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Letter from the Editor

You’re here, we’re here.
Now we can begin.

*Ilios* is the undergraduate-run journal connected to the Political Science Undergraduate Association (PSUA) at the University of Southern California; it is primarily a journal of political science and political philosophy. Our intention is to create a forum for students to critically assess and analyze political issues—whether contemporary, historical, or theoretical in nature. The journal is also committed to welcoming all other disciplines, including (but not limited to) anthropology, sociology, history, economics, aesthetics, law, linguistics, and psychology, in helping to create a vibrant and diverse forum. The idea is to create a space for argumentation and analysis that mirrors the world around us—since all aspects of public life make their way in and out of political life, I believe our journal should be similarly open to such a flow of issues and dilemmas.

The name, *Ilios*, signifies multiple layers of meaning which already begins to describe the purpose of our journal. The name was chosen due to its very ancient Ionian Greek usage in Homer’s *Iliad*; "Ilios" is the ancient name of Troy from which Homer’s *Iliad* derives its title. Firstly, the name was fitting given that *Ilios* is run by undergraduates at the University of Southern California, home of the Trojans. In addition to the more obvious connection, the name pays homage to the *Iliad* being the genesis of Western thought. Socrates, like most male citizens in Ancient Athens, was educated in the agora, listening to and drawing lessons from the epic poetry of Homer, who he claimed was a “first teacher.” As such, without Homer, it is not easy to picture a world in which one could find the immortalized Socrates in Plato’s dialogues, which is, of course, the world in which we live. This genealogical understanding of Western thought underscores the journal’s commitment to being radical—that is to say, grasping things by the root. Lastly, “ilios” means “sun” in Modern Greek; without forgetting the importance of the metaphor of the sun in *The Republic*, arguably the single most important text in the Western tradition of political philosophy, it is the hope of the journal that it can foster a critical dialogue among students that will illuminate and shed light on the pressing political issues of our times.

One of the goals of the USC Political Science Undergraduate Association has been to promote politico-philosophic discourse amongst undergraduates majoring in Political Science; *Ilios* is a further extension of this active encouragement of open communication and debate. I believe that an online publication will be best, with its accessibility and openness, for bringing about a necessary space for politico-philosophic
discourse, not only amongst undergraduates at the University of Southern California, but for all students across the globe. In short, I hope that this first, online publication of Ilios will spark debate and signal the formative moments of a community willing to engage one another on demanding issues.

Like any excellent conversation, I hope the journal and the discussions it fosters will be dialectical; as such, this will require those joining us in conversation to constantly engage past discussions, but also to re-direct the trajectory of future discussions. However, I realize this is merely an empty ideal without a willing community, and thus, I invite and welcome any and all in helping us to create, and incessantly re-forge and re-shape anew, what I hope will be a vibrant forum for politico-philosophic discourse.

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of many people who were involved in making Ilios a reality. None of this would have been possible without the editorial staff of Ilios, the Political Science Undergraduate Association at USC, PSUA President Alia Alanizi, Jody Battles, our faculty advisor Professor Anthony Kammas, and the authors who were willing to help us start a conversation. Following this letter, in addition to a short letter from the PSUA President, you will find the contributions of the authors featured in our first issue. The papers range from case studies on the Russia-Chechnya conflicts to the examination of the philosophies of Karl Marx and Friedrich Nietzsche, as well as a discussion on the failures of the International Criminal Court and investigations into the symbols of justice in world mythology. At the end of the issue is a collection of interviews of professors in the Political Science Department at USC conducted by board members of the Political Science Undergraduate Association, which I hope will be a small step in encouraging and promoting faculty-student relations, both here at USC and abroad.

I hope you appreciate our endeavors.

