

The Long-term Implications for Development of the War in Iraq

Date: 6 November 2006

Speaker: Clare Short MP

Chair: Dr James Putzel

Dr Putzel

Welcome everybody to this public lecture. It's my great honour to have tonight to speak to us the former Secretary of State for International Development, Clare Short, the Right Honourable Member for Birmingham Ladywood. She is going to be speaking about the war in Iraq and its long-term consequences for development.

I wanted to start just by saying that we had no idea when we organised this event that it would be taking place the day after the verdict in the trial of Saddam Hussein would be announced and when we organised the event we had in mind both a serious academic look at what the war in Iraq has meant and means for future development in that country and also a rather strong moral commitment that came out of our own understandings, studying problems of crisis and breakdown. My name is James Putzel and I am the Director of the Crisis States Research Centre here at the School. Some of us warned our own government before the invasion that this way to move against the regime of Saddam Hussein would make Iraq a breeding ground for terrorism. It would likely result in civil war and it's unfortunate that we can probably say the evidence has pointed to that very outcome. We in the Crisis States Research Centre see failed states as states that have collapsed and Iraq, although it was suffering from years of dictatorship, many of them with the support of the United States and western powers and it was reeling from sanctions that were imposed after the Gulf War in 1991. It was not in any sense a failed state until the US/British invasion of the country and when a state is destroyed, and we have learned this increasingly from our studies, the damage is immeasurable. After the invasion the US led coalition decided to dismantle the entire Ba'athist Party and state apparatus violating everything we know about the history of victors and more. The cost of that were the unleashing of processes of disintegration and violence.

Our own Tim Dyson, who is Professor in the Development Studies Institute, has recently published an article on research that they have conducted on child mortality in Iraq since 1990 and the results of that work are really devastating. You can see the early and short report in the *Economic and Political Weekly* and we'll be publishing the entire paper before the end of the month. What the study shows was that it's likely that the United Nations Oil for Food programme had a limited beneficial effect during 1998, between 1998 and 2001 in reducing child mortality but this, almost all the gains were lost in 2002 and 2003 with the build up of the war and subsequent US and UK invasion of the country. They estimate, Tim and his colleagues, that the excess number of under five year old deaths for the entire period, 1991-2003 is between about 670,000 and 880,000 and the cost of the confrontation with Iraq in human development terms have been absolutely appalling.

So it's in that context that we ask Clare Short to come and speak to us tonight. Clare was previously a civil servant in the Home Office and she cut her teeth in politics in community activity. She was a member and subsequently director of Youth Aid and the Unemployment Unit and she entered the House of Commons back in 1983. So that's now a good 23 years of service. She entered as a Member of Parliament for Birmingham Ladywood where she still is the representative and that's the area where she grew up unlike some of the politicians in this country who enter that great chamber. She was Shadow Minister for Women from 1993-1995

and Shadow Secretary of State for Transport from 95-96 and from 1996 to 1997 she became the Opposition spokesperson on overseas development. Clare, I don't know if you remember it but it was during that period that you came to see a few of us in the Development Studies Institute, John Harris, Teddy Brett and myself, and I remember how surprised I was actually, somebody who had had most of their political career dealing with home affairs with social development issues here in the UK, how thoroughly you had got your head around the brief of overseas development before coming into office and in fact I think you were able to slap us down a little bit saying well that idea is irrelevant but tell me something I really can use and we tried to do that.

I have never worked for government before Clare Short's ascendance to Secretary of State for International Development but the programme that she introduced in government, the building of the Department for International Development as an independent department within government led to the creation of a high quality overseas development organisation, one which we would say is really unparalleled among bi-laterals and Clare is responsible for that.

I don't want to go on any longer. I do want to say that Clare was most in the news in relationship to her resignation over the war in Iraq and some said a belated resignation but I think that Clare's opposition to the war since she left government, her book *An Honourable Deception* really laid out the reasons not only why she opposed the war, why she left government but why she also thought twice before doing it and I think drew a line under that issue. Recently she's produced fascinating programmes with the BBC on Rwanda. She has spoken out on Darfur and I was surprised to see, and you were just mentioning it earlier, that you were in the Philippines very recently looking at the devastating effects of open cast mining in the southern conflict ridden areas of Mindanao in that country. So without further ado it's my great honour, great pleasure to introduce the Right Honourable Member for Birmingham Ladywood, Clare Short.

Clare Short

Thank you very much. I am very pleased to be here. I think, as do many people, that the world is in quite a mess and in quite a lot of trouble and not many answers are coming out of places like Westminster and the current political elite of the world and therefore the more people can meet and discuss and have ideas and share new ideas and say how can we get a hold on this and move it forward for the better. So meetings like this become very important as old fashioned political meetings disappear because nobody wants to come to meetings to hear sound bites.

So I think it's good that we are all here and the argument I want to make this evening is that the massive opportunity the end of the Cold War gave to the world, the end of mutual destruction, people tend to talk now as though that era, when both sides armed themselves to the teeth with nuclear weapons enough to blast the planet apart twelve times over, was inevitably going to be successful because we survived it and I think that is not so and if you look back in the history there were lots of moments of enormous danger. I mean the American military told Kennedy to use nuclear weapons for example but just remembering that structure of the world which went on for so long and that division and then the wonderful events of 89/90. I think it's just worth reminding ourselves the velvet revolutions, old authoritarian regimes falling without any violence just through people power on the street, the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, Nelson Mandela being released from prison, apartheid was

going to end, it gave new hope and opportunity to Africa and there was a ripple of sort of painful hope that went across the world.

Maybe now we can have a new world order, save masses of resources, not spending money on ridiculous weaponry, sharing technology, sharing ideas, moving the world forward and I think actually I will go through the developments after a stumbling beginning because I think no-one had prepared themselves what the end of the Cold War would mean and there was very little thinking about how to structure international affairs when everything had been dominated by the two sides wrangling, you know, the whole of the structures of the UN and all of the structures of international institutions. Suddenly when they went there was an incompetence as demonstrated in the Balkans and the failure to react to former communist leaders who reach for ethnic hatred to keep themselves in power and we got that wonderful phrase ethnic cleansing or the failure in Somalia or the horrendous failure in Rwanda, that was all part of the early post-Cold War world that had an incompetence in it unprepared for these new kinds of developments and no sort of structures of decision making to deal with them but there was also an era then of hope and advance and my view is if you look at the world objectively now we face existential challenges.

