – Tiananmen Square

Tiananmen square in Beijing was nominated by Barbara Gordon and Michael May. In June 1989 Chinese students occupied the main square demanding more democracy.

Text 3. Massacre in Tiananmen Square

Several hundred civilians have been shot dead by the Chinese army during a bloody military operation to crush a democratic uprising in Peking's (Beijing) Tiananmen Square. The dead were the result of China's bloody suppression of demonstrations that had transfixed the world. They started with a march by students in memory of former party leader Hu Yaobang, who had died. But as the days passed, millions of people joined in, angered by widespread corruption and calling for democracy.

After weeks of indecision, hardliners in the Chinese leadership won out and martial law was declared. On the night of 3 June, tanks rolled through the streets of Beijing, charged with clearing the square at all costs. On the streets, even as gunfire rang out around them, people sang the workers' anthem, the Internationale. They seemed unable to understand what was happening. Tanks rumbled through the capital's streets late on 3 June as the army moved into the square from several directions, randomly firing on unarmed protesters. The injured were rushed to hospital on bicycle rickshaws by frantic residents shocked by the army's sudden and extreme response to the peaceful mass protest. Demonstrators, mainly students, had occupied the square for seven weeks, refusing to move until their demands for democratic reform were met.

The military offensive came after several failed attempts to persuade the protesters to leave. Throughout Saturday the government warned it would do whatever it saw necessary to clamp down on what it described as "social chaos". But even though violence was expected, the ferocity of the attack took many by surprise, bringing condemnation from around the world.

US President George Bush said he deeply deplored the use of force, and UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said she was "shocked and appalled by the shootings". Amid the panic and confusion students could be heard shouting "fascists stop killing," and "down with the government".

At a nearby children's hospital operating theatres were filled with casualties with gunshot wounds, many of them local residents who were not taking part in the protests. Early this morning at least 30 more were killed in two volleys of gunfire, which came without warning. Terrified crowds fled, leaving bodies in the road.

Meanwhile reports have emerged of troops searching the main Peking university campus for ringleaders, beating and killing those they suspect of coordinating the protests. The demonstrations in Tiananmen Square have been described as the greatest challenge to the communist state in China since the 1949 revolution. They were called to coincide with a visit to the capital by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, by students seeking democratic reform.

Troops were used to clear the square despite repeated assurances from Chinese politicians that there would be no violence. It has been suggested that the Communist leader Deng Xiaoping personally ordered their deployment as a way of shoring up his leadership. Hundreds, and possibly thousands, of people were killed in the massacre, although it is unlikely a precise number will ever be known. Peking has since become more widely known as Beijing.

CHOOSING SILENCE

Ding Zilin's 17-year-old son was killed on 4 June, 1989. Ever since, she has co-ordinated the Tiananmen Mothers, a group consisting of family members of those killed and injured. They want the government to reassess the protests and label them a "patriotic movement", rather than "counter-revolutionary turmoil". But Mrs Ding acknowledged that it was an uphill struggle. "I have to admit that the Chinese Government's behaviour has, from their point of view, been successful. For those Chinese people who understand what really happened and for people in Beijing, no-one can forget 4 June. But most people have chosen silence," she said.

Today's students were little more than toddlers 15 years ago. They are the direct beneficiaries of the government's post-Tiananmen strategy – to win people over, or maybe buy them off, by pushing forward economic reforms and improving their lives.

Herry, a 21-year-old student, is sympathetic. "I can understand the action of the government at that time," she said. "If our government didn't do that at that time, maybe China will become mess, and maybe we can't enjoy the life today like now we have."

Another student, Zhang Xin, said priorities have changed since then. "Students now are more secular, more practical. They want to improve their English, they want to go abroad, they want to get rich, make money, get good jobs. Some years ago it wasn't the case. They were ideal (istic)."

Today's undergraduates look inwards at their own lives rather than outwards at the life of the nation. The party has succeeded in marginalizing those who disagree with it, and in rewriting the history of 4 June within China. But economic reforms and the scars left by its actions mean that few people actually believe in Chinese communism any more.

Text 4. Romanian revolution.

1989: ROMANIA'S 'FIRST COUPLE' EXECUTED

Deposed Romanian president Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife Elena have been shot by a firing squad after a secret military tribunal found them both guilty of crimes against the state. They were charged and convicted of genocide and undermining the national economy among a series of other of-

fences, officials said. News of their death was announced to the people of Romania on national television amid reports the couple had been found smuggling large amounts of money out of the country.

A stunned reaction from the public gave way to scenes of delight and a public outpouring on the streets to celebrate. But there was some unrest from troops who supported the former leader. The deaths end the dictator's 24 years as communist party leader – 21 of them as Romania's president – during which he suppressed all opposition using brutal force. The National Salvation Front is now running Romania, and America and the Soviet Union have recognized the new government. But the White House said it was "regrettable" the trial had not been held in public.

Christmas celebrated The new government has pledged democracy will replace the tyranny of Ceausescu's rule and promised to allow free speech, free thought and free enterprise in Romania. Party leaders called on the West to aid and support its new reform programme. The executions come after 10 tumultuous days of violence and an upsurge of mass protests against Ceausescu's regime. Demonstrations began in the western city of Timisoara against the harassment of a dissident ethnic-Hungarian priest, Laszlo Tokes. It led to protests about a lack of basic supplies such as bread but the backlash from Ceausescu's armed forces led to accusations many people were massacred. Demonstrators stormed Ceausescu's palace and he and his wife tried to flee Bucharest but they were captured by military forces who had turned against them.

1990: ROMANIANS CALL FOR GOVERNMENT CHANGE

Tens of thousands of pro-democracy demonstrators have taken to the streets of the Romanian capital, Bucharest to protest against the interim government of Ion Iliescu. It was the biggest demonstration in the capital, since the revolution just over a month ago which led to the fall and execution of the former communist dictator Nicolae Ceausescu. The protesters converged on Victory Square, where Mr Iliescu's National Salvation Front party has its headquarters. They called for the resignation of Mr Iliescu and the removal of all former communists from the party. The demonstrators claim the interim president is denying opposition parties the chance to stand on equal terms with the ruling party in the free elections planned for May.

Mr Iliescu himself appeared on a balcony overlooking the square and promised to carry on talking with the opposition parties. Ion Ratiu, leader of the opposition National Peasants' Party, told the BBC: "We are at long last emerging from a dictatorship that's lasted virtually 45 years and we had hoped we could advance toward democracy and this is precisely why the young people shed their blood.

"Yet these demonstrations today make it look to me as if there is going to be a new attempt at taking over power from the people." He is holding

more talks with Mr Iliescu later this week, but said the opposition's limited access to the media meant there was little hope of a fair election. The revolution began in mid-December with a protest in the town of Timisoara against the deportation of Hungarian priest, Laszlo Tokes, who had denounced Ceausescu in a sermon.

What began as a small protest, quickly grew into a massive anti-government riot. Many demonstrators were shot when troops were brought in to restore order. But the demonstrations continued and Ceausescu and his wife were captured trying to flee the country, tried and executed on Christmas day. Ion Iliescu remained in power until 1996. But rather than pushing through democratic reforms as he had promised, he blocked moves to prosecute those who behind the shootings in the December revolution. There has been much speculation since the overthrow of Ceausescu that it was not so much a revolution as a coup, plotted by Iliescu and his supporters. It was Iliescu who ordered Ceausescu's trial and subsequent execution. He was finally ousted from power by a centre-right government in 1996 – but three governments later and prolonged political feuding led to the re-emergence of Iliescu's opposition party. He was returned to power in 2000 at the head of the party of Social Democracy, promising faster reforms to get Romania into the European Union.

Text 5. 1990: Violence flares in poll tax demonstration

An anti-poll tax rally in central London has erupted into the worst riots seen in the city for a century. Forty-five police officers are among the 113 people injured as well as 20 police horses. A total of 340 people have been arrested in the heart of London's West End, popular with musical and theatre goers, as cars have been overturned and set alight. Four tube stations have been shut for safety reasons as police try to clear the streets, with much of central London now cordoned off. Demonstrators have attacked police with bricks and cans. Fire fighters attempting to extinguish the blazes have been hit with wood and stones. Restaurants have been forced to close early by the violence which left shop windows smashed and many businesses with their contents looted. Eyewitness reports describe a cloud of black smoke over Trafalgar Square.

PEACEFUL PROTESTS

The violence erupted just after 1600 BST following a peaceful march against the poll tax which saw up to 70,000 people take to the streets in protest at the new government levy. A group of protesters involved in a sit-in at Whitehall, close to the Downing Street entrance, refused to move after requests from police and stewards. As police arrested offenders, placards and cans were thrown from the crowd and the trouble spread to Charing Cross

Road, Pall Mall, Regent Street and Covent Garden. David Meynell, deputy assistant commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, in charge of the operation, said a peaceful march had been "completely overshadowed by the actions of about 3,000 to 3,500 people in minority groups". He said they "without any doubt at all" had launched "a ferocious and sustained attack on the police". The Home Secretary David Waddington is expected to make a statement to the House of Commons on the rioting tomorrow.

More than 400 people were arrested and property was damaged with repairs estimated at £400,000 after the demonstration which saw 100,000 people turn out to protest against the poll tax. The demonstration had been preceded by many smaller rallies across the country. The poll tax enraged people because it was a levy on individuals regardless of means. Its unpopularity contributed to the downfall of Margaret Thatcher who resigned in November 1990 after 11 years at the helm of British politics. Her successor, John Major, appointed Michael Heseltine Environment Secretary to dismantle the poll tax. It was replaced by the council tax – a levy related to the value of a house.

Text 6. Hundreds of Thousands Protest French Labor Law

Paris, March 28 Hundreds of thousands of people poured into the streets of cities across France today in the biggest show of force to date against Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin and his new labor law targeting youth.

The police said that 450,000 people turned out nationwide, not including Paris, where hundreds of thousands more people marched in a colorful, mainly peaceful demonstration marked by scattered incidents of violence. One of the country's largest unions, the CGT, put the nationwide figure at 3 million, a turnout that the CGT secretary general, Bernard Thibault, hailed as "historic."

Incidents erupted in Paris and several other cities, including Nantes, La Rochelle, Grenoble and Bordeaux, Europe 1 radio reported. In Paris, about 100 hooded youths clashed with the police in midafternoon, the radio and witnesses said, and toward the end of the march the police fired tear gas to disperse hard-core elements.

The marches were part of a nationwide day of action against the Villepin legislation, which was intended to encourage hiring by making it easy for companies to fire workers under age 26 during their first two years on the job. Student and union opposition to the law has ballooned into one of the biggest protest movements in France in years.

From early this morning, traffic was disrupted on trains, planes, buses and the Paris Metro as unions heeded calls for a one-day strike. School children and teachers stayed home, newsstands were empty, the main French radio

network broadcast only music, mail went undelivered, some banks were closed and most universities remained shut down.

In Paris, demonstrators of all ages marched for several hours in a largely good-natured protest. Marchers sported banners, flags, bicycles, and mainly umbrellas, greeting a sudden downpour with a loud cheer.

But as the march reached its destination, Place de la Republique in eastern Paris, small groups of youths began harassing other demonstrators, kicking, punching and stealing handbags and portable phones, the radio said. The police fired tear gas, forcing demonstrators to run for cover into nearby side-streets.

Even as the protest wound its way through Paris, Mr. Villepin faced hostile questioning from opponents of the law in Parliament. Braving cries of "Sit down!" and "Stop!" he defended the labor law as the best way to meet the anxiety of young people at a time when youth unemployment in France tops 20 percent. "We must convince all the French that tomorrow can be better than today and especially young people," Mr. Villepin said, adding that if unions sought to open a dialogue, "I am ready." When boos erupted from the benches of the left, Mr. Villepin retorted that the Socialists, who were in power for most of the 1980's and 1990's, had "never addressed this problem."