All the best,

Kevin Lee
Executive Editor, Ilios
Letter from the President of the PSUA

The USC Political Science Undergraduate Association arose out of students’ desires to think, to learn, and to be heard. While there are a multitude of organizations at the University of Southern California that promote political discussion amongst students, we have found that the academic study of politics adds another, perhaps necessary, dimension to radical political discussion. Not only does political science provide us with the tools necessary for critical thought, it also unites students through a common desire to learn. It is this perseverant search for knowledge that defines us, regardless of whether or not it can be attained. Therefore, the PSUA is being re-established to motivate student discussion that reflects the desire to begin such a search. We hope to inspire one another through student gatherings, faculty mentoring, panel discussions, and this journal of student reflection. We encourage our readers to think and to confer with one another. Plato once wrote that one of the penalties for refusing to engage in politics is being ruled by one’s inferiors. In light of such an insight, we hope that the PSUA will be both a vehicle and a catalyst for political engagement.

Sincerely,

Alia Alanizi

President, Political Science Undergraduate Association
Creation: The Most Noble Power

Catherine Sullivan
University of Southern California, Class of 2011
Major: Political Science, Philosophy

In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche calls for a new species of philosopher—a person with the “will to concern himself with… dangerous maybes” (10). Acknowledging that seeking out ‘untruth’ and ‘uncertainty’ is an uncomfortable—and often painful—task, he admits that this inquiry involves great risk, and perhaps there is “none that is greater” (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 9). Like Nietzsche, Marx challenges us to rid our own world of falsification by recognizing untruth as ‘a condition of life’ and questioning conventional value assessments in a dangerous way. Nietzsche criticizes the accustomed values of man, which resist creative acts that threaten to contradict established norms and truths. He sees the questioning and shedding of these values, however, as only the beginning.

For this new species of philosopher, such an inquiry represents the early part of a transformation of the spirit, a cyclical process that Nietzsche symbolizes using the ‘three metamorphoses.’ During these three stages of transformation “the spirit becomes a camel; and the camel, a lion; and the lion, finally, a child” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 25). Like a camel, the spirit bears much and exults in his own strength from this heavy burden. Suffering hunger in one’s soul for the sake of the truth is indeed burdensome, as one recognizes that the search for truth and understanding may be a fruitless one. Eventually, the beast of burden seeks solitude, and becomes a lion, or a beast of prey. In order to “conquer his freedom and be master in his own desert,” the lion “seeks out his last master” in pursuit of victory—the great dragon of “thou shalt” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 26-27). Representing ‘all created value,’ the dragon opposes the
lion’s will just as society opposes the will of a defiant thinker. In order to be free to create his
own values, the lion must defeat the dragon and his accompanying ‘thou shalt’ commands. The
lion, however, does not have the power to create new values and must transform into a child that
embodies “innocence and forgetting, a new beginning” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 27). In contrast
to the ‘No’ of the lion, the child’s ‘Yes’ allows creation to take place, as he imposes his own will
on the world. In the child, “the spirit now wills his own will, and… his own world” (Nietzsche,
“Zarathustra” 27). Marx leads his readers down a similar path of questioning and self-
overcoming, though he seems more hopeful that small-scale changes in individual consciousness
may one day lead to a greater societal transformation—Nietzsche seems doubtful that even one
individual will ever rise to his challenge.

Prior to the camel stage, it seems as though people are also in a childlike condition of
ignorance and obedience, but one that differs drastically from the childlike state of one who has
gone through the spiritual metamorphosis. Nietzsche characterizes these individuals as part of
the ‘herd,’ whose “moral value judgments” are based “solely on the utility… [and] preservation
of the community” (“Beyond Good and Evil” 112). Such values are in direct opposition to “the
highest and strongest drives… [which] break out passionately and drive the individual far above
the average and the flats of the herd conscience”—thus, the “will to stand alone” is called evil by
the unquestioning sheep of society (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 113-114). Both Marx
and Nietzsche find the church at least partially responsible for the perpetuation of these self-
destructive values, as individuals are encouraged to sacrifice personal freedom in this world for
the prospect of salvation in another. Marx famously calls religion the opium of the people,
describing it as “the fantastic realization of the human being inasmuch as the human being
possesses no true reality” (54). People tend to debase this world out of fear—fear of
meaninglessness, uncertainty, and the finality of life. As a result, both philosophers accuse the masses of seeking out religion as a pacifying ideal. They see the dominant morality as descending “from heaven to earth,” and Marx instead suggests that in attempting to shatter the status quo and question these ideals, people should rather “ascend from earth to heaven” (154).