Global warming, in the generation of my grandchildren who are 11, 10, 8 type ages, their children's lifetime, that we could see an end to human civilisation on this planet and if that isn't some sort of crazy talk, that's what serious climate scientists all over the world are agreed upon, that's the biggest threat we face. Population growth, we are due to go from 6 billion people to 8 to 9 billion by 2020, 2030 and 90% of those new people will be born in the poorest countries, all of whom have got great problems of poverty and strain on environmental resources as a massively speedy urbanisation takes place, that's a further enormous strain on the future of the world and how we cope with it, the displacement of people that will come with that and of course there's further environmental strains, fisheries, if we don't change our behaviour and get international cooperation and manage our fish stocks we'll have no sea fisheries in 40 years. The spreading of desertification which for example is one of the causes of the tension of Darfur and a part of the cause of that crisis is the environmental strain on population growth and environmental strain, it doesn't forgive the actors who behave so badly but we should understand that sort of development is creating new strains in the world and of course the possible consequences of the spread of disorder fail states if we can't respond to all of this and the problem of nuclear proliferation. These I think are the fundamental problems that we face and as I have said a real risk if we don't come together and cooperate very fully of an end to human civilisation on this planet. Probably some humans would survive in little clumps somewhere but as we live not and it's unthinkable the misery and pain and turmoil of the process of massive loss of life and displacement of people that projected if we don't take very serious action very soon.

But all this gloomy future is not inevitable. We have unprecedented technological capacity, knowledge, capital availability, possibility of moving knowledge and technology across the world and sharing it, the speed with which a country can educate its people as demonstrated by the east Asian countries and so on. As the Nick Stern analysis of global warming said we need to take very, very urgent action but we could avert the worst of these crises. It requires, though I think a new mind set, unprecedented international cooperation and it requires a fundamental commitment to a more equitable world order that is fair enough that people across the world are willing to come together and reach agreements about how to manage global shortages and the rest because we have got a world order that is fair, that everyone can buy in to, that everyone will be better off. It requires a guarantee of development to all people

and to the poorest countries and it actually requires a new model of what it is to live in a developed economy because the current model under which we live in the OECD countries, 20% of humanity, massive consumption of fossil fuels and everything else in a very wasteful, throwaway society, is obviously the model that China, India, Africa if it could, Latin America is working for. That's the model of development but it's completely unsustainable for the world. If China continues with the fantastic levels of, and the great achievement, these levels of economic growth that it's had for the past 15/20 years at this rate it would have the same GDP per head as the United States of America by 2032. If it had the same consumption of cars, petrol and the rest it would be more than double the current consumption of petrol. There isn't that much oil in the world and if it uses the same amount of paper, massive trees, and if everyone moves to meat eating the consequences for global agriculture and so on are so great and that's not at all to say of course that China is doing anything wrong but if that's the model and China goes down the road, and India goes down the road, it's simply unsustainable for humanity and that means we've all got to change our model of living to have a less consumerist, less throw away, more sustainable, less fossil fuel based.

We've got to create a new model of civilisation. It's doable. I've got a house in London, in Clapham, and I've been just talking to someone, I mean the Swedes are systematically in throughout their country, that there is all this heat in the earth and you can have a deep bore hole and some pipes and then you can heat a house with energy that's in the earth already with no CO₂ emissions. Well if that kind of technology is available and of course Sweden in its beautiful rational way is implementing it across the country so could we all and there's a new study from the Germans about the possibility of using the deserts of the world to generate massive energy production that could provide more than we get currently from fossil fuels.

So we are facing an existential crisis and the only way we are going to get through it is if we cooperate in unprecedented way because otherwise we just will not have the international agreements. You know, we've seen the wrangling over Kyoto and Bush's unwillingness to cooperate but the Kyoto negotiations endlessly went on. If we go on like this we will endanger the future of the world, we've all got to limit our use of fossil fuels and the developing countries including India and China said how dare you, you've been doing this since the Industrial Revolution, you've pumped the atmosphere full of carbon dioxide and now you want to say to us restrict your consumption and therefore hold back your development, we won't agree and thus the Kyoto agreement that the OECD countries would move first and really make some progress and then the big developing countries would come in later and that was a kind of fair agreement but very difficult to reach and blown apart in its effectiveness by the position of the United States administration which was partly Bush but Clinton too was making reservations. Bush has made the performance of the United States worse but its exceptionalism was there beforehand.

But what I'm trying to say is end of the Cold War, massive opportunity for advance, new series of threats enormously dangerous, only way to cope with them whole new settlement, a whole new concept of how we are going to manage the world, much more multilateralism, not just because that's morally better anyway, of course it is, but the only way seriously to protect human civilisation and the future of any kind of decent life on this planet. We talk about the planet being in danger, the planet will survive, it might be changed but it will survive. The question is whether we who, we've only been here 160,000 years, we've only been out of Africa 50,000 years, we've only been in this country 12,000 years I see that recent research, the world can do very well without us and the way we're behaving it might

well and we need a bit more humility and a bit more seriousness about the threat that we face and we are all in it together so that the more moral future, the more international law, the better international agreements is the only way for the rich and powerful to survive as much as the poor and the weak. We are in this together and the only way forward is that.

Now the war in Iraq I would argue, we can all argue about all the detail in every way, but the war in Iraq and the deceit involved in it and the way in which it has bitterly divided the world, weakened the United Nations. Look at Kofi Annan, honoured and respected right across the world, Nobel Peace Prize but because he dared to say that the war was illegal they smeared him and diminished him and they tried to get at him with completely false and exaggerated allegations of oil for food, really weakening. I mean if you look at all the studies of the attitudes to the United Nations amongst public opinion across the world there is less and less respect especially of course in the Middle East where it is seen as now as the policy of the United States, of America, automatically supported of course by the United Kingdom. So if you take Darfur and Sudan where we had achieved a very important peace process north/south. Yes, you've got a complex government, I mean you've got something of a failed state in Sudan myself but that's a bigger and wider argument but one of the reasons that they say they won't take a UN peace keeping operation is because they are around the corner of Iraq and they see the UN as a tool of the United States.

So that's just an example of if you undermine the UN you undermine the capacity of the international system to deal with crises and emergencies and of course the consequences of all those lies and deceit was a tiny number of people who we now know, the project for the new American century, the neo cons, Rumsfeld, Cheney & Co, for which now in charge of the World Bank which is another weakening institution I gather, they had written down and published their views that there needed to be military action to get rid of Saddam Hussein in Iraq saying that getting rid of his regime would be a side benefit but the real purpose was to have permanent American bases in Iraq in order to control the Gulf. That's what it was really about. So the lies and the deceit are part of them being convincing themselves that the invasion would be popular or the preparatory work for the post-invasion phase done in the UN State Department, Department for International Development, other international organisations that included, as has been said, just taking the top layer off the Bathist structures but keeping them in place in order to keep a stable country. It was chucked away, responsibility was handed to the Pentagon and the chaos that has followed and the failure to keep order is part of the incompetence that flowed from the deceit in my view and I am not using these words simply to be insulting. The deceit about what the objective was, you know, that after the Twin Towers were attacked Rumsfeld went to the first meeting and said that's it, lets go for Iraq and you know in the run up to the war 80% of the American people believed the attack on the Twin Towers had come out of Iraq. They were lied to in different ways and of course if you believe that you would think it was reasonable to have an attack on Iraq and then of course they said but in coalition yes, alone no, and America was so anxious to be seen to be in coalition. It went around the world, it got the coalition of 35 if you remember. It bullied Rwanda, Eritrea, Ethiopia, all sorts of very poor countries who couldn't say no to America. They weren't asking them to go, they were asking them to put their names on a piece of paper so they could call it a 35 country coalition because the great blasting member of the coalition was the United Kingdom. I think it's still arguable that America wouldn't have gone without the United Kingdom and that is a tragedy for this government, Tony Blair's legacy but also our own sense of honour in our role in the world but I'll come back to some of that.