The protests and strikes represent a test of wills, with students and trade unions demanding that the unpopular labor law be rescinded and Mr. Villepin insisting that it go into effect, albeit with possible changes. The law was drafted and hastily enacted by Mr. Villepin after riots, mainly by unemployed youths, shook France last autumn. Detractors say the law gives employers license to use youthful workers for two years then drop them to avoid having to provide the social benefits attached to long-term contracts.

Efforts by Mr. Villepin to defuse tension over the law have so far borne no fruit. He offered Monday to meet with student and union leaders on Wednesday, the day after the protests, "to advance and get out of the current crisis." But the leaders of two main unions, FO and CFDT, said they would not sit down again with Mr. Villepin until he rescinded the law. Some student leaders have moved from demanding the law's withdrawal to calling for Mr. Villepin's resignation.

The government was on edge today, even before the street protests, following a march Thursday in Paris that degenerated in the shadow of the Invalides monument to Napoleon, with hardcore elements attacking both the riot police and students, smashing shop windows, battering cars and setting them on fire. Police officers were patrolling commuter trains into the capital today in an effort to weed out potential troublemakers.

Asked how she felt about the disruption caused by the strikes, one Marseille woman interviewed on LCI television complained that not enough people had stopped work. "Everyone should be on strike," she said.

Text 7. China and Tibet

Tibetan communities launched a series of protests against Chinese rule in Tibet in March 2008. It was the biggest challenge to Beijing's authority there since 1989.

What sparked the protests?

Buddhist monks marched from monasteries in and around Lhasa on 10 March to mark the 49th anniversary of a Tibetan uprising against Chinese rule. According to reports, security forces arrested some of the marchers, and the following day more monks marched through the streets to appeal for their colleagues to be freed. As the protests escalated, economic and social grievances came to the fore, and more members of the general Tibetan population became involved in the monks' protests. There were confirmed reports of mass rioting on the streets of Lhasa. Protests and violence were later reported in areas of Gansu, Sichuan and Qinghai provinces, which are home to sizeable Tibetan communities. The protests were fuelled by day-to-day grievances, as well as a desire for Tibetan independence. Many Tibetans are angry at the increasing numbers of Han Chinese migrants arriving in the region, accusing them of taking the best jobs. Tibetans feel they have been left behind by the economic boom which coastal provinces have enjoyed, yet they are suffering from China's accelerating inflation.

What are the underlying issues?

The two sides disagree about the legal status of Tibet. China says Tibet has officially been part of the Chinese nation since the mid-13th Century, so should continue to be ruled by Beijing. Many Tibetans disagree, pointing out that the Himalayan region was an independent kingdom for many centuries, and that Chinese rule over Tibet has not been constant. For example, after a brief military conflict between China and Tibet in the early part of the 20th Century, Tibet declared itself an independent republic in 1912. Although its status did not receive widespread recognition, Tibet functioned as an independent government until 1951. China sent troops to Tibet in 1950 and summoned a Tibetan delegation the following year to sign a treaty ceding sovereignty to China. Since then there have been periods of unrest and sporadic uprisings as resentment to Beijing's rule has persisted. Although China has invested in the economy, rights groups point to widespread mistreatment of the Tibetan population and a denial of religious and political freedom.

Will the two sides be able to resolve their differences?



The Chinese government has been engaged in low-level talks with Tibet's government-in-exile, based in India, over recent years. But the talks have not got very far, and do not show much hope for the future either. The gulf between the two sides is just too great, analysts say. China insists that the Tibetans in exile, led by the Dalai Lama, want nothing less than to separate Tibet from the motherland. The Dalai Lama – Tibet's spiritual leader – says he wants nothing more than genuine autonomy for the region.

Why is the Tibet issue so well-known?

Perhaps one of the reasons Westerners know so much about Tibet is because of the Dalai Lama. Since fleeing Tibet following a failed uprising in 1959, he has travelled the world advocating more autonomy for his homeland, yet stressing non-violence. He won the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts in 1989. But Beijing faces disputes from other quarters, as well as Tibet. The island of Taiwan has essentially been self-governing for half a century, but China regards it as part of its territory – and has said it is willing to use force if necessary to make sure this remains the case. Uighur separatists in Muslim-majority Xinjiang province have waged a low-level insurgency against the Beijing government for many years. The Beijing government frequently claims it faces "international terrorism" in Xinjiang, and that the Taleban is active there, but human rights groups say these claims are exaggerated.

Will there be further protests?

China responded to these protests with a show of force, and officials and state media have vowed to "resolutely crush" pro-independence sentiment. But the fundamental cause of the demonstrations has not been resolved and so tension is likely to persist, correspondents say. The Olympics in Beijing this summer have focused the world's attention on Tibet, and campaigners both inside and outside China are using the publicity surrounding the event to highlight their particular concerns.

Text 8. What lies behind the violence in Kyrgyzstan

Clashes in southern Kyrgyzstan have spiraled out of control. Thus far 118 people have been confirmed dead, a further 1,500 as injured, and tens of thousands of ethnic Uzbeks have fled to neighbouring Uzbekistan. The number of those killed over the past four days are without a doubt significantly higher than these estimates suggest. Local Muslim custom requires that the dead are buried within 24 hours. Many people are burying family members immediately without registering their deaths.

Although Uzbeks make up only 15% of Kyrgyzstan's population of 5.4m, most of them live in the southern part of the country, where they make up the majority. The Fergana Valley, where most of the killing happened, was divided arbitrarily by Stalin in the 1920s among Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. As a result, the Kyrgyz Soviet republic was left with a

sizeable Uzbek population, the Uzbek Soviet republic with a Tajik population, and so on. While the Soviet Union existed and the republics were part of the same country, this made little practical difference. But when the Soviet Union fell apart, these artificially created borders became final, separating newly independent states and fomenting ethnic tensions.

The interim government has been powerless to put an end to the violence. Roza Otunbayeva, the acting president said that the country needed outside help and appealed to Russia to send peacekeeping troops. Security officers were given shoot-to-kill orders. The Russian government initially responded that the violence was an internal affair for Kyrgyzstan to handle on its own and agreed only to send humanitarian aid. A day later Russia dispatched paratroopers to secure its Kant military base in the northern part of the country. The United States also has an air base in the north, but has not been invited to intervene with its military forces.



The cause of the rampage involving Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks, which began in Osh, Kyrgyzstan’s second-largest city, remains unclear. Observers believe that the events were orchestrated by individuals taking advantage of long-standing tensions between the two ethnic groups. The interim government has blamed ex-president Kurmanbek Bakiyev and his supporters. It says they instigated the unrest to prevent a national referendum on its proposal for a new constitution, which was scheduled to be held on June 27th. Mr Bakiyev, who was ousted in a popular uprising in April and now lives in exile, has rejected the charge.

This wave of violence has been shaped by politics. Mr Bakiyev hails from the south of the country. His stronghold was in Jalal-Abad, where he still has many supporters. Ethnic Uzbeks, who play almost no role in Kyrgyzstan’s public life—whether in government, regional administrations, or the military—have tended to prefer the interim government, which has set

its sights on turning Kyrgyzstan away from authoritarian presidential rule to a parliamentary republic.

Whatever the cause, the fighting between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbeks has been ferocious. Some eye witnesses claim that the army, which consists mainly of ethnic Kyrgyz, has sided with its kin. Violence spread to Jalal-Abad over the weekend. Although atrocities appear to have been committed by both sides, the Kyrgyz quickly gained the upper hand. Uzbek houses have been looted and set on fire—plumes of smoke are visible for many miles around—women have reportedly been raped, and armed Kyrgyz gangs have been harassing and shooting at Uzbeks. Gas was shut off in much of Osh, as was electricity in some quarters. Shops have been ransacked and food has become scarce.

Many ethnic Uzbeks, mostly women, children and the elderly, have fled the city to the nearby border with Uzbekistan, looking for safety. According to official Uzbek figures, 32,000 people have so far crossed the border and now live in make-shift tents. Unofficially, at least 75,000 people are believed to have fled the country. An NGO based in Uzbekistan says that there are already more than 200,000 Uzbek refugees sheltering there.

“It is a human-rights disaster in every respect,” says Andrea Berg, a researcher with Human Rights Watch, a New York-based organisation, who happened to be in Osh when the rioting started. She says she received many desperate phone calls from people unable to get out of the city because of blockades erected by Kyrgyz gangs. Those Uzbek women and children who made it are now gathering in different villages along the border and do not know what has happened to their husbands, brothers and fathers.

The current clashes are the worst ethnic violence in Central Asia in 20 years. In June 1990 clashes between Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks in the Osh region left several hundred people dead. That conflict was resolved through the quick deployment of Soviet troops. Its suppression was enforced by Askar Akayev, who ruled as Kyrgyzstan's president until 2005, when the “tulip revolution” saw him replaced by Mr Bakiyev.

Text 9. What's there to fight about?

Overnight fighting in the streets of Osh, the second-largest city in Kyrgyzstan, has killed at least 45 people and injured hundreds more. Hospital workers reckon most of the dead were felled by gunfire. Several buildings in downtown Osh were burning by the morning of Friday June 12th 11th, and gangs of young men were seen walking the streets with iron bars in hand. The army has moved personnel carriers into the city centre and a military official, on behalf of the interim government in Bishkek, the country's capital, declared a local curfew effective through June 20th.

In an immediate sense, it is unclear what caused the violence. Kyrgyzstan has been on a low boil since Kurmanbek Bakiyev was forced from power in April. National police killed at least 83 protesters on April 7th, losing several of their own men too; less deadly clashes have broken out several times in the months since. The leader of the interim government, Roza Otunbayeva, has said that the latest fighting may have been sparked by a “local conflict”.

In another sense though, the cause of this week’s fighting is all too easy to guess. Ms Otunbayeva’s government, struggling to maintain order on a national scale, may well be right in its initial assessment that this began as an isolated fight in a casino. But it seems likely that the violence was caused by an explosion of the broader tensions between the ethnic groups that predominate in southern Kyrgyzstan. In the chaotic days and weeks after Mr Bakiyev surrendered his seat in Bishkek, opportunistic mobs indulged in looting and score-settling across the country. In the north, around Bishkek, Kyrgyz gangs attacked enclaves of Russians and Meshketian Turks. What had been latent became manifest.

But the real show was in the south, where Mr Bakiyev fled with his entourage, taking brief refuge in his family stronghold. One of our correspondents was travelling with him at the time: a major theme of the diary he kept was of the anxiety felt by both sides of the ethnic divide. A majority of the country is ethnically Kyrgyz, perhaps 70%, with large minorities of ethnic Uzbeks, Russians and other groups spread throughout. Uzbeks comprise perhaps 15% of the country’s population, a plurality among the minorities. But around Kyrgyzstan’s bit of the Fergana valley—the eastern rim surrounding the ethnically mixed heartland of modern Uzbekistan—Uzbeks form a narrow majority. (Ethnolinguistic maps of the region reward close study, though the figures from the best Soviet-era research are out of date.) Mr Bakiyev’s departure aggravated the anxieties felt by both of the peoples there: that in a vacuum, the other side would seize power. There was fighting in Jalal-Abad, the other major city of the south; our correspondent sheltered with Uzbeks in a university courtyard.

In June 1990, during the last days of the Kyrgyz and Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republics, street brawling around the oblast of Osh took a turn for the bloody. A state of emergency and curfew were imposed for the whole of the summer. That’s when Kyrgyzstan got its first president, Askar Akayev, who held country’s ethnic frictions in check while governing with increasing brutality—until Mr Bakiyev displaced him in the “tulip revolution” of 2005.