Marx proposes a complex philosophy of materialism in which man’s consciousness both conditions, and is conditioned by, his material circumstances. He notes that “the mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general… [and thus] it is not the consciousness of the men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness” (Marx 4). Likewise, Nietzsche uses Zarathustra’s symbolic journey to argue on behalf of the material basis of ideas, as he saw that “much that was good to one people was scorn and infamy to another” (“Zarathustra” 58). He argues that “it is we alone who have devised cause, sequence, for-each-other, relativity, constraint, number, law, freedom, motive, and purpose,” and as such, “we project and mix this symbol world into things as if it existed ‘in itself’” (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 29). Rejecting this ‘symbol world’ and any metaphysical explanations of morality, Marx sees man’s consciousness as a result of his social and material conditions, and hence, his class consciousness as one such ‘devised constraint.’ As people become convinced that their estrangement from themselves and their labor stem from a natural progression of productive, opportunistic capitalist values, Marx encourages them to recognize their exploitation as a choice and question such assumptions. Nietzsche and Marx acknowledge that most individuals go about their lives in such a way as to block out these ‘radical’ ideas of doubt and untruth—unaware of their chains—and have yet to pass from the initial childlike phase to the critically conscious, tormented phase of the burdened camel.
Both philosophers consider deep suffering necessary for spiritual transformation and self-liberation, and “a ruthless criticism of everything existing” as an essential aspect of this suffering (Marx 12). While Nietzsche recognizes that “there are many ways of overcoming,” he reminds us that in order for a person to overcome himself, there must be something to overcome (“Zarathustra” 199). He measures freedom “by the resistance which must be overcome” and suggests that “one would have to seek the highest type of free man where the greatest resistance is constantly being overcome” (Nietzsche, “Twilight” 542). The idea that pleasure and joy must come out of pain and suffering is a consistent theme throughout both of their works. According to Nietzsche, “the discipline of suffering, of great suffering… has created all enhancements of man” (“Beyond Good and Evil” 154). One must be willing to undergo immense suffering if he is to experience the joy and wonder of the child—“to be the child who is newly born, the creator must also want to be the mother who gives birth and the pangs of the birth-giver” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 87). The creation of one’s own existence does not come without sacrifice.

Likewise, Marx identifies the essence of man as self-consciousness—more specifically, the “Unhappy Consciousness” (111). He calls suffering an “enjoyment of self in man” and claims that “man, as an objective, sensuous being is therefore a suffering being” (Marx 116). Like Nietzsche, Marx believes that greatness can emerge from suffering, and sees the reduction of man to ‘absolute poverty’ of both the “physical and mental senses” as essential to his revolutionary movement (87).

This suffering comes about through a ‘ruthless criticism of everything existing,’ or what Nietzsche calls revaluation. Marx pushes people to realize that meaning is constructed by those who hold the greatest power in society, claiming that “the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas” (172). These individuals rule the “material force of society” which in
turn control and shape the “means of mental production” (Marx 172). He calls political economy the most moral of all the sciences, and since capital has become the supreme good, its possessor is also considered good. In the capitalist political economy, the worker has become a commodity estranged from his own work. Drawing an apt comparison between the oppressive nature of both labor and religion, Marx points out that just as “the more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself… the more objects the worker produces the fewer he can possess and the more he falls under the dominion of his product, capital” (72). The object of labor is no longer the satisfaction of a need, but instead becomes a “means to satisfy needs external to it” (Marx 74). Ultimately, the worker’s coercive relationship with his master and his work causes man’s own deed to become “an alien power opposed to him, which enslaves him instead of being controlled by him” (Marx 160). The initial step out of this involuntary servitude involves the realization that capital is a social construct—its only value comes from that which man arbitrarily places on it. This mind-bending realization forces man to imagine his life without such constructs, as he sees his formerly accepted truths and values crashing down around him to reveal a world of seeming arbitrariness and falsehood. These first moments of paralytic despair weigh heavily on his consciousness and represent his transition into the camel stage of his metamorphosis.