What I am trying to argue is that at the end of the Cold War, the initial stumble, the hope of a new era, all the talk of a new world order, and then there was, let's concede and as I've said an initial failure in the Balkans, a terrible failure in Somalia, the desperate, disgraceful failure in Rwanda but then things started to turn. There was the Kyoto agreement in which a UN process was reached. In Sierra Leone after an initial stumble, with the UK playing an honourable role in backing up the UN, was a success in bringing a civil war to an end and a country starting to rebuild itself and then in the year 2000 to mark the millennium, at a UN meeting attended by more prime ministers and presidents than had ever previously attended any UN meeting, the centre piece of the declaration of what we were going to do in the new millennium was work together to systematically reduce poverty across the world. I mean that was a shift in the whole discourse of the international system and the rhetoric of leaders that I think was very significant and there was a UN meeting in Monterrey on financing development and there was a big consensus and a promise of more resources. Even after the Twin Towers were attacked there was a meeting of the World Trade Organisation as you know at Doha in that November and a commitment to a trade round that would put making the international trading system fairer for developing countries at the centre of the trade round. As you know it's failed to materialise but nonetheless this was a radical agenda. It was a big shift in the centre of the international system.

At Johannesburg there was a meeting on the environment, this was 2002, September, 10 years after the Rio meeting, the first time the UN had ever organised a meeting on the environment and a very important shift. The green movements, the environmental movements had been seen very strongly and reasonably in the developing world as coming from the north and saying we want to impose all sorts of restrictions now, that's why there was such a bust up at the Seattle World Trade Organisation meeting. The proposal was, and Clinton supported it, the NGOs supported it and the trade union movement supported it, into the trade rules we should put conditions for environmental rules and minimum conditions for labour. Now that sounds very reasonable because the countries with lowest environmental standards and problems of child labour are the poorest countries in the world. So the green agenda was seen as we've polluted and plundered the world to get here and now we are going to impose rules on the international system that mean the poorest countries are locked out and can't take off and it was a very divisive agenda, the environmental agenda.

Before the Johannesburg meeting where there was a new understanding that if the world was to unite there had to be an absolute guarantee of a commitment to development for all, an end to poverty, a sharing of resources and technology and knowledge to achieve that and within that agreements would be reached about how we looked after our environmental resources and in that period, it was really the decade after 89/90, after the initial stumble, we also had a change in the model of development, much less Washington consensus, much more making the measurable reduction of poverty behind the millennium development goals, the measure of success in development which is more children in school, less women dying in childbirth, more children surviving, very human centred and changes in the way the World Bank and IMF were operating that I think were very significant around and behind that kind of model and of course much more collaboration between developing countries and international institutions because no longer was it Washington or the donors telling a government what it had to do but it was the government talking with its people about how to achieve those goals and then an open process of saying okay, what's the partnership to achieve these mutually agreed objectives that were agreed through a UN process of systematically reducing poverty rather than doing what the World Bank had told you.

Lots of finance ministers in Africa for example, from the least developed countries said it was much tougher politically. They used to say, sorry we've got to do it. It's the only way we are going to get any support from the international system. Now they have to argue with their countries that this was the plan for development because it was in the interests of the country and we also had progress in...we had an era of collapse and the growth of disorder after the end of the Cold War, as two sides who had lined up behind every single tension in Africa pulled back and you had an outbreak of conflict mostly within rather than between countries but then after the end of apartheid and as South Africa became active on these issues on the continent, peace in Angola, peace process led by Mandela in Burundi which is still moving forward. In Sudan the north/south/east process and that civil war had gone on for over 10 years since independence in Sudan in 58 and the Congo which had collapsed with the end of Mobutu and his role in the Rwandan genocide and so on but with South Africa playing a very, very important role in the peace talks in Sun City, a peace process that's still incomplete and far from perfect in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

So I'm summarising, this is my period in the Department for International Development, but lots of very powerful, effective and successful changes were taking place in the international system around a commitment to the systematic reduction of poverty, making the UN more effective in intervening to bring conflicts to an end and help states rebuild and a better model of development that focussed on helping countries build their institutional competence, their better financial management, the better tax systems and so on so that they could take greater control of the future of their own economy and attract growth in the private sector and so on that's the key to the reduction of poverty and there was a real will and agreement that there had to be major reform in the UN system that's now deeply contentious, developing countries who are now very suspicious of any proposals for UN reform but in that period there was very considerable agreement that the UN needed reforming and a consensus that we needed to update it.

Then of course the Twin Towers, the attack on the Twin Towers, September 11th 2001. The first response, remember we were all scared that the US would just lash out like Clinton had done after the attack on the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 98 and he sent a cruise missile straight away into Sudan, into some innocent pharmaceutical factory, there was a pause, there was a process of discussion with Afghanistan. The world stood together, said to Afghanistan please hand over Osama Bin Laden for trial and after that failed there was agreement internationally that action must be taken in Afghanistan. This might be contentious here but I think all of that was right. What went wrong in Afghanistan was not the political process to establish consultations with Afghan people and a quite sensible, slow process of consensus building about how to create new, more accountable political institutions and the international community agreed to stabilise Kabul but then the United States wanted to be free to roam to catch Osama Bin Laden and Mullah Omah and to Hoover them up and send them to Guantanamo Bay and that to me, the activity of the Americans bombing and strafing in the south of the country and in the province that the UK has now moved into, meant that the rebuilding of Afghanistan in an honest UN led multilateral for the benefit of the people way was distorted at enormous cost because the situation in Afghanistan now is very dangerous indeed for all of us with NATO deployed there and in very considerable trouble and the people of Afghanistan are quite reasonably fed up, especially in the south where they've seen no development and it's got consequences for Pakistan. Pakistan is a country with a mounting Islamist movement, sympathetic to the rebels in Afghanistan, of course it has a nuclear weapon.