Text 10. Tear gas, not tulips

Five years after the “Tulip revolution” which led to the ouster of one president, Kyrgyzstan has seen another flee the capital, another new govern-

ment set up and more elections promised. How stable the new regime will be, however, is far from clear.

Violent clashes between thousands of anti-government demonstrators and police in the capital, Bishkek, on Wednesday April 7th left at least 65 people dead and about 500 injured. The police used tear gas, smoke grenades and live bullets to dispel rioters in front of the presidential palace in the city centre—to no avail. The crowds stormed the government building and set fire to the prosecutor's office.

In the afternoon, the president, Kurmanbek Bakiyev, imposed a curfew on Bishkek and three regions in the north and centre of the country. By the evening, though, he had left the capital in an aeroplane and was rumoured to have landed in Osh, his stronghold in the volatile Fergana valley. His appearance there could raise the spectre of north-south divisions and the continuation of violence.

As the president was fleeing, leaders of the Opposition were negotiating with members of his administration about a transfer of power. After the prime minister, Daniyar Usenov, resigned, his post was taken by Roza Otunbayeva, who will lead an interim government for six months until elections take place. Ms Otunbayeva was a prominent opposition figure during the 2005 revolution and became foreign minister. But, disenchanted with Mr Bakiyev, she later joined the new opposition.

The revolution has thus devoured its children. Yet the uprising itself did not come as a surprise, only perhaps its speed and its bloodiness. Discontent had been simmering since the beginning of the year, after a steep increase in energy prices.

That was painful in itself and made the nepotism of President Bakiyev and the increasing scale of corruption by senior officials—worse than under the previous leadership—much harder to bear. The uprising in Bishkek was triggered by events the day before in the city of Talas, in the north of the country, where unrest has been concentrated (President Bakiyev is from the south and southerners dominated his administration). Several thousand demonstrators stormed the regional government building and took the governor hostage. He was freed by the police, but the demonstrators later retook the building. The protest then swept through the country, reaching Bishkek the next day.

Mr Bakiyev made two decisive mistakes. First, he had almost all the country's opposition leaders arrested by the morning of April 7th, which left the protesting crowds without any sense of direction or moderating influence. The leaders were almost all released later in the day but by then it was too late. Second, he miscalculated by using brutal force to hang on to power, which ultimately made it impossible for him to stay. The police were also clearly outnumbered by protesters.

Mr Bakiyev disappointed many of his supporters by not living up to his promises of democracy and political reform. He failed to curb corruption, mismanaged the economy, placed some of his numerous relatives in important positions and overall, became more authoritarian than the predecessor he helped to oust.

On the eve of the fifth anniversary of the Tulip revolution, on March 23rd, he declared that Western-style democracy, a system based on elections and individual human rights, might not be suitable for Kyrgyzstan (which once styled itself Central Asia's Switzerland, a tolerant, mountainous place). He thought "consultative democracy"—ie, talking to local bigwigs—would be more in line with the country's traditions.

The events in Kyrgyzstan have implications for Russia and America, which both have military bases in the impoverished country. The Americans, who supply troops in Afghanistan from Manas base in the north of the country, just managed to retain rights to it last year. This upset the Russians, who had offered the Kyrgyz \$2 billion in aid, presumably hoping Manas would be closed. The Kremlin's leaders do not seem to have offered Mr Bakiyev asylum in Moscow, as they did to his predecessor. On April 8th, the new prime minister said America can continue to use the Manas airbase.

But the abrupt change in Kyrgyzstan is also being closely watched in the rest of Central Asia. This was the second time that as few as 5,000 demonstrators succeeded in overthrowing an unwanted government in Kyrgyzstan—an example that the no-less authoritarian neighbours fear could be emulated elsewhere. For the Kyrgyz people, though, it is an opportunity to get things right the second time around.

TERORISM AND GLOBAL SECURITY.

Text 1. The Changing Faces of Terrorism

The oft-repeated statement 'One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter' reflects genuine doubts about what constitutes 'terrorism'. Sir Adam Roberts surveys the ever-changing definition of terrorist activity, including mass murder of civilians exemplified by the events of September 11.

ORIGINS

The attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11 confirmed that terrorism had acquired a new face. Terrorists were now engaged in a campaign of suicide and mass murder on a huge scale. Previously it had been possible to believe that there were limits beyond which even terrorists would not go. After the thousands of deaths on September 11, it was evident that at least one group would stop at nothing.

'...terror is often at its bloodiest when used by dictatorial governments against their own citizens.' Terrorism was not always like this. Its history is as much European as Middle Eastern, and as much secular as religious. Far from being wilfully indiscriminate, it was often pointedly discriminate. Yet there are some common threads that can be traced through the history of terrorism. What happened on September 11 was a sinister new twist in an old story of fascination with political violence.

The word 'terrorism' entered into European languages in the wake of the French revolution of 1789. In the early revolutionary years, it was largely by violence that governments in Paris tried to impose their radical new order on a reluctant citizenry. As a result, the first meaning of the word 'terrorism', as recorded by the Académie Française in 1798, was 'system or rule of terror'. This serves as a healthy reminder that terror is often at its bloodiest when used by dictatorial governments against their own citizens.

ASSASSINATION

During the 19th century terrorism underwent a fateful transformation, coming to be associated, as it still is today, with non-governmental groups. They developed certain ideas that were to become the hallmark of subsequent terrorism in many countries. They believed in the targeted killing of the 'leaders of oppression'; they were convinced that the developing technologies of the age – symbolized by bombs and bullets – enabled them to strike directly and discriminately.

Terrorism continued for many decades to be associated primarily with the assassination of political leaders and heads of state. In general, the extensive practice of assassination in the 20th century seldom had the particular effects for which terrorists hoped.

In the half-century after the World War Two, terrorism broadened well beyond assassination of political leaders and heads of state. In certain European colonies, terrorist movements developed, often with two distinct purposes. The first was obvious: to put pressure on the colonial powers (such as Britain, France, and the Netherlands) to hasten their withdrawal. The second was more subtle: to intimidate the indigenous population into supporting a particular group's claims to leadership of the emerging post-colonial state. Sometimes these strategies had some success, but not always.

(By Professor Adam Roberts
11 May 2007)

Text 2. Terrorism: A Brief History

What is terrorism? There are more than a hundred definitions. The Department of State has one, Title 22 of the U.S. Code Section 2656: "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience." The Department of Defense has another, and also the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while the present writer has contributed two or three definitions of his own. But none is wholly satisfactory.

Too much has been made, in my opinion, of the element of "noncombatant targets" in order to define terrorism; there has not been a terrorist group in history that has attacked only soldiers or policemen. And what if a group of gunmen attack soldiers in the morning and civilians at night: Are they terrorists, do they belong to a different category, or do they change their character in the course of a day?

No all-embracing definition will ever be found for the simple reason that there is not one terrorism, but there have been many terrorisms, greatly differing in time and space, in motivation, and in manifestations and aims.

INITIAL STUDIES

When the systematic study of terrorism began in the 1970s, it was—mistakenly—believed by some that terrorism was more or less a monopoly of extreme left-wing groups, such as the Italian Red Brigades or the German Red Army or various Latin American groups. (There was also ethnic-nationalist terrorism, such as in Northern Ireland, but it figured less prominently.) Hence the conclusion: Terrorism comes into being wherever people are most exploited and most cruelly oppressed. Terrorism, therefore, could easily be ended by removing exploitation and oppression.

However, it should have been clear even then that this could not possibly be a correct explanation because terrorism had been altogether absent precisely in the most oppressive regimes of the 20th century—Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. True, there was virtually no terrorism in the very richest

societies and the most egalitarian—but nor was there terrorism in the very poorest.

A decade passed and most of the terrorist groups of the Far Left disappeared. If there was terrorism during the 1980s, it came to large extent from small cells of the Extreme Right. were some instances of aircraft hijackings and bombings (such as over Lockerbie, Scotland), and a few embassies were attacked or even seized (such as in Tehran), but these operations were not carried out by groups of the Extreme Left.

The most deadly terrorist act in the United States prior to September 11, 2001, was the 1995 bombing of a federal building in Oklahoma City, carried out by right-wing extremist sectarians. Nationalist terrorism continued (in Ulster, the Basque region of Spain, Sri Lanka, Israel, and some other places), but the Islamist terrorism that figures so prominently today was, as yet, hardly in appearance except, sporadically, in some Middle Eastern countries.

Today, terrorism and al-Qaida, and similar groups motivated by religious fanaticism, have virtually become synonyms, inevitably, perhaps, because most contemporary terrorism is carried out by their adherents. But the temptation to equate terrorism with these groups should be resisted for the simple reason that terrorism antedates militant Islamism by a very long time and, for all one knows, will continue to exist well after the present protagonists of jihadism have disappeared.

Terrorism is not a political doctrine, even though some have attempted to transform it into an ideology; it is, instead, one of the oldest forms of violence—even though it goes without saying that not all violence is terrorism. It probably antedates regular warfare because the fighting of armies involves a certain amount of organization and sophisticated logistics that primitive man did not have.

THE HIGH TIDE OF TERRORISM

The high tide of terrorism rose toward the end of the 19th century. Among the main active groups were the Irish rebels, the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries, and assorted anarchists all over Europe and North America. But secret societies were also actively engaging in terrorism outside Europe—in Egypt, for instance, as well as in India and China—aiming at national liberation. Some of these attacks had tragic consequences; others were more successful in the long, rather than the short, run.

The violence of the 19th century terrorists was notable—they killed a Russian tsar (Alexander II), as well as many ministers, archdukes, and generals; American presidents (William McKinley in 1901 and, before him in 1881, James Garfield); King Umberto of Italy; an empress of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy; Sadi Carnot, president of France; Antonio Canovas, the Spanish prime minister—to mention only some of the most prominent

victims. The First World War, of course, was triggered by the murder of Franz Ferdinand, the Austrian heir to the throne, in Sarajevo in 1914.

Rereading the press of that period (and also novels by leading writers from Fyodor Dostoevsky to Henry James and Joseph Conrad), one could easily gain the impression that terrorism was the greatest danger facing mankind and that the end of civilized life was at hand. But as so often before and after, the terrorist danger passed, and, as the Russian Bolshevik revolutionary Leon Trotsky noted on one occasion, one minister was killed, but several others were only too eager to replace him.

CONTEMPORARY TERRORISM

Terrorism reappeared after World War I in various countries, such as Germany and the Balkan nations. Before coming to power, both Fascists and Communists believed in mass violence rather than individual terrorist acts—with some occasional exceptions, such as the assassination of the Italian Socialist leader Giacomo Matteoti.

There was little terrorism during World War II and during the two decades thereafter. This explains, perhaps, why the renewal of terrorist operations in the 1970s and, *a fortiori*, the appearance of Islamist terrorism were interpreted by many, oblivious of the long, earlier history of terrorism, as something wholly new and unprecedented. This was particularly striking with regard to suicide terrorism. As noted earlier, most terrorism up to the late 19th century had been suicide missions, simply because the only available weapons were daggers, short-range pistols, or highly unstable bombs likely to explode in the hands of the attackers.

It is true, however, that contemporary terrorism differs in some essential respects from that perpetrated in the 19th century and earlier on.

Traditional terrorism had its "code of honor": It targeted kings, military leaders, ministers, and other leading public figures, but if there were a danger that the wife or the children of the target would be killed in an attack, terrorists would refrain from striking, even if doing so endangered their own lives.

Today, indiscriminate terrorism has become the rule; very few leading politicians or generals have been killed, but very many wholly innocent people have. The term terrorism has, therefore, very negative connotations, and terrorists now insist on being called by another name. When Boris Savinkov, who headed the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries before World War I, published his autobiography, he had no hesitation in giving it the title *Memoirs of a Terrorist*. Today this would be unthinkable—the modern terrorist wants to be known as a freedom fighter, a guerrilla, a militant, an insurgent, a rebel, a revolutionary—anything but a terrorist, a killer of random innocents.