Nietzsche provides a comparable account of fabricated enslavement in his discussion of society’s ‘religious neurosis’—the destruction of which can have equally as numbing an impact on one’s consciousness as the negation of one’s material conditions. Just as the power of capital has induced people to accept class divisions and involuntary labor as natural and acceptable conditions, religion has perpetuated false ideals of sacrifice, enslavement, self-mutilation, and most notably, the “denial of the world and the will” (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 61). This denial of passion and self reflects a certain weak-spirited will to power that Nietzsche
criticizes as equally arbitrary and oppressive as the social and material reality constructed by the ruling class. Since good and evil are merely creations of those in power at any given time, he claims “good and evil that are not in transitory, do not exist… [and] must overcome themselves again and again” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 116). Consequently, “that anything at all is good and evil—that is [man’s] creation” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 196). When the fact that God is dead, along with the superficial commands that accompany his perceived omnipotence, sets in—really sets in—to a person’s consciousness, inexpressible fear and sorrow take hold as he tries to imagine his life without these arbitrary moral mandates. The immense suffering that consumes a person at the horrifying thought of meaninglessness in life is a profound burden that the camel willingly takes on as his own.

The beauty in Marx and Nietzsche, however, is that they do not stop here at a perpetual state of suffering and social numbness. Instead, each proposes a way in which man can embrace the uncertainty and absurdity of the human world in an effort to create meaning in his own life. Marx aims to overthrow the material force that perpetuates these conditions, and calls for the recognition that “man is the supreme being for man” (60). Only after this is realized will those with the most ‘radical chains’ rise up and announce “the dissolution of the existing social order” (Marx 65). Society’s reliance on capital to control the lives of individuals is precisely what Marx seeks to destroy. Because capitalist values have “resolved personal worth into exchange value,” Marx wants individuals to reject this arbitrary worth, along with the idea that “the laborer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it” (485). However, because man’s consciousness is a product of his social relations, a practical overthrow of the existing order is dependent upon “man’s consciousness of the necessity of associating with the individuals around him” (Marx 158). Out of this collective
suffering, Marx hopes, people will feel compelled to break out of their current conditions and ‘found society anew.’ By abolishing the division of labor, men will thereby abolish class division. However, in order to produce the kind of mass consciousness that Marx calls for, “the alteration of men on a mass scale is necessary, an alteration which can only take place in a practical movement, a revolution” (193).