So bad intent, incompetence in policy making gives us Afghanistan which doesn't bubble up until more recently but the failure to act properly and with good intent explains in my view the current situation in Afghanistan and then in Iraq. I think too many people talk as though it was either do something in Iraq or do nothing in Iraq. I really think that's a mistake. The sanctions were causing enormous harm. The UNICEF figures on child deaths were very, very serious and of course the inspection process had been brought into dispute by so many countries putting spies in and getting to deadlock but everyone should have been agreed that the status quo in Iraq was intolerable for the people of Iraq and it would have been perfectly possible, and this is Tony Blair's tragedy, to say to the Americans you want to go to Iraq but you're alone unless you do it properly and for the right motive. Let's go back to the UN, let's get the inspectors in. If there are no weapons let's lift the sanctions and open up the country. Let's indict Saddam Hussein for war crimes and crimes against humanity as we did with Milosevic and let the people of Iraq be supported in the process of getting him to trial, their country opening up and so on and so forth.

So I just want to put that as a side because people so often talk as though we either were in favour of sanctions going on indefinitely and Saddam Hussein going on indefinitely or we had to support what was done. I mean in my own case when it was unstoppable that we went war I still think, and this was the deal that Tony Blair made with me and then demonstrated that he had done it just to manipulate and didn't mean it, if we had internationalised under the UN the reconstruction of Iraq and moved to implement the road map behind Israel which would have given us a Palestinian state by the end of 2005 and implement the policy of WMD which is officially the policy of the US and the UK that there should be none in the region including Israel. Even if they had insisted on the invasion of Iraq the Middle East would have been in a totally different place.

We are in the place we are because there was bad intent. It wasn't about WMD, it wasn't about Saddam Hussein, it was about and they are building them now permanent bases in Iraq and they want a pro-American Iraq that will allow them to have permanent bases from which they can dominate the Gulf and the crucial oil that comes from that region and it seems to me therefore there is no exit strategy. Exit strategies are being talked up because of the elections tomorrow in the United States of America but a commitment to permanent bases means I think a permanent insurgency and we all know that the cost to the people of Iraq is monumental. I mean they are suffering in loss of life and well being but the other thing in terms...here we have the biggest hegemonic power in the world with at least half of world military spending it spends on the most sophisticated military technology that there has ever been, can't control Iraq, and similarly in the Lebanon war, another disgrace, but the great power of the Middle East, fourth probably biggest military power in the world, Israel with its nuclear weapons and access to the most sophisticated military technology that's available, couldn't defeat Hezbollah. Now what's the lesson when there is such anger, quite reasonably, because of the endless suffering of the Palestinian people, American support for dictatorships that misuse their people and general sense of humiliation in the Arabian and Muslim world, what's the conclusion? Non state violence can succeed which of course was Osama Bin Laden's conclusion in Afghanistan when the Americans and the Saudis supported him to harry and trouble the Russian presence in Afghanistan and his conclusion is we've brought down one great power and we can bring down another and of course he was very moved by the American scuttling out of Somalia. They are not willing to take suffering and death and therefore we could beat them.

Now this is incredibly dangerous. We've got NATO being...I mean Hobbs was right. We want justice and fairness but utter chaos and disorder causes horrendous suffering for everyone, impoverishment and of course talk about a world that can come together to deal with these other crises that I was talking about, if this is what is going to spread across the world, as the UN breaks up and international law is not respected. I mean Israel's, as you know, collective punishments, the settlements in the occupied territories, Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo, breaches of the Geneva Convention, such international law as we have has all been ripped up and thrust to one side and we've got this danger of spreading disorder. Can we within that world get a more equitable international system, a more effective development system and the agreements we need in order to be able to manage these existential crises that we face. I think it becomes more and more difficult.

Gleneagles I'm afraid was more spin than substance. We can come back to that if anyone wants to. I mean the general promises about increased aid when ECO, of what Europe had already promised, are clearly already not going to be fulfilled. The second big thing was trade and that was going to be Doha and that's collapsed. Let's hope that it can come back but it's in trouble and the third was a bit more debt relief for the reformers that already had had debt relief paid for out of the total existing aid budget because the World Bank and the IMF and so on had to have the money back that was being written off. So development matters, people in the world I think have a deep instinct for the argument I'm making that one, it's immoral that when we have such gross consumption that there are still so many hungry people but secondly I think people have a deep instinct that if we don't make the world fairer we are in trouble all of us. So I think people will wear the white band, rally the Gleneagles mean it, but they were being substantially conned because triangulation says if people don't like it because you are having a war in Iraq I'm going to say I really care about Africa and I'm going to save it in order that people won't hate you completely.

Gloomy, but it isn't all black and white. There has been progress in Africa, peace processes that I have talked about. Economic growth, I think it's averaging 6% across the continent in sub-Saharan Africa. It needs 7 through to 2015 to halve poverty and there are serious countries moving forward and models of reform. The situation in the Horn, it's difficult. There's been a peace process in Nepal, after failure has gone forward, the one in Sri Lanka has collapsed and of course the international system has no energy or capacity to deal with Sri Lanka because it's all mesmerised and broken up and bitterly divided over Iraq and the Middle East and so on.

This doesn't mean that we should give up. There are lots and lots of profoundly pessimistic people and I think it's objectively reasonable to be pessimistic at the moment but we need to have clarity about what needs to be done. I mean there could be peace in the Middle East, there still could be, the two state solution, Israel, Palestine. There could be a negotiated end to the occupation in Iraq with all the Iraqi forces coming together and inviting internationals in to help them and Britain and the UK come out and the US give up on its intention on permanent bases. It's not going to happen in the short term but America is in profound trouble and a future, it's only 2 years of this President, we are talking mega history of the world here and the fate of millions of people. The conclusion of America's pre-emptive unilateralism is that even the biggest, mightiest, richest country in the world can't operate alone. It needs international law, needs multilateral institutions.

I mean there's a high likelihood that a future president, whoever they are, it doesn't matter, don't know about you but Hillary doesn't fill me with inspiration, but they are in so much

trouble that they've got to find a way out. The way out actually involves a change in policy on the Middle East. They don't want it and it might take them a lot of trouble to get there but there isn't a simple way unlike Vietnam where you could pull out and write off that territory, this is half the oil of the world, bit more than, and the world economy will collapse. So they can't write off that region, there isn't a tidy way of getting out and leaving the disorder and that's the hope that we retain this argument, people are mobilised for a more equitable and just world order, an updated UN, return to multilateralism and those of us who live here or are citizens of this country our ridiculous obsession with the special relationship, and it really is, we lost an empire, never find a role famously and our role now is to be best friend of the biggest bully in the playground and it has been actually the obsession of every British Prime Minister of all parties since the Second World War apart from Edward Heath, bless him, who was so intent on getting into the European Union and Britain's position disables the European Union from being able to stand for a different kind of world order. If one of the big economies won't then the EU isn't able to say what we need is this new multilateral world order rather than a world of competing great powers.