If there is no agreement concerning a definition of terrorism, does it mean that total confusion and relativism prevail, that one view is as good as another? It is perfectly true that, as an often quoted saying goes, one person's

terrorist is another's freedom fighter. But since even the greatest mass murderers in history had their admirers, from Hitler to Pol Pot, such wisdom does not take us very far. Most of those who have studied terrorism and are reasonably free from bias will agree much of the time in their judgment of an action, even if perfect definitions of terrorism do not exist. Someone has compared it with pornography or obscenity, which is also difficult to define, but an observer with some experience will know it when he sees it.

There are no shortcuts to explain why people choose to be terrorists, no magic formulas or laws similar to Newton's and Einstein's in the physical world. From time to time, new insights are offered that do not, however, usually survive critical examination. Recently, for instance, it has been suggested that terrorism occurs only (or mainly) where there has been a foreign invasion of a country. This proposition is true in some cases, such as Napoleon's occupation of Spain or the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq. But a look at the geopolitical map of contemporary terrorism shows that, in most cases, from Sri Lanka to Bangladesh to Algeria to Europe, foreign invasion is not the decisive factor. And even in Iraq, the great majority of terrorist victims occur not among the occupying forces but as the result of attacks of Sunnis against Shiites, and vice versa.

(By Walter Laqueur)

Text 3. What is Terrorism?

What exactly is terrorism? A terrorist act would appear to be easily recognizable. Despite laws and international treaties defining terrorism as criminal behavior, many people have their own perceptions as to what constitutes terrorism. The pattern is familiar. First, a bomb attack or other violent act takes place. Then, frequently, a so-called "communiqué" is issued by some group claiming responsibility for the attack. Meanwhile, authorities and the society at large deal with the impact – death and destruction.

Terrorism can occur anywhere, and it usually comes in the form of a surprise attack. In Samarra, Iraq, a Shi'a shrine was blasted into ruins in February. On the Indonesian island of Bali, three suicide bombers took 20 lives last October. In London, bombs ripped apart three subway stations and a bus last July. And in the United States, on September 11, 2001, hijacked airliners toppled New York City's World Trade Center and slammed into the Pentagon near Washington.

VIOLENCE LINKED BY A COMMON GOAL

Analyst Brian Jackson, with the RAND Corporation in Washington, says that while the goals of specific terrorist groups may vary, there is a common thread linking these acts of violence. He says, "Terrorism is a psychological weapon. It's attempting to cause fear, and, through causing that

fear, influence others. So by injuring some members of the population, you attempt to cause fear across that population and, by doing that, have that population exert pressure on the government to change its decisions."

TERROR AND A CHANGE IN GOVERNMENT

That is exactly what happened in Spain two years ago. Three days before national elections, a series of explosions ripped apart four commuter trains, killing about 200 people. Conservative Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar, who had sent troops to join the U.S.-led coalition in Iraq, blamed the Basque separatist group ETA for the bombings. Then, al-Qaida claimed responsibility for the blasts and demanded that Spain withdraw its troops from Iraq. Spanish voters responded by electing the opposition Socialist Party of Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero. One of Mr. Zapatero's first acts as Spain's leader was to pull Spanish forces out of Iraq.

A BROADVIEW AND THE LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

At the Center for Defense Information in Washington, analyst Steven Welsh says there is a broadly accepted view of what constitutes terrorism. According to Mr. Welsh, "Traditional definitions usually include the use of violence in order to intimidate a civilian population or to coerce a government, usually carried out by non-state actors or clandestine agents who do not have a lawful basis, in order to disrupt otherwise peaceful settings or the conduct of national affairs."

Although most experts on the subject say terrorism is a political term rather than a legal one, nations and international treaties have sought to put terrorist-related crimes like aircraft hijacking and the murder of diplomats into a legal context. But these definitions can vary in scope and content.

Jeffrey Breinholt is Deputy Chief for Counterterrorism at the U.S. Department of Justice. He says, "There is no such thing in the United States as a 'crime of terrorism.' Instead, what we do as a government is to list those things that we know terrorists do from our experience with them, and then make it a crime to commit those various acts." Unlawful possession of weapons and explosives and destruction of U.S. government property are some of the terrorism-connected acts covered by U.S. federal law.

THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEPTIONS

Regardless of how terrorism is defined, Brent Heminger at the independent Terrorism Research Center in Washington says there are people who do not see specific acts as terrorism because of their own political or social beliefs. Mr. Heminger contends, "If you went out in the streets in the U.S. and asked 10 separate Americans of all nationalities and creeds what terrorism is, you would get 10 different answers. Each person's perception of a terrorism fighter and a 'freedom fighter' is different, especially in the U.S. In the 1980s, terrorists in Central America were, in fact, our 'freedom fighters.'"

Some people have defended the Irish Republican Army's violence in Northern Ireland as part of a legitimate effort to unite the British-ruled region with the Irish Republic. Similar justifications have been made regarding violence by Chechen and Sri Lankan separatists. Perceptions of terrorism can also be shaped by religion. Some people claim that the holy writings of their faith contain passages that provide justification for violence -- this, despite the fact that all major religions say the killing of innocent people is unacceptable.

VIOLENCE RISES TO MAINTAIN TERROR'S SHOCK VALUE

The death toll from a single act of terrorism soared to new heights with the murder of roughly 3 thousand people in the September 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington. To RAND Corporation analyst Brian Jackson, terrorism's mounting bloodshed reflects the perpetrators' attempts to always make the greatest possible impact with their crimes.

"In the 1970s and 1980s, terrorism was frequently a case where the group tried to kill a few to scare many for whatever reason," says Mr. Jackson. "As societies have gradually become more accustomed to violence, as we see groups with different goals, we've seen terrorist organizations that have really scaled up their activities to try to kill more people."

Fighting Terrorism The West views terrorism as a significant threat to peace and stability that compels strong and comprehensive action. Center for Defense Information analyst Steven Welsh says efforts to combat such violence have to go far beyond the apprehension and punishment of those who perpetrate violence.

Mr. Welsh contends, "In order to cast the broad net, to get everybody who shares the guilt and to look at things we need to put a stop to in order to prevent terrorism, we need to look at the ancillary activities that radiate out from the violent act itself -- such as the financing, the planning and the incitement to violence." Those activities, aided by modern technologies to allow surreptitious movement and communications, make the global war against terrorists increasingly complex and difficult. But the United States and other nations say they will not be deterred in their effort to defeat them. In our next report on terrorism, we'll explore the socio-economic, religious and political factors that motivate terrorists.

Text 4. What Motivates a Terrorist?

Terrorism existed for thousands of years before the word entered European languages after the French Revolution in the late 18th century. The violent and random tactics of terror have been used by groups on the political left and right, by religious fanatics of various faiths, by the rich and poor, by nationalists and revolutionaries. Terrorist Mohammed Atta was motivated out

of hatred for America to fly an airplane into a New York City skyscraper. Ulrike Meinhof waged a terror campaign against West Germany in the 1970s out of disenchantment with its society. Former Israeli Prime Minister Menachim Begin was driven by a vision of an independent Jewish homeland to bomb a hotel in Jerusalem.

A JUSTIFICATION FOR VIOLENCE

Whatever the reason -- rational or irrational, political, economic, religious or personal -- terror specialist Bruce Hoffman of the RAND Corporation think tank here in Washington, says that those who engage in terrorism believe that they have no alternative. "And that becomes the justification or the rationale for violence. Often attached to that or married to that is the catharsis of violence, in other words, the satisfaction they feel of the David against a Goliath, the weak striking out against the powerful," says Hoffman.

A common perception of a terrorist is that of a poor and ignorant individual who acts out of desperation. But the Red Brigades, which terrorized Italy in the 1970s and '80s are but one example of organizations created by educated members of the middle class. Bard O'Neill, Director of Insurgency Studies at the National War College in Washington, says another such group is al-Qaida, which launched the September 11, 2001 attacks against the United States. "Al-Qaida people come from middle class backgrounds," says O'Neill. "And when you begin to look at that, you find out that their motivation is very much psychological. People who are searching for a sense of identity, a sense of respect, searching to address humiliation -- these are the kinds of things that tend to motivate them rather than poverty."

O'Neill says al-Qaida leaders motivate their members through claims that the West has socially, economically and politically humiliated Islamic society. He adds that the inner circle of any terrorist organization tends to be close-minded. "They are the ideologues. They are committed; they are in it for the duration. But when you get beyond the inner core, to the outer circles of a terrorist organization, there you're dealing with people with all different kinds of motivations. And as you move further and further out, you may find people who are there, simply perhaps to make money, to seize opportunities," says O'Neill.

RELIGIOUS MOTIVES

Another powerful motivating force is religion. The RAND Corporation's Bruce Hoffman says Islamic terrorist organizations that recruit members who are willing to die redefine self-destruction as a social good. "It becomes positive in the sense that if it's a religious context, the bomber is rewarded with a glorious ascent to heaven. But there are also financial and material incentives for the bomber's family that transcend both religious and secular groups. The families themselves are often well taken care of and looked after," says Hoffman.

Scholars say that Islamic terrorists who volunteer to die adhere to the concept of "istishad", or martyrdom, which promises entry into paradise for those who go to their deaths in an attack against an enemy. However, terrorism by definition targets innocent civilians, which violates Islamic teaching. As a result, the prospective martyr is faced with a contradiction.

Radwan Masmoudi, President of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy in Washington, says it is resolved by mentally denying the civilian status of people on buses or in restaurants. "They are saying that, 'No, these are not really civilians. They are somehow associated with this war and that is why we are targeting them.' They know that it is clearly forbidden in Islam to kill civilians, so they have to find an explanation or a way to say these targets are not really civilians, that they are somehow associated with the military," says Masmoudi.

In recent years, Osama bin Laden and other terrorist leaders have portrayed the West's presence in the Muslim world as an attack on Islam. Michael Scheuer, a former CIA officer who was involved in the hunt for bin Laden, says U.S. foreign policy often feeds that perception. "Whether it's our unqualified support for Israel, now our military presence in Afghanistan, in the Philippines and Iraq, our presence on the Arabian Peninsula, our physical presence is pushing that even further -- the idea that jihad needs to be waged in defense of Islam," says Scheuer.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Radwan Masmoudi of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy says there is widespread unemployment and corruption in Arab societies. He also points to the loss of Islam's position as a dominant culture centuries ago, adding that anger over such failures has driven some Arabs to terrorism. Masmoudi, however, warns that the anger should not be directed against innocents, but at ways of finding peaceful solutions to serious problems. "As an Arab and a Muslim, I think -- we have to think -- 'Why are we in such a mess?' But we cannot let that anger control us. We have to control our anger. Anger is good because anger gives you energy, it gives you motivation, as long as you're still using your head to determine your reaction," says Masmoudi. Experts recognize that terrorism often works on a tactical level by raising public awareness about particular goals or grievances. But they note that there are few examples of terrorists who gain and keep power without setting limits on violence and without an ability to peacefully engage in the art of politics.

Text 5. Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy

International terrorism has long been recognized as a foreign and domestic security threat. The tragic events of September 11 in New York, the

Washington, D.C., area, and Pennsylvania have dramatically re-energized the nation's focus and resolve on terrorism. This issue brief examines international terrorist actions and threats and the U.S. policy response. Available policy options range from diplomacy, international cooperation, and constructive engagement to economic sanctions, covert action, physical security enhancement, and military force.