In definite contrast to Marx, Nietzsche recommends that the burden of doubt and falsity be borne in solitude. Man must flee the company of others in order to examine—and reconsider—his own values and beliefs, as well as the social constructs that produced his individual consciousness. According to Nietzsche’s allegory, the lion can only become his own master by conquering his past one. His claim that “whatever lives, obeys” pushes man to explore exactly to whom he owes his obedience (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 114). This questioning ultimately asks whether one obeys his own will or takes commands from another who has framed his will as the truth. Nietzsche considers the notion of morality nothing but an ancient will to power, and challenges individuals to stop subjecting themselves to such manipulation. The dragon of ‘though shalt’ in Zarathustra’s metamorphoses must be conquered by the lion, which overcomes imposed commands and desires in order to allow for his own. By shedding his slave morality that encourages weakness, conformity, and powerlessness, the lion adopts the value-creating morality of the ruling group—master morality. Whether one embraces the timid values of slave morality—benevolence, industriousness, moderation, modesty, pity, etc.—or qualities [such as hardness, overpowering, imposition of one’s will, and exploitation] that characterize master morality, it seems that “life simply is will to power” (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 203). Thus, the lion must say ‘no’ to formerly accepted norms and values in order to make way for the ‘yes’-saying child with the will to create his own.
While each of Nietzsche and Marx’s paths to liberation may arguably be characterized by these phases of metamorphosis, the lion-like stage presents a few points of divergence between the two philosophies. This defiant, nay-saying aspect of the transformational cycle is appropriately symbolized by a creature of the utmost courage, for radical self-consciousness and the willingness to recognize and pursue one’s will contrary to the status quo requires a great deal of courage. Nietzsche’s protagonist in *Zarathustra* is brutally ostracized, “hated by the good… [and deemed] danger of the multitude” (21). In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche calls daring philosophers “the bad conscience of their time,” who are often considered “disagreeable fools and dangerous question marks” (137). For Marx, the courage to take such risks comes from a sense of collective suffering within an individual’s social relationships. He envisions the oppressed proletariat masses bringing their ‘existence’ into harmony with their ‘essence’ by means of a revolution, where individual critical self-consciousness cannot help but take place as a result of man’s radical change in his social and material circumstances. Marx sees this as a continual conditioning process between the existing world and man’s consciousness, claiming that “circumstances make men just as much as men make circumstances” (165). It seems, then, that a full realization of both individual and societal emancipation for Marx is dependent upon one’s peers having the necessary awareness and courage as well. On an even larger scale, the abolition of capital for an entire country appears inextricably linked to that country’s relations with other competitors in the global market. Thus, even if a radical transformation took place within a particular community, that community would continue to be oppressed so long as the ruling leaders of other powerful communities were able to keep their sheep in check.

For Nietzsche, on the other hand, it seems that the courage required for radical self-consciousness is an individual endeavor and must occur in spite of one’s social relations. While
he, too, finds the birthplace of greatness in suffering, Nietzsche encourages each man to discover his own path of liberation without concern for social relations that threaten to impede him. In this pursuit, Nietzsche says that man must love himself, implying that an individual’s courage must be based in some part on his sense of self-worth. Nietzsche warns against making the heart small,” and claims that “the noble soul has reverence for itself”—an essential aspect of the ‘overcoming’ man’s character (“Beyond Good and Evil” 228). Describing the greatest individual as “he who can be loneliest, the most concealed, the most deviant, the human being beyond good and evil, the master of his virtues, [and] he that is overrich in will,” Nietzsche doubts whether or not this type of greatness is even possible (“Beyond Good and Evil” 139). He openly declares that men are not equal, and advises them not to ‘will beyond their capacity’ or ‘desire anything of themselves against probability’ (“Zarathustra” 291). Such greatness requires thinking on one’s own—not merely digesting what Nietzsche has to say and acting accordingly. In an ironically biblical scene, Zarathustra leaves his followers behind, daring them to resist him and find themselves. Nietzsche does not see the future philosopher as a disciple or a companion; he desires a worthy opponent. He seems to have little hope that such a ‘great’ individual will ever emerge from the rabble, so long as most are not even willing to critically evaluate their own beliefs, let alone his.