So that's where I think we are. These are tough and dreadful and disappointing times but the only way forward is back to the agenda that most of us I'm sure want to be on and this isn't just can we persuade them to be nice and moral. There's no other way for America to get out of the trouble it's in, for the world to survive, for the billionaires to continue to be able to count their billions. We are in this together, the ways forward are this multilateralism, a commitment to even development, a more sustainable way of living, sharing of knowledge and technology which is all doable and could be such an exciting adventure because I don't know about you, and this is my very final point, I keep thinking if my granny could come back and see what riches we have, she lived through the 1930s and in times when you gave some meat to the men and one fire, and she used to save every paper bag, funny really that poverty led to a very kind of green behaviour we would call it now, never wasting anything, and saw how rich we all are she would be stunned by how miserable we are. You know generations struggled to get a house, a job, just to keep the kids alive, to get them fed, put some clothes on and now we've got it and we've got obesity and binge drinking and drug taking and no meaning. So the other side of this is that adventure to make this world more equitable and sustainable I think would give us a better quality of life and that's where our politics should be and where we've got to go. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Dr Putzel

I would like to be able to take questions now. We can use up to 45 minutes for some debate and discussion here and I want to very quickly move right to the audience.

Question

Philip Harris – The consequences of this crime are terrible and unpredictable. It seems to me that we shouldn't draw a line under it and the only way to prevent or to have a reasonable chance of preventing it happening again is to prosecute those who started it. It seems to me there are three possibilities for prosecution, before the International Criminal Court, impeachment and prosecution in the domestic courts. It seems to me that the International Criminal Court can't satisfactorily deal with the matter especially because the worst crime is the unlawful invasion which isn't covered I think. Secondly, impeachment is hopelessly political and so it can't possibly succeed so it seems to me that domestic prosecution for murder, for murder I think has been committed, conspiracy to kidnap, conspiracy to torture,

these are possibilities that ought to be explored but we can't draw a line under it without dealing with what has happened and the people who have done this and what do you think?

Question

Clare, I would like to congratulate you on a great lecture. My name is Miranda Jane Campbell, I'm a British citizen, I'm a writer and the first question, I want to ask you two questions, one, when will the war in Iraq be over and two, are you saying that we are running out of the world's natural resources and that we should ration on the resources that we have?

Question

Andrew – If the answer to a lot of these questions is multilateralism how important is it for the United Kingdom to have a very strong and very nationally identified Department for International Development?

Clare Short

As you know, the first question, we had this debate in the House of Commons last week about setting up a Committee of Inquiry into the causes of the war in Iraq. Now that came, the Welsh Nationalists have been working on this and working for impeaching. It's not clear that impeachment still exists in British constitutional arrangements. I mean it was an old mechanism and was taken up by the United States but the old mechanism was for the Commons to vote to set up an inquiry in the Lords when the Lords were the predominant House, so I think both the Commons wouldn't do that. If it had the guts to ask for an inquiry it's not going to ask the Lords to do it so I actually think impeachment is gone, it's a dead part of British constitutional arrangements but of course what we were trying to achieve was an inquiry like the one there was over the Falklands. I mean Mrs Thatcher agreed during the Falklands War that there would be an inquiry afterwards. Now the argument which you will know in the Commons was how dare you call for an inquiry when our brave troops are on the ground, you know, soon it might be over and then we might have an inquiry then.

I wrote a speech which I am putting on my website saying yes, you could say it's a historical question, what about all the deceit but you need to get to the truth and the incompetence of it says we need to say what's gone wrong with our political system and correct it but because my view is very much that this project for the new American sanctuary, the plan for long term bases, is the real reason and because that has never been admitted and the building of the long term bases I think most people don't know about although they are massive and expensive and meant to be permanent because the plan is then for the American troops, there would be less of them and they would pull back into the bases and Iraqi troops keep order in the country, that's the plan but I don't believe for a second that we are into the insurgency while there are still those long term bases so we need to get to the truth in order to get an exit strategy in my view. I'm sure, I think if Gordon Brown takes over we'll probably get an inquiry, a parliamentary inquiry, because he'll want to sound fresh and different so in the end I think that will come.

Now on prosecution I agree with you. The International Criminal Court does not have jurisdiction. Although it is a breach of international law it doesn't have jurisdiction to arrest and bring to trial. Impeachment I've dealt with and with the UK criminal courts, you will know the families of soldiers who have died are trying to get the UK courts and are trying to take the illegality of the war into the courts with great difficulty. I don't think they are finished yet but they have not had any success. So this will rumble on but I agree with your fundamental point, I don't think we are going to get to prosecutions but we should get to truth

on the record and one of things that I think is profoundly dishonest of the Labour Party to say that this could be brushed aside, it is profoundly dishonest of the House of Commons, you know lying to the House of Commons is meant to be the sin but because the Conservatives supported the war there's no will to get to the bottom of it but you know Profumo has just died and he told a lie about the fact that he was having an affair with a prostitute, yes, it was a lie and he had to resign as a minister and an MP and do penance for 30 years, these lies are profoundly more important. I think our whole political system is in trouble now. So I agree with your analysis but I think in the end we will get an inquiry which is pushed for immediately. I don't think the courts are going to admit it as yet.

When will the war in Iraq be over? Well the spin is a year or so isn't it? I mean it was we stay as long as it takes and we will not cut and run and then American public opinion most importantly has turned very profoundly against Iraq and sees itself as having being lied to and wasted money and young lives and shouldn't be there and UK public opinion has turned also but with less effectiveness in our political system I think for the reason that I have just described. So the spin now is oh, our troops might all be out in a year and it's the same spin in America but we are back to what I'm saying. I believe the aspiration for permanent bases means continuing insurgency and this is a short term spin to get through elections. I mean it is still not ruled out that the US will attack Iran. There are still serious high placed people in that administration saying there should be an attack on Iran and Iran has got some of its nuclear, civil nuclear capacity in bunkers and they talk about using nuclear bunker-busters. So I'm afraid we are not coming out soon but I'm back to my conclusions of my talk that actually America is in desperate trouble and Israel is profoundly weakened by the war in Lebanon and in that there is an opportunity but it might take time and the thing is to bring that forward as rapidly as we can.

Then is the world running out of natural resources like oil? I mean certainly oil. I mean serious oil people say we are very nearly at peak oil. That doesn't mean it's all gone but that there is in the world has all been found so there's not more out there that's never been found before. There's some like the shale in Canada which is very expensive to extract and you can get out if the price goes up but with the growth of China and India and hopefully Africa and Latin America, when it's running out and you know China is building a coal-fired power station every week, the strain on the available oil resources is going to be enormous. That's going to drive the prices up. It will incentivise non-fossil fuel energy but it will also potentially lead to conflicts over oil. America is lining up in West Africa where there is rich oil resources, China is in Africa too. There is a new scramble for Africa.