The September 11th terrorist incidents in the United States, the subsequent anthrax attacks, as well as bombings of the U.S.S. Cole, Oklahoma City, World Trade Center in 1993, and of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, have brought the issue of terrorism to the forefront of American public interest. Questions relate to whether U.S. policy and organizational mechanisms are adequate to deal with both state-sponsored or -abetted terrorism and that undertaken by independent groups.

Terrorist activities supported by sophisticated planning and logistics as well as possible access to unconventional weaponry raise a host of new issues. Some analysts' long-held belief that a comprehensive review of U.S. counterterrorism policy, organizational structure, and intelligence capabilities is needed has now become a mainstream view.

U.S. policy toward international terrorism contains a significant military component, reflected in current U.S. operations in Afghanistan and (on a smaller scale) the Philippines and in planned deployments of U.S. forces to Yemen and the former Soviet republic of Georgia.

President Bush has expressed a willingness to provide military aid to "governments everywhere" in the fight against terrorism. Important issues for Congress include whether the Administration is providing sufficient information about the long-term goals and costs of its military strategy and whether military force is necessarily an effective anti-terrorism instrument in some circumstances.

A modern trend in terrorism is toward loosely organized, self-financed, international networks of terrorists. Another trend is toward terrorism that is religiously- or ideologically-motivated. Radical Islamic fundamentalist groups, or groups using religion as a pretext, pose terrorist threats of varying kinds to U.S. interests and to friendly regimes. A third trend is the apparent growth of cross-national links among different terrorist organizations, which may involve combinations of military training, funding, technology transfer or political advice.

Looming over the entire issue of international terrorism is a trend toward proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). For instance Iran, seen as the most active state sponsor of terrorism, has been aggressively seeking a nuclear arms capability. Iraq is thought to be stockpiling chemical and biological agents, and to be rebuilding its nuclear weapons program. North Korea recently admitted to having a clandestine program for uranium enrichment. Also, indications have surfaced that the Al Qaeda organization

attempted to acquire chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons. As a result, stakes in the war against international terrorism are increasing and margins for error in selecting appropriate policy instruments or combinations of them to prevent terrorist attacks are diminishing correspondingly.

Text 6. History of Terrorism

Terrorist acts or the threat of such action have been in existence for millennia. Despite having a history longer than the modern nation-state, the use of terror by governments and those that contest their power remains poorly understood. While the meaning of the word terror itself is clear, when it is applied to acts and actors in the real world it becomes confused. Part of this is due to the use of terror tactics by actors at all levels in the social and political environment. Is the Unabomber, with his solo campaign of terror, a criminal, terrorist, or revolutionary? Can he be compared to the French revolutionary governments who coined the word terrorism by instituting systematic state terror against the population of France in the 1790s, killing thousands? Are either the same as revolutionary terrorist groups such as the Baader-Mienhof Gang of West Germany or the Weather Underground in the United States?

So we see that distinctions of size and political legitimacy of the actors using terror raise questions as to what is and is not terrorism. The concept of moral equivalency is frequently used as an argument to broaden and blur the definition of terrorism as well. This concept argues that the outcome of an action is what matters, not the intent. Collateral or unintended damage to civilians from an attack by uniformed military forces on a legitimate military target is the same as a terrorist bomb directed deliberately at the civilian target with the intent of creating that damage.

Simply put, a car bomb on a city street and a jet fighter dropping a bomb on a tank are both acts of violence that produce death and terror. Therefore (at the extreme end of this argument) any military action is simply terrorism by a different name. This is the reasoning behind the famous phrase "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter". It is also a legacy of legitimizing the use of terror by successful revolutionary movements after the fact.

The very flexibility and adaptability of terror throughout the years has contributed to the confusion. Those seeking to disrupt, reorder or destroy the status quo have continuously sought new and creative ways to achieve their goals. Changes in the tactics and techniques of terrorists have been significant, but even more significant are the growth in the number of causes and social contexts where terrorism is used.

Over the past 20 years, terrorists have committed extremely violent acts for alleged political or religious reasons. Political ideology ranges from the far left to the far right. For example, the far left can consist of groups such as

Marxists and Leninists who propose a revolution of workers led by a revolutionary elite. On the far right, we find dictatorships that typically believe in a merging of state and business leadership. Nationalism is the devotion to the interests or culture of a group of people or a nation. Typically, nationalists share a common ethnic background and wish to establish or regain a homeland.

Religious extremists often reject the authority of secular governments and view legal systems that are not based on their religious beliefs as illegitimate. They often view modernization efforts as corrupting influences on traditional culture. Special interest groups include people on the radical fringe of many legitimate causes; e.g., people who use terrorism to uphold antiabortion views, animal rights, radical environmentalism. These groups believe that violence is morally justifiable to achieve their goals

Text 7. Preventing Nuclear Terrorism

Nuclear materials have a wide range of characteristics. Enriched uranium or plutonium has awesome explosive potential. Cesium emits deadly radiation, while isotopes of some radioactive substances, such as thallium, can be safely injected into patients undergoing medical procedures. Any kind of nuclear material in the hands of terrorists could have serious security implications.

Nuclear energy is a double-edged sword. Contained in the controlled environment of a nuclear power plant, it can generate electricity to run entire cities. Unleashed in a bomb blast, nuclear energy can destroy a metropolis. The catastrophic consequences of such an explosion have prompted U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan to call nuclear terrorism one of the most urgent threats of our time. "Even one such attack could inflict mass casualties and change our world forever. That prospect should compel all of us to do our part to strengthen our common defenses," says Annan.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS

Last year, 91 nations signed the U.N. International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. The convention prohibits individuals from possessing radioactive material with the intention of causing death or serious bodily injury. But some countries have weak nuclear safeguards. Paul Leventhal, founder of the non-governmental Nuclear Control Institute in Washington, D.C. says terrorists could exploit such weakness. "The states today that we're most worried about in terms of assisting terrorist organizations are Iran and North Korea," says Leventhal. "If they were able to acquire fissile material, not necessarily from the state apparatus itself, but one or two entrepreneurial physicists like A. Q. Khan of Pakistan, and I think you also have to include Pakistan also as a potential supplier of terrorist organizations."

A.Q. Khan, or Abdul Qadeer Khan, is the developer of Pakistan's nuclear bomb. He is under house arrest in that nation for selling nuclear technology to North Korea and Iran. Pakistan denies any prior knowledge of the transfer, but Khan remains a national hero. A member of Pakistan's Cabinet, Sheikh Rashid Ahmad, said last year that the scientist would not be sent to a third country for prosecution. "I support the idea that the government should tell the people about these sensitive matters, no matter what the effect of that will be. I am not a spokesman for a cowardly nation. Yes, we supplied Iran with the centrifuge system. Yes, Dr. Qadeer gave Iran this technology. But we are not going to hand over Dr. Qadeer to any one. We will not," says Ahmad.

A centrifuge is used in a costly and complicated industrial process to concentrate uranium as fuel for nuclear power plants. Further processing creates fissile material for bombs. Paul Leventhal of the Nuclear Control Institute says that kind of material is very difficult, but not impossible to obtain. "One can assume that a group would either have a very sophisticated operation to steal or otherwise acquire the material without the knowledge of a nation or a corporation, or they would have people on the inside". Leventhal says about five kilograms of enriched uranium or plutonium atomic bomb. Ivan Oelrich, a physicist with the Federation of American Scientists, says that assembling a bomb is easier than obtaining the fissile material. "You need to have machinists, people who can do computer models and mechanics, people who can actually make the components of the bomb and operate machinery," says Oelrich.

A "DIRTY BOMB"

Terrorists could also spread fear with a so-called "dirty bomb," in which radioactive material would be dispersed by conventional explosives. Pavel Felgenhauer, an independent Russian military analyst, says corrupt elements in former Soviet republics could sell nuclear material for such bombs. "The fact that these materials have been spreading out from the former Soviet Union and the fact that terrorists do get their hands on such kind of materials or can do that, the facts exist. And maybe we just don't know all of the story at all," says Felgenhauer. Physicist Ivan Oelrich says highly radioactive material would create a genuine physical threat, but it could also kill the terrorists before they had a chance to explode the device. He says low-grade radioactive contamination also could spread psychological terror. "To be honest, the health dangers would be virtually zero. But people would know, 'Oh, they've put radioactivity into the building, I'm not going to work there.' It might be that because of the reaction, you know, we're human beings and not always rational, and from reaction of people you might have to abandon a building, not because it's actually dangerous, but because people think it is," says Oelrich.

A POWER PLANT ATTACK

Another example of nuclear terror would be an attack on a nuclear power plant, turning it, in effect, into a huge dirty bomb. But Ivan Oelrich says such facilities have numerous safeguards against that. "Nuclear containment vessels are supposed to be able to withstand a crash from an aircraft, for example. It's not going to be easy for a terrorist to disrupt the operation of a nuclear power plant. There is, or course, the question of somebody on the inside who wants to betray the plant. That's another question, but there are ways to deal with that — two man rules, you have background security checks, etc.," says Oelrich. Given that benefits of nuclear technology are tied to the potential for nuclear terrorism, experts underscore the constant need for security. Some, such as Paul Leventhal of the Nuclear Control Institute, even call for development of alternative energy sources to avoid disaster at the hands of nuclear terrorists.

(By Peter Fedynsky Washington, D.C.)

Text 8. Combating Nuclear Terrorism

Experts say the international community must continue efforts to ensure that nuclear weapons don't fall into the wrong hands.

"Loose nukes" is a colloquial term referring to nuclear bomb material — or actual nuclear weapons — that are not adequately secured or accounted for. Experts say the danger is that these materials could be stolen or sold to a criminal or terrorist organization that would then manufacture a crude nuclear weapon. Matthew Bunn, a nuclear threat and terrorism expert at Harvard University's Belfer Center, says there are four major factors in assessing how urgent the nuclear threat is in a particular country or at a particular facility. "First, the quantity of material — that is, is there enough material there to make a nuclear bomb or is it much less than what you need for a bomb? Second, the quality of the material — would it be very difficult to process to make it into a bomb? Third, the security level at the facility; and fourth, the level of threat at the facility," says Bunn.

RUSSIAN WEAPONS CONTROL

Based on those criteria, Bunn and other experts — such as Daryl Kimball, head of the Arms Control Association — say the greatest concern for the last 15 years has been Russia. "During the communist era, Russia had a relatively good security system enforced by the K.G.B. [secret police] to make sure that Russia's rather extensive network of research facilities and military facilities with these materials and weapons were secure. But with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the breakup, the ability of the Russian government — and especially the governments in some of the other former Soviet states — to secure these materials has degraded," says Kimball. But experts

say since the fall of the Soviet Union [in 1991], the United States has been helping Russia to secure so-called "loose nukes." David Mosher, a nuclear weapons expert with the RAND Corporation, says "The United States has spent a lot of money working with the Russians to try to get materials and weapons locked up or consolidated in fewer places. At the end of the Cold War, they were spread out over Russia in a lot of different places. And there has been some consolidation that has gone on — helping the Russians dismantle old weapons, so that weapons that are no longer being used have been taken apart. And some of the fissile material from those weapons has actually been bought by the United States to turn to fuel for nuclear reactors."

NUCLEAR THREATS AND ISLAMIC RADICALS

Mosher says the problem with Russian "loose nukes" has not been nearly as bad as previously thought. But he says one country that must tightly secure its nuclear arsenal is Pakistan. "Because there is Islamic radicalism in Pakistan and some parts of the Pakistani government are very sympathetic to those forces, there is concern that either during a coup or some other problem in Pakistan, that control of the weapons could be turned over to Islamic radicals which, in turn, might be willing to use them against their foes on the peninsula — that is India — or perhaps against the United States or Western interests," says Mosher.