Clearly, Nietzsche does not advance ideals of equality as a crucial aspect of self-consciousness. Rather, he finds the notion of equality detrimental to man’s individual transformation, and furthermore claims men will never be equal. Whether or not Marx’s path necessitates equality is up for debate. The central question seems to be this: equality of what sort? The notion of equality implies worth, so in order for man to be equal or unequal, there must be some comparative basis of evaluation. If one accepts Marx’s claim that man has been
driven to assess his worth solely in terms of capital, then the abolition of said capital would appear to leave all mean on an ‘equal’ footing. However, by asking us to recognize this basis of evaluation as contrived and arbitrary, Marx does not demand that we shed our inequalities, but instead that we reconsider the basis on which we evaluate equality and worth in the first place. When a person loses that by which he measures his ‘exchange’ value, he struggles to find a new basis of assessment. The challenge for Marx is determining what exactly it will be, if in fact there is such a measure. If one truly has ruthlessly criticized everything in existence, it seems hard to imagine any way of measuring man against his peers that is not constructed and arbitrary. Marx claims that the notion of equality is “nothing but a translation of… ‘Ich=Ich,’” a seemingly simple concept of self-identity (99). Thus, both Marx and Nietzsche dare the individual to reject any external basis of worth—the contemporary mentality resembling “Ich = Mitmensch”—and just be himself. Tearing down the concept of equality, as opposed to idealizing it, requires a great deal of courage, and only when man has overcome the false sense of worth placed on him by others is he ready to create his own.

This defiant, nay-saying phase of the metamorphosis ultimately gives way to a path of what can only be described as a sort of lighthearted self-determination. The individual in the lion stage may feel “powerless against what has been done” and feel anger and resentment toward the past (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 139). It is precisely this sense of powerlessness, uncertainty, and absurdity that compels us to find comfort in otherworldly considerations. However, Nietzsche views doubt and absurdity not as reasons to fear, but as reasons to laugh. We must learn to laugh and play in the world, like a child. More than anything, he claims, we must learn to live without shame and fear of condemnation for our desires and actions. Like a child, the individual who has overcome himself views the world with a renewed sense of wonder, and sees life as though
“nothing were… real except our world of desires and passions” (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 47). This will to desire becomes necessity, as people “no longer do anything ‘voluntarily’ but do everything of necessity, [and] their feeling of freedom, subtlety, full power, of creative placing, disposing, and forming reaches its peak—necessity and ‘freedom of the will’ then become one in them” (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 48). The liberated man obeys, but he takes pleasure in serving as both the commander and the ‘executor of the order.’ In generating necessity for himself, such an individual exercises what both Marx and Nietzsche identify as the driving force of human life—creative power.

The free spirit must “overcome the entire past” and create his own values ‘over and beyond himself’ (Nietzsche, “Beyond Good and Evil” 136). Marx sees men as essentially creative animals, constantly producing their material lives and consequently, their consciousness. Like Nietzsche, he recognizes that if man does not produce these circumstances himself, they will be imposed upon him. By advocating an overthrow of “all those conditions in which man is abased, enslaved, [and] abandoned,” Marx hopes that man will bring about for himself an existence that reflects his creative essence (60). The fact that “labor is shunned like the plague,” demonstrates that man does not owe his existence to his own will (Marx 74). By removing capital—a ‘social relation of production’ to which man has come to owe his existence—Marx hopes to eliminate all motives for labor other than the delight that man takes in his work. The objection that the abolition of private property will cause ‘universal laziness’ to overtake society does more to highlight man’s subjugated state of existence than to deny it. Marx envisions a society, much like Nietzsche, in which the only force that compels man to act is his own will. Such a man creates his own ‘good and evil,’ and—recognizing that ‘the way’ does not exist—has the courage to ask, “this is my way; where is yours?” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 195).
This notion of one’s ‘way’ is another topic of arguable contention between Marx and Nietzsche. Marx’s path to liberation calls for the “alteration of men on a mass scale,” which appears to conflict with Nietzsche’s claim that there is no one ‘way’ of overcoming (193). One could argue, however, that Marx did not necessarily intend for consciousness on a mass scale to mean that everyone takes the same path. In fact, the envisioned outcome points to just the opposite—each individual pursues his own unique path alongside others who happen to be doing the same. Thus, individual consciousness may be seen as a step toward mass awakening, rejecting the idea that the two are necessarily mutually exclusive.