All of that has potential for conflict in it if we are not very careful but the other big things that we are running out of, we are running out of fish, we are running out of forest, you know, that is effecting the whole of the international climate and so on but we are running out of the capacity to absorb carbon dioxide emissions. That's the biggest and most dangerous of all and on that I think the only way forward is rationing. I don't think market solutions can solve it. We need an international agreement with all our climate scientists saying this is how much the world can bear. We've then got to have what's called contraption and convergence, we've got to end up with a sort of allowance per head across the world. The poorer countries are allowed to continue to expand their emissions, we've got to contract ours until we converge on a so much per head and I think the only way to get there is rationing. So companies should be rationed and then have to reduce annually and you could do that through carbon trading I think but I think for us I think we should have a carbon card with how ever much we are all entitled to use and then when you pay your bills for your petrol or booking a flight or paying

for your bills you have to give both and if you've had two international flights and if that's all we can afford then that's it and I don't think a price mechanism can get the speed of reduction in consumption in our kind of economies that's going to leave some room for the developing countries to increase consumption but hopefully have access to better technology so they don't repeat all our dirty fossil fuel using mechanisms and of course rationing is much more equitable than market mechanisms. You know Britain rationed in the Second World War because we had a shortage of food and we produced the healthiest generation of babies that have ever grown up in this country. Out of shortage came sharing, came healthy children.

If multilateralism is the answer how important is the DFID? I think British foreign policy should be a part of international development policy, not just because it would be nice, it would be nice, but back to my argument that we need a stronger multilateral system and a more equitable world to survive past 2050 in any kind of decent shape for humanity to live and so all this Britain's, we've punched up our weights, we've got to have a nuclear weapon, a new one even though we've got one pointed at no one and no one is pointing at us, because we are going to be macho and you know our defence policy is like we'll never deploy unless we are alongside the United States, this is all nonsense. When Britain is like a big Scandinavian country if you like, with those kind of values, saying multilateral order, all countries that agree, particularly getting Europe into agreement, settlement in the Middle East, more equitable use of international resources is what Britain's role in the world should be and that in the DFID where those values lie and those who think it should be rolled back into the Foreign Office that's no good. To get those values you have to change the Department of Trade. You have to change what the Treasury does in the IMF. You have to change what DEFRA does in international environmental negotiations and so on. So you need a department that takes those values to the core of government in the interest of the UK as well as the wider world but when it was rumoured that DFID was going to be rolled back into the Foreign Office, which the Foreign Office would dearly like, Tony Blair said, and he rarely says things as clearly as this, when challenged in the House of Commons he said no, no, the establishment of the Department for International Development is one of the great successes of our government. It is not going to be challenged and the Tories are currently are posing as big friends of development so for the time being I think it's safe although it's a bit weakened.

Andrew

Just very briefly, I bide the argument about not rolling it back into the Foreign Office but should it be in fact rolled into the EU or the UN as a multilateral feature?

Dr Putzel

[Questions from the video room] Okay, from outside we have - Should the Coalition solve the problem of religious and ethical fragmentation in Iraq at this point or should it solve it itself and how? What do you think has to change in the US to get a different verdict, to get a different mindset? If the 2008 elections won't change it what do you think will? Can poverty be alleviated in sub-Saharan Africa without an active role by the TNC's and the Washington Consensus that is the multilateral institutions World Bank, IMF?

Clare Short

The first question was should the DFID, the Department for International Development carry on existing or should it be rolled into the UN or the EU? It's a very important question. There are far too many actors in development. You get to sort of, I don't know, Tanzania Health Reform, you've got every single UN agency, all the bi-laterals, the meetings are so many

players and it's so bureaucratic and expensive and the obvious thing is to pull the resources in a more efficient international mechanism and I think we should be aiming for that but currently UN development, because the UN system in its development role is so fragmented and so many different agencies it hasn't got the effectiveness on the ground the UN intervention, I mean it's trusted by countries, but you know you've got UNFPA, UNICEF, UNDP and they've all got little office and Kofi Annan was trying to write a reform to get them into a common house and they need to get into a common budget and become just more effective on the ground but we should work on that and the EU is really quite poor. Now 60% of world wide ODA is EU. If you take what's spent through the EU, you know from country's budgets, I think it's about a third of the UK money goes through the EU and what the EU member states spend individually but it's improved a bit but it's still not very good. If the EU could take on this role of helping build a stronger multilateral order then it really needs to improve its effectiveness and if we can improve its effectiveness then more of the spend should go through because we should get away from so many actors and that should be an absolutely explicit objective of policy but as yet the DFID is one of the more effective operators in the world so we shouldn't close it until we've had some change to prepare multilateral agencies for much greater effectiveness.

Currently the African Development Bank is under Donald Kaberuka, the former Finance Minister of Rwanda who did a wonderful job there, is now the President. [END OF SIDE]...do it overnight, we've got to build the capacity for more multilateral institutions throughout.

The second question was from next door or wherever they are, should the coalition solve the problems of ethical and religious fragmentation in Iraq or should it be the Iraqis or what? I agree with General Dannatt, you know, this is fantastic. The newly appointed Chief of the Defence Staff said we had better go out quickly because our presence is making it worse. This is constitutionally stunning and of course any prime minister that had real support in the country would sack him but the army is all politicised. If he was being sacked it would have ripped out everywhere so of course Tony Blair said yes, we agree with each other after lots of phone calls overnight I gather!

So I mean the fragmentation is very, very serious. It's a war each against all. There is no security and everyone gets back into their identity group and there are militias everywhere. I mean it is suggested that some of the militias were originally trained and funded by the occupying powers as to try and get control of the insurgency. If that's true it's another enormous sin. As time goes on this gets more and more difficult to do but the Association of Muslim Scholars, which represents all the mosques, the Sunni mosques, has said that if America would declare its intention to end the occupation they would come into negotiations and call for an end to the insurgency. I mean if we are serious this is what we would be looking for, a new government of national unity for Iraq, trying to bring everybody together, an absolute commitment, a determination to get out as quickly as possible as they want in the responsible way then calling for international help to that Iraqi government and national unity to stabilise the situation. If the occupation continues the fragmentation and conflict will continue. I have no doubt and you know General Dannatt, Head of the Army and the Chief of the Defence Staff thinks the same as I on that matter.