Daryl Kimball from the Arms Control Association says the United States and Pakistan are addressing the issue of nuclear security. "The United States government has very quietly, behind the scenes, been discussing with the government of Pervez Musharraf certain strategies to better secure Pakistan's [nuclear] facilities. But what the United States government has done and how much Pakistan has cooperated is not known outside of very small government circles."

Kimball says there is another dimension to the nuclear issue, not tied to weapons. "We also need to be thinking about the dozens of other countries around the world that possess reactors that use highly enriched uranium as fuel. There are research reactors, generally smaller reactors, in dozens of countries that were built with the assistance decades ago of the United States or the Soviet Union, that still contain highly enriched uranium which is usable in nuclear weapons," says Kimball.

Nukes for Sale?

Analysts say a major concern is that someone working either at a nuclear weapons facility or civilian reactor might sell nuclear materials to a terrorist group. But Matthew Bunn from Harvard University says that hasn't happened yet. "We are not aware of any cases so far where highly enriched uranium or plutonium, which are the essential ingredients of nuclear weapons, have in fact been transferred to terrorists," says Bunn. "That doesn't mean it hasn't happened, it just means that we don't have any evidence that it has. And there

does not appear to be a sort of organized, consistent market for this kind of material in the way that there is for illegal drugs or something like that."

Analysts say it would take several kilograms of plutonium or about 20 kilograms of highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb. So far, the documented cases of people trying to sell those substances illegally involved just several grams. In addition, Kimball says it would be difficult for a terrorist group to obtain nuclear materials. "It would require an extremely sophisticated, well-financed organization to acquire substantial quantities of plutonium or highly enriched uranium to make a bomb. Then you also have to consider that that organization would have to have the expertise or hire the expertise to manufacture a crude nuclear weapon." Kimball and others believe the best way to ensure that "loose nukes" do not fall into the wrong hands is for governments to devote far greater resources and cooperate closely in establishing ever more stringent security measures around facilities housing nuclear materials.

(By Andre de Nesnera Washington, D.C.)

Text 9. Hamas

Hamas is one of the two main Palestinian political groups. Since June 2007 it has been in de facto control of the Gaza Strip, after seizing power from the Fatah party in a series of bloody clashes. In 2009, after Israel waged a fierce three-week military campaign in Gaza to stop rockets from being fired on its southern communities, Hamas suspended its use of rockets and shifted focus to winning support at home and abroad through cultural initiatives and public relations.

Hamas derives its name from an acronym for the Arabic words "Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya," which translates into English as the Islamic Resistance Movement. It was founded in 1987 during the first Palestinian uprising with its roots in Muslim Brotherhood politics in Gaza and became more active in the second Palestinian uprising which started in 2000. The group's 9,000-word charter, written in 1988, includes a description of the struggle for Palestine as a religious obligation, saying the land is an endowment that cannot be abandoned. It recognizes the fact of Israel but refuses to recognize its right to exist, and has been responsible for many of the deadliest suicide attacks in Israel.

But the social programs that were the group's initial focus made the group widely popular among ordinary Palestinians – it created centers for health care, welfare, day care, kindergartens and preschools along with programs for widows of suicide bombers. In January 2006, facing a divided Fatah, the party created by Yassir Arafat, Hamas won a decisive victory in parliamentary elections.

After Hamas took office, it faced increasing turmoil. Israel withheld tax revenues it collected on behalf of the Palestinian Authority, and Western assistance to the Palestinian government was cut off until Hamas renounced violence and agreed to recognize Israel. After months of negotiations, Prime Minister Ismail Haniyah of Hamas and President Mahmoud Abbas, the leader of Fatah, agreed in March 2007 to form a national unity government in an attempt to end the Palestinians' international isolation. The pact did not succeed in restoring the flow of aid and did not last. Clashes between the two groups steadily escalated until gunmen loyal to Hamas took control of Gaza in June, ousting the remnants of Fatah.

Hamas now was in sole control of a territory, but one of the poorest in the world, and conditions in Gaza quickly went downhill. Israel sealed off its borders, causing businesses to wither. Hamas remained defiant, and increased the rate of rocket attacks against border communities within Israel. For months, what followed was a steady cycle of Gazan rockets, Israeli retaliation, more rockets and more Israeli raids.

By June 2008, Hamas and Israel were both ready to reach some sort of accommodation, and the six-month truce was declared, although never formally defined. Their job, the Hamas officials said, was to stop the rocket attacks on Israel not only from its own armed groups but also from others based in Gaza, including Islamic Jihad and Al Aksa Martyrs Brigades.

It took some days, but they were largely successful. Hamas imposed its will and even imprisoned some of those who were firing rockets. But the shipments of goods, while up some 25 to 30 percent, never approached what Hamas thought it was going to get. Israel said it planned to increase the shipments in stages, and noted that the rockets never stopped completely.

After the truce lapsed on Dec. 19, rocket firing stepped up quickly, with more than 60 rockets and mortar shells falling on Israeli border towns on Dec. 24 alone. On Dec. 27, Israel began a sweeping campaign of airstrikes across Gaza, targeting not only military installations but the infrastructure of Hamas's control. On Jan. 3, 2009, Israel opened a ground war, sending tanks and troops across the border into Gaza.

On Jan. 18, 2009 Israel, then Hamas, announced unilateral cease-fires, ending a devastating 23-day battle in which more than 1,300 Palestinians and 13 Israelis died.

In May, Khaled Meshal, the head of Hamas's political wing, who is based in Damascus, declared in an interview that rocket attacks against Israel had been stopped for the moment. In April, only six rockets and mortar rounds were fired at Israel from Gaza, a marked change from the previous three months, when dozens were shot, according to the Israeli military.

Mr. Meshal said his group was eager for a cease-fire with Israel and for a deal that would return an Israeli soldier it is holding captive, Cpl. Gilad Shalit, in exchange for many Palestinian prisoners. He also appeared to reach

out to the Obama administration, which has refused to talk with Hamas, saying that his movement only wanted to return to the land occupied by Israel in 1967, and that it was open to negotiating a 10-year truce.

By July 2009, Hamas's Gaza leaders had clearly opted for a switch from rocket attacks to what they call a "culture of resistance," which was the topic of a two-day conference focused on the plight of Palestinians there. In June, a total of two rockets were fired from Gaza, according to the Israeli military, one of the lowest monthly tallies since the firing began in 2002.

In that tactical sense, the war was a victory for Israel and a loss for Hamas. But in the field of public opinion, Hamas took the upper hand. Its leaders have noted the international condemnation of Israel over allegations of disproportionate force, a perception they hope to continue to use to their advantage. Suspending the rocket fire could also serve that goal.

Text 10. Europe Knows Fear, but This Time It's Different

After the murderous bombings in Madrid on Thursday, Spanish newspapers immediately compared 11-M – March 11 – to 9/11. But there was a flaw in the analogy. On Sept. 11, 2001, the United States was caught off guard. In contrast, Spain and several other European countries have experienced terrorism for more than three decades. And lately they had been bracing for a big terrorist action somewhere in the region.

Despite this, many Europeans, although not all governments, have so far resisted the American call for an all-out "war on terrorism." To some, that looks like the overreaction of a nation unaccustomed to terrorism on its own territory. For the critics, the slogan has been misused – to alienate the Islamic world, to undermine civil liberties, to justify invading Iraq and to promote President Bush's re-election campaign.

Now, after the murder of close to 200 people and the injuring of 1,400 more in Madrid's train bombings, fresh questions are being asked: Will European attitudes toward terrorism harden? Will Europe recognize that its cities are as vulnerable as New York and Washington were on 9/11 and Madrid was on 11-M? Will it too start reorganizing its security services to confront a new enlarged threat?

The quick answer, many European security experts say, is "perhaps," with the final response dependent on who is blamed for the bombings: the Basque separatist group known as ETA, which has killed more than 850 people in the past 35 years and on Friday was the Spanish government's principal suspect in the case, or Al Qaeda or another external terrorist group, which may have made Spain a target for its support of the American-led war in Iraq.

"If this is shown to be an ETA bombing, the response will be, 'This is dreadful, worse than anything we have seen, we have to do what we can to

help, but it is not new,' " said Frans Heisbourg, director of the Foundation for Security Research, based in Paris. "If it emerges that this is Al Qaeda or a combination of Al Qaeda and ETA, then I think we will have crossed a threshold in the level and intensity of terrorism."

In that sense, then, Europe would prefer homegrown terrorism. Since the 1970's, Germany and Greece have known leftist terrorism, while Italy has suffered both leftist and rightist violence: in 1980, Italian neo-Fascists killed 84 people and wounded 200 in a bombing in Bologna. Until the peace agreement in Northern Ireland six years ago, the Irish Republican Army also sponsored separatist violence in Britain, while France still struggles against nationalist extremism in Corsica.

Because of these European conflicts, plus spillovers of violence from the Arab world like bombs in the Paris in the 1990's that were linked to the Algerian civil war, Europeans grew used to seeing military patrols at airports and railroad stations and to living with bomb scares or worse. After 9/11, they had reason to fear terrorism of a different magnitude, and that is the specter now being contemplated in Madrid.

In the first days after the bombings in Spain, one senior German official, who asked not to be named, said the initial evidence all pointed to ETA. Still, he noted that news reports raising the possibility of a Qaeda role would be well received in the Arab world. "Afterward, when it is shown to be ETA, they can say, 'We know the truth, our brothers were successful but no one is willing to give them credit,' " he suggested.

Martin Ortega, a fellow at the European Union's Institute for Security Studies in Paris, offered a different view: that with general elections taking place in Spain today, the ruling conservative People's Party had an interest in blaming ETA. "Undecided voters may think a center-right government will be tougher on terrorism," he said. "If Al Qaeda is punishing Spain for Iraq, the opposition Socialist Party will benefit because it opposed the war." Mr. Ortega, who is Spanish, added, "In my personal opinion, it's Al Qaeda."

Other experts were keeping an open mind late last week. "If ETA has done this, it will be easier to deal with inside Spanish territory," said Rolf Tophoven, director of the Institute for Terrorism Research and Security Policy in Essen, Germany. "If it is Al Qaeda or some spinoff group, it will represent an attack against democracy and freedom. It will mean similar terror could happen in any European city tomorrow or next week."

Of course, even if ETA acted alone last week, the most frightening aspect of the attack was its scale. And Al Qaeda could still strike in Europe at any time. Spain had already been named by Al Qaeda as a potential target because of its stance on Iraq, where it now has 1,300 troops. Britain expects even more to be a target for a terrorist attack because of its direct engagement in the Iraq war, while Italy also supported Washington. Even France and Germany, which took the lead in opposing the war, feel vulnerable, having

aided in the American-led effort to dismantle Al Qaeda. And France is facing radical Muslim threats over its recent ban on head scarves in public schools.

As a result, security experts say, cooperation between the European police and intelligence agencies has grown substantially since Sept. 11, 2001. They said that, despite Washington's anger over French and German opposition to the war in Iraq, European and American intelligence groups continue to work closely. And this has led to the arrest of numerous Al Qaeda suspects in Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal and Italy.

"I think that at an intelligence level Europe has made tremendous progress in degrading the capability of Al Qaeda in certain key countries," said Magnus Ranstorp of the Center on Terrorism and Political Violence at St. Andrews University in Scotland. "But there is still much to do, notably on the issue of identity theft. It is still easy to buy a passport off the street in Europe. The United States is sealing itself off and the question is whether Europe should follow."

Most experts here say no. "Every European country has strengthened its police and judiciary since 9/11," said Sergio Romano, a former Italian ambassador to Russia and NATO. "But they cannot go much beyond that. There is a great deal of resistance in Europe to more radical measures impinging on individual rights."

Other political variables also affect European attitudes. Britain was quick to endorse President Bush's war on terrorism as evidence of its "special relationship" with the United States. But Britain, like France and Germany, is also wary of radicalizing Europe's large Muslim populations by appearing to link them to Islamic terrorism (although France risked Muslim anger with its decision to ban the head scarf, in the name of social integration).

Spain, like Britain, embraced the American approach, principally in order to place its fight against ETA in the context of a global war on terrorism. France, though, has played a more crucial tactical role in the Basque conflict, by clamping down on ETA's traditional use of France's own Basque region as a logistical rear guard. Several top leaders of ETA are among 124 suspects or militants currently in French jails, and until last Thursday, those arrests, in addition to arrests and weapons seizures in Spain, had convinced Spanish leaders that ETA had been weakened.

More than anything, political differences over Iraq have altered European perceptions of the terrorist threat. "I think Europeans soured on the 'war on terrorism' because the United States applied it to the war in Iraq," said Gary Saymore, director of studies at the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, who served as a special assistant to President Bill Clinton. "Before Iraq, I don't think there were major differences in terms of policy responses."

Yet even if Al Qaeda is ultimately blamed for the Madrid bombings, few experts believe Europe will respond as the United States did after 9/11.

"Some weeks ago, we discussed whether Europe would react violently to its own 9/11," Mr. Ortega said, "and we agreed that instead it would take measures to increase the safety of citizens, to advance on homeland security, to improve ties with the Islamic world. I think that's what we'll see."

On the other hand, if ETA is found responsible, the experts believe the Madrid bombings should still serve as a warning. "Among counterterrorism experts watching Al Qaeda and other Islamic groups," Mr. Ranstorp said, "the question is not 'if,' but 'when.' "

(By ALAN RIDING)

HUMAN RIGHTS WORLDWIDE

Text 1. What are human rights?

Human rights are rights inherent to all human beings, whatever our nationality, place of residence, sex, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, language, or any other status. We are all equally entitled to our human rights without discrimination. These rights are all interrelated, interdependent and indivisible. Universal human rights are often expressed and guaranteed by law, in the forms of treaties, customary international law, general principles and other sources of international law. International human rights law lays down obligations of Governments to act in certain ways or to refrain from certain acts, in order to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals or groups.

Universal and inalienable The principle of universality of human rights is the cornerstone of international human rights law. This principle, as first emphasized in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 1948, has been reiterated in numerous international human rights conventions, declarations, and resolutions. The 1993 Vienna World Conference on Human Rights, for example, noted that it is the duty of States to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems.

All States have ratified at least one, and 80% of States have ratified four or more, of the core human rights treaties, reflecting consent of States which creates legal obligations for them and giving concrete expression to universality. Some fundamental human rights norms enjoy universal protection by customary international law across all boundaries and civilizations. Human rights are inalienable. They should not be taken away, except in specific situations and according to due process. For example, the right to liberty may be restricted if a person is found guilty of a crime by a court of law.

Interdependent and indivisible All human rights are indivisible, whether they are civil and political rights, such as the right to life, equality before the law and freedom of expression; economic, social and cultural rights, such as the rights to work, social security and education, or collective rights, such as the rights to development and self-determination, are indivisible, interrelated and interdependent. The improvement of one right facilitates advancement of the others. Likewise, the deprivation of one right adversely affects the others.

Equal and non-discriminatory Non-discrimination is a cross-cutting principle in international human rights law. The principle is present in all the major human rights treaties and provides the central theme of some of international human rights conventions such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Convention

on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The principle applies to everyone in relation to all human rights and freedoms and it prohibits discrimination on the basis of a list of non-exhaustive categories such as sex, race, colour and so on. The principle of non-discrimination is complemented by the principle of equality, as stated in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights."

Both Rights and Obligations Human rights entail both rights and obligations. States assume obligations and duties under international law to respect, to protect and to fulfil human rights. The obligation to respect means that States must refrain from interfering with or curtailing the enjoyment of human rights. The obligation to protect requires States to protect individuals and groups against human rights abuses. The obligation to fulfil means that States must take positive action to facilitate the enjoyment of basic human rights. At the individual level, while we are entitled our human rights, we should also respect the human rights of others.

Text 2. Iranian women struggle for equality

In the days before International Women's Day, 33 women were arrested in Tehran for peacefully protesting outside a court building. Eight of them were subsequently released. Those detained include many of the big names of Iran's women's movement, who are calling for an end to discriminatory laws against women. It is not hard to find women who have been caused great suffering by the law as it stands. "This is my son just after he was born," say Forugh, looking through old photo albums in the tiny apartment where she lives alone. Ali Reza is now seven and Forugh has not been able to see him for many months. When she separated from her husband the judge gave him custody of their child. "From the moment he came home my husband used to start shouting until he left again," she remembers. "So many times it ended in a physical beating". She says Ali Reza would come to her defence: "Don't do anything to my mum,' he'd say. But he would beat the child and throw him aside".

Painful separation The judge said Forugh could see Ali Reza for up to 12 hours a week, but they had to meet in a police station. It frightened the child so much she gave up. Now Forugh's ex-husband does not let them meet and even prevents them talking on the phone. Forugh is worried about the damage it has done to Ali Reza. "One time he came to see me after some months and I asked him: 'Do you feel bad that I separated from your father and you are far away from me?' He said: 'No. I could see how much daddy was bothering you'". Forugh breaks down in tears. Her story illustrates how the laws in Iran are weighted against women: the father automatically gets

custody of a boy over two years of age or a girl over seven. Forugh lost her child and got no financial support from her ex husband.

Fighting for justice There are those trying to change things. Parisa is approaching total strangers on the street and talking to them about the legal status of women. She is collecting signatures for a petition asking for the repeal of Islamic laws that discriminate against women. The campaign has struck a chord with many Iranian women like Mahnoush who are fed up with being second class citizens. Mahnoush has just signed the petition and explains why: "I am protesting that in any instance I am considered only half a man... maybe I am more effective than a man so why should my rights be half his". Her friend Shima has also signed because she says she has seen lots of women suffer, even her own mother when she divorced. "The right to divorce is really ridiculous. I have seen women go and say their spouse is a drug addict and the judge says stay with him, at least he can support you. The judges do not consider the value and dignity of women. It's disgusting."

Surrounded by fear Parisa is nervous being filmed collecting signatures. She thinks plain clothes police are filming us from a parked car nearby even though she only arranged the meeting point at the last minute. Some of her colleagues have been arrested while campaigning. Parisa believes the authorities see them as a threat. "Officials don't want to listen to the women's movement because they think it's something that's come from the west," she explains. She says the interesting thing is the rich, westernised women are less supportive of the campaign to change discriminatory laws than the poor and more conservative women. Parisa thinks it is because less well off women cannot afford good lawyers when they run into trouble.

1,000,000 signatures The one million signature campaign to change the law began with a peaceful protest last June in one of Iran's biggest squares. Women activists sat on the grass and sang feminist songs. Within minutes the police beat them and started firing tear gas and mace spray. More than 70 people were arrested. Among them 20-two-year old student Delaram Ali who is now on trial. "I am charged with acting against national security, disturbing public order and doing propaganda against the system, and having connections to illegal opposition groups," explains Delaram. She says she spent three days in solitary confinement in Evin Jail after the police injured her hand in the protest last June. Delaram is being defended by Iran's best known woman lawyer, Shireen Ebadi who won the Nobel peace prize for her human rights work. Mrs Ebadi says Iranian law allows peaceful protests, that it is the police not the demonstrators who should be prosecuted for their violent action. "We filed a complaint against the police. Unfortunately although 10 months has passed no representative of the police has come to reply to the complaint in spite of being asked to attend many times," she explains.

7 March 2007 By Frances Harrison
BBC News, Tehran

Text 3. Don't you dare go to dinner

Liu Xiaobo and China's with-us-or-against-us moment

"IT IS the unrelenting, unremitting continuance of pressure that often yields results on human rights." Thus Britain's then prime minister, John Major, during a visit to Beijing in 1991. On the first trip to China since then by a Conservative prime minister, David Cameron was far more cautious. In the face of Chinese fury over the awarding of the Nobel peace prize to an imprisoned Chinese dissident, Mr Cameron opted for deference.

Liu Xiaobo's prize on October 8th has made Western governments almost as uncomfortable as China's. Since the early 1990s the West and China have largely managed to accommodate their differences over human rights while pursuing closer economic ties. "Pressure" has consisted of polite but unproductive "human-rights dialogues" between lower-ranking Chinese and Western officials. The peace prize has pushed the issue back to the fore.

For Western governments, the timing is unfortunate. Their economies are suffering while China's is booming, China holds many more cards than it did in 1991, when its economy was far smaller and communism was collapsing all around it. Mr (now Sir John) Major was the first Western leader to visit Beijing since the crushing of the Tiananmen Square protests two years earlier. An ostracised China was grateful for his mere presence.

Mr Cameron is the first Western leader to visit Beijing since the Nobel announcement. China is in an uncompromising mood. Police have kept tight controls over the movements of Mr Liu's wife and other dissidents. On November 9th, as Mr Cameron was in town, Mr Liu's lawyer was stopped from flying to Britain. China is doing its level best to prevent any Chinese from attending the award dinner in Oslo on December 10th.

Mr Cameron, trailing behind him four cabinet ministers and a vast business delegation, was clearly anxious not to let Mr Liu's plight spoil a commercial opportunity. In formal talks with Prime Minister Wen Jiabao he did not raise Mr Liu's case, though he brought it up later over dinner. At Peking University Mr Cameron spoke about the need for "greater political opening" and the rule of law. Yet Chinese leaders themselves talk in similar terms, all the while defending one-party rule. On the same day, a campaigner on behalf of families of children poisoned by tainted milk was sentenced to 25 years in prison, for disturbing the social order.

President Nicolas Sarkozy took a similarly soft-spoken approach during a visit to France by his Chinese counterpart, Hu Jintao, from November 4th-6th. The trip resulted in more than \$20 billion-worth of contracts, including an agreement by China to buy 66 more Airbus jets. The two leaders' apparent rapport was in sharp contrast to 2008, when the Chinese pilloried Mr Sarkozy for threatening a boycott of the Olympic Games because of a Chinese clamp-down on Tibetans.

Now 15 Nobel peace prize winners are calling on G20 leaders, during their summit on November 11th and 12th, to press China for Mr Liu's release. Anxious for Chinese support for efforts to rebalance the global economy, no leader will be keen to do so. European countries appear ready, as usual, to send ambassadors to the Oslo dinner. Even that, the Chinese say, is offensive. The dinner must be shunned.

Indeed, China rather than the West is playing up Mr Liu's case. On November 5th Cui Tiankai, a deputy foreign minister, said that other countries faced a stark choice: either take part in "this political game" over Mr Liu or develop friendly relations with China. Make the wrong choice, he threatened, and "they will have to bear the consequences." On the same day the *People's Daily*, the Communist Party's main mouthpiece, said that Mr Liu's award was an attempt to "topple China". Westerners eager for business will hurry to explain that they want nothing of the sort.

(Nov 11th 2010 | BEIJING | From The Economist print edition)

Text 4. Walking several paces behind

South African women are improving their lot, but it is a struggle

IN THE latest Mo Ibrahim Index on African governance, South Africa is ranked fourth out of 53 African countries for its record on women's rights. In the World Economic Forum's "gender gap index" it comes an impressive sixth out of 134 countries in the world. In the UNDP's "gender empowerment measure" it also does well, being placed 26th out of 182 countries. But in the UN's "gender-related development index" it is ranked a poor 129th, again out of 182. Such a wide discrepancy is not simply because the various bodies measure different things, but also because the picture of women in South Africa is so mixed.