What has to change in the United States to get a different mindset? I'm not...I mean there are people from the United States here, I mean more than half of the American people are profoundly happy so there's been quite a lot of change in mindset. I mean they were

evidently misled and lied to and they are very happy about where they are and what their country is doing so a change in the mindset is already at work. They've got a rotten political system. I mean America going round the world selling democracy when you have to raise millions to be, to stand for election, what could be less democratic than that and that's their political system and money talks so big in their political system. It's not a proper democratic system so they've got that problem but America has a history of renewal of itself. You know its original constitution was a massive advance on the values that we had in our political system here. It had slavery but abolished it and had its battle about that. The Civil Rights Movement came out of the United States of America. The anti Vietnam War Movement, let's not write off progressive America. We need to reach out and make more and more links and have these shared arguments I think. I mean it's for others who are more American and more into American history to make this argument but the profound unhappiness of the country says to me there is hope there. They hate what's being done, they want another way. Well finding the other way forward should be winnable and you know, American politicians seem to change with the wind. I mean Hillary supported the Iraq invasion but who knows if the people are unhappy, she changed her views on religion she might change her views on that! So let's not give up and let's not turn our back and spurn all Americans because remember most of them agree with most of us and our elite agrees with their elite so we've got a shared problems here and they have, you know, driving globalization but they've got a massive growth of inequality and the whole, it's not just poorer people, right through to the middle have had no gains in income and yet lots of jobs going to other countries so there is a very disgruntled country in its own economic interest, the majority of the population, they've got rotten healthcare, terrible insecurity and a lot of people not getting any benefit from the enormous enrichment that's come to the rich with globalization. So I think we could pal up there.

Can poverty be eradicated without the transnational corporations and the Washington institutions? No, in my view. If you look at East Asia, the great model of fantastic progress, what did they do? Used the fact they had abundant labour to attract inward investment, employment in manufacturing and then they invested massively in education and Ghana and South Korea have the same GDP per head in 1968. I think the equivalent for Africa is probably agri-processing. I think phone, what you call them, phone centres, call centres, thank you, because Africa has a fantastic talent for languages, it's in the same time zone as us, Francophone, Anglophone, but the big investment, the transfers would come through transnational corporations and actually they tend to have better employment standards and environmental standards than local cowboy capital because you know all of the attention of the media. So people love to hate them but I think...and if we can put basic regulation into the international system so that no country is allowed to lower its environmental standards to get inward investment or to offer cuts in taxation.

So we've got a basic platform then I think if we could have some peace processes in Africa, getting more investment in, more people employed, more value added. I mean coffee comes out of Africa green, Germany is a great big coffee exporter or the roasting and packaging is in Germany or the jobs. A fair trade coffee bar, the only fair trade thing out of Africa is the raw cocoa. It is made in Europe. All that has got to go back into Africa, all those jobs and all that value added and so on and it's only transnational corporations that are going to bring those levels of investment and they will if they think they can make money out of it and the Washington institutions, people like to hate them too but they are public sector institutions invented by Keynes to prevent the world ever managing itself as badly as it did in the 1930s. It's tax payers money that goes into them. If the thinking of the world goes neo-liberal then

those institutions will go neo-liberal but we can pull them back to a better idea of development that is more human centred and success being measured by human beings having better chances in life.

So my answer to those two questions is no, poverty can only be eradicated if you get economic growth and you need better arrangements so that a country can absorb and use investment well and indeed keep its own savings at home so it's invested back into its country but you need transnational corporations to transfer technology and you need the Washington institutions to help with some of the transfer of effective government institutions.

Question

Manfred Bienefeld – I have two comments and a question. The first comment is to deepen and extend a point, a very valuable point that you made in your presentation, pointing out that critique of the United States in Iraq for not having an exit strategy is ill conceived because its clear now that the US didn't have an exit strategy because it didn't intend to exit as those bases that you've talked about made clear. The other thing which has become clear and there was a stunning article in *Harpers Magazine* about 5 months ago written by conservative officials who had worked under Bremer in the first Iraq administration showing that the very first Iraqi administration that was established by the Americans had included ministers who had from the outset had organised death squads that had gone out, Shi'ite death squads that had gone out murdering Sunni's and the conclusion of this contribution is that the civil war that is now raging is not an unfortunate outcome but was another outcome which was part of the logic of the intervention or at least there is good evidence to suggest that.

My second comment is to wonder about your description of the East Asian success stories and I just make a very quick point here that one of the really striking defining characteristics of Taiwan, South Korea and Japan is that they kept direct foreign investment very much at arms length and relied very, very little on that and indeed that differentiated them dramatically from the Latin American countries and that leads to my third point that your call for a different pattern of development, a more equitable pattern of development and a less resource intensive development I think is very valuable and very important but I wonder what you see as the main obstacle standing in the way of reaching this and having in response to a recent question, given some pointers to the positive role that you can see multinationals playing in the world, I whether you see any sensors in which increasing corporate power in relation to politically constituted power is creating a problem, obstacles in reaching those outcomes that you have so rightly put in front of us especially their role in the media and their role over public policy even in the developed countries never mind the developing countries?

Question

I am a student from Malaysia, one of the small countries who did not agree with the Americans but our very strong voice was hardly even given an opportunity to be heard at the UN. Anyway it would appear to me that the UN system has failed in preventing the invasion. International law definitely failed, it has been reduced to mere pinprick, so useless the law seems to have become and it would appear also that the execution of offenders is almost impossible to do also and it would appear to me that because I am concerned about future invasions, future breaches of this international law. My concern is that it would appear as if that to prevent your country from being invaded is to have strong nuclear power maybe. Maybe Iran is thinking about that. Maybe North Korea is doing that. After all that is your excuse, the answer to the Security Council when they say why they have a nuclear weapon because the US keep on saying they are one of the forces of evil but I find that prospective

very scary, having many countries having nuclear weapons. Perhaps you could share your views on how we can prevent future invasions?

Question

Robert Wade – just a quick question – what do you suppose is Wolfowitz's strategy for using the World Bank and in particular do you suppose that there is some intention to use the World Bank to advance western interests in Africa perhaps to counter the advance of China and other countries?

Question

Brian Stevens - just a very quick point about this question of possible change in American attitude. I think three or four weeks ago there was a report of a Congressional Committee under Jim Baker, a former colleague of George Bush, which actually talked about the possibility of working with Iran and Syria and at one time our present government did make considerable strides in developing better relations with Iran. I wonder if you see any future in that sort of approach?

Clare Short

I agree with the point about the bases. I think it's completely neglected in the discussion. That was a point of my speech that didn't get made in the debate so why an inquiry now because we still haven't had the truth and the truth is the bases and until we face that there is no exit strategy.