In the "founding provisions" of South Africa's 1996 constitution, "non-sexism" is given equal billing with "non-racialism". To promote women's rights in what had been a predominantly patriarchal society among whites as well as blacks, the ruling African National Congress (ANC) has brought in a slew of laws over the past 16 years, legalising abortion, giving women equal power in marriage, cracking down on domestic violence, criminalising sexual harassment at work, banning all gender discrimination and providing women of any skin colour with the same degree of affirmative action in education, employment and politics as blacks, coloureds (people of mixed race) and Indians. Another gender-equality bill is due soon.

On paper South Africa has one of the world's most impressive legal arsenals for protecting women's rights. But the gap between principle and practice is often wide. In some areas, particularly in politics, it does well. Women played a big part in the liberation struggle and the ANC has promoted their cause. Women hold 44% of parliamentary seats, the third-

highest proportion in the world, and 41% of cabinet posts, including many of those often assigned to men: defence, agriculture, foreign affairs, mining, science and technology, and home affairs. Gill Marcus is the first female governor of the central bank. The Democratic Alliance, the country's main opposition party, is headed by Helen Zille.

In other areas, however, women's progress has been slower. More than a decade after the passage of the Employment Equity Act, which requires companies with over 50 people to hire and promote women (as well as blacks and the disabled) in proportion to their representation in the population as a whole (52%), white men still dominate senior management and company boards in both the public and private sectors. The Women's Business Association says that a fifth of the country's private-sector boards have no women (and that only 10% of chief executives and board chairmen are women). Universities, where more than half of undergraduates are now female, have done more, with women now accounting for 45% of academic staff. About a quarter of judges are female.

Although women make up nearly half the labour force, most are in lower-wage sectors, particularly domestic service. So women on average still get less than two-thirds of a man's pay packet. Women are also more likely to be unemployed and to head the poorest households. The introduction of a child-support grant for children up to the age of 15, recently raised to 18, has helped, but it amounts to only 250 rand (\$36) a child each month.

It is in the home, particularly in black ones, that attitudes have changed least. There men continue to rule the roost, sometimes imposing their authority with drug- or alcohol-fuelled brutality. In its latest world report, Human Rights Watch, a New York-based lobby, describes the level of physical and sexual violence against South African women as "shockingly high". South Africa has one of the highest incidences of reported rape in the world. In a study by the World Health Organisation, fully 40% of South African women claimed that their first experience of sex was non-consensual. South Africa also has one of the world's highest murder rates.

The (black) founder of a new women's-rights lobby, the Sonke Gender Justice Network, says his biggest challenge is to convince men that abusing women is culturally unacceptable. But women are sometimes complicit, too. Violence is often seen as a normal part of male-female relations. According to recent research by the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, a Johannesburg-based group, most black women believe a man has a right to have sex with his wife or partner whenever he wants. Another study showed that most black teenagers felt it is fine to force sex on a girl if you know her or if she accepts a drink from you.

Traditional customs die hard. President Jacob Zuma has at least 21 children by at least ten different women, four of whom he married; he is now engaged to another, who is pregnant. In certain rural areas women are still

expected to walk a few paces behind their husbands. In KwaZulu-Natal thousands of bare-breasted maidens display their virginal beauty in a dance before the polygamous Zulu king, Goodwill Zwelithini. In villages in the eastern Cape teenage girls continue to be forced into marriages with older men who treat them as virtual slaves. Women who do not fit into the community are still sometimes burned as witches. Lesbians are gang-raped to "cure" them of their follies. The lot of ordinary South African women is still hard. But it is getting distinctly better. And a growing number of them are doing very well.

(Oct 7th 2010 | JOHANNESBURG |
From The Economist print edition)

Text 5. Children's Rights Still Violated 20 Years After Convention

Nations are staging special events to mark the 20th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which came into force on November 20, 1989. It is the most widely ratified international human rights treaty. Every country in the world, with the exception of the United States and Somalia, has ratified it. In pre-Convention days, most of the world thought children should be seen and not heard. Now, 20 years later, some children are making their voices heard. But most remain silent and their human rights continue to be violated.

"I want to have my rights and I want to defend those who don't have a voice to say no," says 12 year old Tracy from Lebanon. She is one of 23 children chosen from 16 countries to come to Geneva to participate in workshops, debates and other events to mark the 20th anniversary of the Convention. Tracy is an active member of the Children's Council of World Vision in Lebanon and understands the problems children face in her country.

"One of these problems is children's physical abuse. In schools," she says, "they hit children, in their houses. And, the other is the sexual abuse."

Sixteen-year old Fredrica says children's rights in her country, Sierra Leone, are being violated. Their situation is going from bad to worse every day.

"So many things are happening to us that is against the rights and when the Convention on the Rights of the Child puts laws, most of these laws have been violated every day," she says. "So, many violence, cases of child trafficking... Every day things are going bad, bad, bad and bad. But, we just hope that things get better for all the children living in Sierra Leone and also in Africa."

Cara is 17 and part of Planned Canada's Youth Action Council. It's an organization that works with children, families and communities to improve conditions in the developing world. Cara says she feels a special responsibil-

ity to speak out on behalf of disadvantaged children because she comes from a country that has a stable government, and a good educational and health system.

"I feel that it is my responsibility because I have the resources to help other children around the world who don't have a voice and who don't have their rights respected to really speak up for them and try to help them in any way I can."

Cara notes many adults don't know children have rights. She feels duty bound to inform them, as well as the children, of their rights.

"Because the children need to know how to protect themselves, how to stick up for themselves and fight for what is right. And, the adults need to know," she says. "It's just as important for them to know so that we gain their support. Because us alone, we are limited to do so much, but us together, if we work together to fight for child rights, then we can really have success."

UNICEF Goodwill Ambassadors, super-model, Claudia Schiffer, actor, Ewen McGregor and Hollywood actress, Mia Farrow have been advocating for the rights of children for years. They are trying to make life better for them. So is the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay.

"With the adoption of the Convention by the General Assembly two-decades ago," she says, "the international community unanimously recognized for the first time in history that children, both girls and boys alike, are not simply the property of their parents or of their care givers, but individual rights-holders."

Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, Saad Houry, calls the Convention a milestone, but notes the reality does not always live up to the document's vision of a world made safe for all children. He says millions of children remain excluded from that dream.

"Despite remarkable economic growth in scores of countries over the past 20 years, shocking disparities are also growing, with the poorest children left further behind."

Much remains to be done to ensure children's rights are being respected. Nevertheless, young people all over the world clutch onto their dreams and believe they can turn them into reality.

Despite the success of the Convention in raising awareness of children's rights worldwide, one of the largest and most influential countries in the world has not ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The United States has not approved the Convention because it fears government interference in family life and the possible loss of its sovereign rights.

Also, many of the countries that have ratified the Convention have not taken any measures to implement the laws.

Suppression of children's rights and the abuse of children remain major worldwide problems.

Text 6. UN General Assembly Condemns Human Rights Violations in Burma, North Korea

The U.N. General Assembly has expressed its grave concern about on-going human rights violations in Burma and North Korea. In a vote Thursday evening, the assembly adopted resolutions urging both states to end systematic and widespread abuses against their citizens.

The separate resolutions were adopted in the General Assembly committee responsible for social, humanitarian and cultural affairs – known as the Third Committee.

With 180 of the GA's 192 members voting, the North Korea resolution was adopted with 97 countries in favor, 19 against and 65 abstentions.

Many of the abstentions and 'no' votes were cast by member states that said they are opposed to resolutions that single out specific countries for censure. Others said they believe the right place for discussing human rights is in Geneva at the Human Rights Council.

But a Swedish diplomat, speaking on behalf of the European Union, which co-sponsored the resolution, said the measure is necessary because similar resolutions asking North Korea to end human rights abuses have gone unheeded for the last four years.

"We strongly urge the government to immediately put an end to the human rights violations in the country," he said. "The General Assembly cannot ignore the suffering of the people of the DPRK. We must assume our responsibility and give voice to them. If we do not react, the political signal that we give would be that our concerns have decreased or that the situation has improved – which is not the case."

The non-binding resolution expresses "very serious concern" at continuing reports of "systematic, widespread and grave violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights," including torture, public executions, collective punishment, and the imposition of the death penalty for political and religious reasons.

North Korea's deputy U.N. Ambassador Pak Tok Hun categorically rejected the resolution, saying it was a U.S. initiative intended to destroy North Korea.

"The draft resolution is nothing more than a document of political conspiracy of hostile forces, to put the veil of a unanimous message of the international community on the U.S.-led human rights campaign against the DPRK in a bid to deny and obliterate the state and social system of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea," said Pak Tok Hun.

He said that it would be "futile" to expect any outcome from the resolution, because North Korea would remain "invincible forever".

The General Assembly committee also adopted a resolution on human rights abuses in Burma, which is also known as Myanmar. Of the 183 countries voting, 92 were in favor of the measure, 26 were against and 65 abstained.

Myanmar's ambassador, Than Swe, said if western countries are truly concerned about human rights in his country or any other they should adopt a cooperative approach, instead of a resolution that he called "out of step with the times we live in."

The resolution expresses the General Assembly's "grave concern" over the recent trial, conviction and sentencing of pro-democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi and her return to house arrest. It calls for her immediate and unconditional release, as well as the release of the more than 2,000 political prisoners in Burma. It also urges the military regime to ensure the necessary steps toward free, fair, transparent and inclusive elections next year.

CONTENTS

ВВЕДЕНИЕ	1
ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT	4
Text 1. The History of the Palestine Conflict	4
Text 2. Gaza Strip	7
Text 3. West Bank	9
Text 4. New Jerusalem settlement hits peace process.....	10
Text 5. More controversial construction on track for Jerusalem, official says	12
Text 6. Dmitry Medvedev restates Russian support for Palestinian state	13
PROTESTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS.....	15
Text 1. When politics takes to the street	15
Text 2. Vote on political protests	16
Text 3. Massacre in Tiananmen Square	18
Text 4. Romanian revolution.	19
Text 5. 1990: Violence flares in poll tax demonstration	21
Text 6. Hundreds of Thousands Protest French Labor Law	22
Text 7. China and Tibet	24
Text 8. What lies behind the violence in Kyrgyzstan	25
Text 9. What's there to fight about?	27
Text 10. Tear gas, not tulips	28
TERORISM AND GLOBAL SECURITY.....	31
Text 1. The Changing Faces of Terrorism	31
Text 2. Terrorism: A Brief History	32
Text 3. What is Terrorism?	35
Text 4. What Motivates a Terrorist?	37
Text 5. Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy	39
Text 6. History of Terrorism.....	41
Text 7. Preventing Nuclear Terrorism	42
Text 8. Combating Nuclear Terrorism.....	44
Text 9. Hamas	46
Text 10. Europe Knows Fear, but This Time It's Different	48
HUMAN RIGHTS WORLDWIDE.....	52
Text 1. What are human rights?.....	52
Text 2. Iranian women struggle for equality	53
Text 3. Don't you dare go to dinner	55
Text 4. Walking several paces behind	56
Text 5. Children's Rights Still Violated 20 Years After Convention	58
Text 6. UN General Assembly Condemns Human Rights Violations in Burma, North Korea.....	60

Учебное издание

Анкудинова Ирина Федоровна
Беркович Татьяна Александровна

АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК: ПРОБЛЕМЫ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ

Хрестоматия
по специальностям
«Международные отношения»
и «Регионоведение (США и Канады)»

В авторской редакции
Компьютерная верстка Н.А. Тятовой

Формат 60×84/16.
Бумага писчая. Печать офсетная. Усл. печ. л. 3,5.
Уч.-изд. л. 3,0. Тираж 0 экз. Заказ

Издательство Владивостокского государственного университета
экономики и сервиса
690600, Владивосток, ул. Гоголя, 41