I think, I haven't seen the *Harpers* article you talk about but of course the neo-cons had bought the argument, the Shi'ite's were so oppressed from Chalabi, so oppressed under Saddam Hussein that they would welcome the invasion and be the base of strength that would enable America to have its way so you can see the beginnings of the division in that and the crudity and foolishness of it because anyone who wanted to help Iraq have a decent future would have wanted equity and everyone having a fair chance so that the whole country would go forward. So there's the both the point you make and this allegation that I want to look into that some of the militias were set up by the occupying powers to try and get at the insurgency which if so it's...but divide and rule is the method of controlling, colonising and occupying isn't it throughout history and here it is again.

I am not an expert on the East Asia model but the assembly of manufacturing products for the world economy was a crucial part of their economic growth strategy. Yes, they took strong control of the future and on what terms and then very wisely invested in the development of human capacity and education and I mean a lot of the NGOs try to talk the same model for Africa and of course is benighted by these ridiculous boundaries that give so many small countries that therefore don't have the same strength but I think if you look at the capital markets and the...I mean for example the British pension funds are desperate to find places to invest where they get a higher rate of return than an economy like this. Out there is Africa desperately short of investment in infrastructure. There are mutually beneficial arrangements to be made and the question is on what terms is it done? I mean if there's peace, stronger government, more regional integration in Africa so there is a properly respectful way bonds can be issued and more investment can come into the economy and technology transfer can take place I am sure that is part of the future but this is a bigger and deeper discussion but there is responsible private sector investment I just want to say that. There is irresponsible and one of things about whether we have basic rules that don't...I mean I used to argue when I was in DFID if responsible capital increasingly, what big capital wanted rules to fight with

dirty capital and if we couldn't unite the interests so that the multilateral system and that to get a stronger rules based system where countries didn't have to offer cheap environmental standards and poor labour standards we could have made progress and that's really my point to your other point about corporate power.

If corporate power is out of control and not properly regulated its monopolistic, it becomes corrupt and we are seeing it in the United States of America and we are seeing a so called Labour government kind of selling the health service to corporate power. No, corporate power needs very strong regulation, action against corruption within in which to do its proper job of running proper banking or bring a decent investment but if you allow it too much power it corrupts itself and the political system and I think there are signs of that at work. I mean the whole sort of social democratic model of society with strong regulation, the private sector in its right place, high quality public services which I think is the most civilised model for modern governance has been rolled back apart from the Scandinavian countries partly because of what's happened in Britain but that's where we need to be.

I agree very much with the logic of our student friend from Malaysia and that is what is going to happen. If you were Iran, lets be clear, Iran says it wants civil nuclear power and of course under the non-proliferation treaty it is entitled to have that. So there's everyone telling it can't have. Apparently there was some deception to the International Atomic Energy Authority but under the non-proliferation treaty it is entitled to have. India didn't sign a non-proliferation treaty, neither did Israel, neither did Pakistan and they're nuclear powers but if I was Iran I would want a nuclear weapon, just one, not to attack anyone because they would be mad to because then they would be smashed but so that no-one would attack them but if Iran gets one Saudia Arabia will want one, Turkey will want one, Egypt will want one and on it goes and this threat of proliferation is a very...it's one of the existential threats we are living with and countries like Britain saying we've got to have a nuclear weapon as long as anyone wants one is part of then saying if you want to be any kind of authority in the world you have to have one and of course in Britain's case it also locks us into the American alliance because the weapons are got from them and serviced by them. So I agree with your analysis and the conclusion of that is frightening because if we get that massive proliferation we'll get use and if we've got use in the Middle East, God help us all. So the answer is to turn back from that road and go for having a UN that works which would mean that the Security Council would have to be reformed and getting back to international law.

What's Wolfowitz's strategy for the World Bank? I'm not sure. I know his management of people is so appalling that some of the senior quality people have left and are leaving in droves. It's meant to be corruption but corruption is a complex thing. It's a two way street, it's easy to pretend that it's all the fault of developing country governments but it takes a rich provider to go for the big bride that's been the pattern of the past. Does he think he can control the World Bank enough to use it for western interests in Africa? Don't know. On the other hand the IMF reforms are giving a bigger place to China because of its position in the world economy and I can see the logic of increasing the voting power of China is accepted and presumably India too. Will he, I mean it's hard not to believe he would do that if he could. Did he want to go to the World Bank because he wanted to escape his sullied reputation or did he want to take his neo-con project with him? I don't think we know but my understanding is the Bank is very weak in reputation and in the quality of the people who want to continue to work for it which is a big chance for the African Development Bank which I would love to see that being a really leading edge player in Africa, I think getting behind, it having greater effectiveness and more resources is the answer.

And then Brian Stevens, yes, made the very important point. It is funny that in Britain there was more unhappiness about the invasion of Iraq than in the US but we are now stymied in doing anything about it whereas in the US there is real political process. Congress has done more and now this Baker Commission which of course is going to report after the elections which are now nearly done and of course we've had this big leak that one of the ways of stabilising Iraq is asking Iran and Syria to help and I think that's true but that's kind of lovely because then you get America's got no exit strategy without changing its Middle East policy. That would mean my optimistic scenario out of this dreadful situation we're in. If you can't stabilise Iraq and get out without giving up your aspiration for bases, without creating a different relationship with Iran and Syria and of course then you get to Israel, Palestine of course, but if that was resolved, America didn't have to prop up all these authoritarian regimes, if you got all WMD out of the region including Israel it would be a new era in the Middle East. There would be an opening up. There would be more democracy and that is the way forward and I don't think there is anyway out of this mess without moving in that direction. Now would Britain go there? Under Jack Straw there were big efforts to make relationships with Iran but in the end he got moved and what would you do...if I were Iran I would do what India, Pakistan and Israel did, I would play it long, I would keep going. I'm not saying they want nuclear weapons but if I were them I'm afraid, I hate nuclear weapons, but if were them I would, just one or whatever it takes to stop someone attacking me.

So you have to allow processing and the world has to give in on that to improve its relationships with Iran but it could and Syria, remember...of course Tony Blair has said in his remaining months as Prime Minister as well as solving global warming he's going to get a Middle East process and he is thinking of going to Syria again but I think that's just illusion. I don't think Britain can do anything until it is clearer about what its objectives are and what it's doing and if it thinks that announcements to the media...I mean like you know Britain is meant to be a world leader on global warming because it was raised at Gleneagles but nothing happened and our emissions are going up so I think we've got a dysfunctional government that is completely delusional and therefore can't in the short term help and funny enough the processes in America and the Baker Commission and the strength of public opinion is more looking for an answer than I'm afraid a serious debate in Britain to our shame.

Dr Putzel

I'm very sorry that there are many, many more people with questions than we have time to deal with here but we should be very interested in entertaining your questions if you would email to the Crisis States Research Centre. I can't promise Clare will respond and I would like to take this opportunity to tell you, Clare, thank you for a very stimulating talk. We hope that you'll be a frequent visitor to the LSE now that you are more free than you once were and thanks for the debate from all the audience.