This is not to say that Marx’s plan would serve as the ideal Nietzschean transformation. Marx’s proposed path to liberation relies on man’s initial recognition of uncertainty and absurdity in the world—through a ‘ruthless criticism’ of his material conditions—and yet appears to ignore these same realizations in fashioning a response. Marx rejects the notion of anything as fundamental to human nature, claiming that the “human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual” (145). Therefore, the only thing we can predict for certain regarding man’s behavior is that he is essentially unpredictable. This lack of certainty and reliability has a crippling effect on the mutual dependency and consistency in human behavior required by Marx’s proposal. Man becomes severely dependent on the ‘critical mass’ in two primary ways. Firstly, the abolition of capital requires a large social movement, and any individual who decided to pursue this ideal alone would likely be considered a ‘laughing stock’ and fail to effect any real change. Secondly, with men pursuing their work solely out of interest and desire, a level of specialization would necessarily ensue in which the man who loved farming would be totally dependent on the individual who enjoyed the practice of medicine, and vice versa. The resulting complex network of dependency puts a great deal of faith in a creature
whose desires and interests are constantly evolving with no particular consistency. The practical application of societal criticism as Marx sees it depends upon a view of human nature that he himself rejects. While men may be dissatisfied with their exploited, alienated circumstances, one cannot organize a massive, ongoing reaction without relying on predictive assumptions about their attitudes and behavior.

Nietzsche does away with this dependency, challenging men to rejoice in the chaos and absurdity of life and live for themselves, regardless of their material circumstances and the consciousness of their neighbors. Nietzsche’s more individualistic path acknowledges that a person’s ability to realize his own potential should not depend upon his neighbor’s ability to do the same. He seems to have it right when he claims that “independence is for the very few,” that only a few are able to be true to themselves, and many who are able still ‘lack the will’ (“Beyond Good and Evil” 41). Few people have the courage to ask tough questions, and push past a complacent zone of comfort in which the ‘greater good’ will always win out. Few people have the courage to stand up to their peers, let alone themselves, and question their motives for action. Sadly, few people care enough to even think about asking these questions, and even fewer care enough to get others to think about these questions. It is for these reasons that I would argue that Nietzsche offers the more optimistic path of liberation. While he may not have the rosiest view of humanity, his plan allows for an individual to accept a view that is difficult for most to stomach, and still find a way to appreciate life’s apparent meaninglessness. One can either be weighed down by these terrifying thoughts of uncertainty and finality, or embrace them as liberating and empowering—I tend to prefer the latter. I am struck by the paradoxical simplicity of such a life, as the individual who truly adopts a childlike outlook toward life realizes “how little is sufficient for happiness!” (Nietzsche, “Zarathustra” 277).
While Marx’s hope for a mass awakening seems destined to remain just that, he as an individual is arguably one of the few for whom liberation (in the Nietzschean sense) has been achieved. He had the insight to tear down the constructs that society imposed upon him and the courage to radically question accepted norms and values. He was forced into exile, into solitude, as a consequence for his bold actions and continued to create a view of the world for himself that enabled him to exercise sympathy for the common man. In moving beyond morality, beyond resentment, and beyond himself, Marx did much more than criticize the status quo—he worked at changing it. It does not take much to adopt a cynical view of life and ascend to one’s cave in an effort to escape the unthinking masses. It takes a great deal of courage and kindness to question and empower people as they embark on their own paths of self-liberation. Like Zarathustra, Marx descended from his cave an awakened child, and attempted to show the world not only the evil that could come from power, but also the good.

---

1 In his chapter titled “What is Noble” in Beyond Good and Evil, Nietzsche discusses what he considers to be the four virtues of the noble soul—insight, courage, solitude, sympathy.
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I. Introduction

Life in Sudan under the twenty-one year reign of Omar al-Bashir has been turbulent. In June of 1989 al-Bashir, then a general in army, deposed the democratic government of Prime Minister Sadiq Al-Mahdi in “a military coup d’état organized in cooperation with the Muslim Brotherhood” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 18). Under the reign of President al-Bashir the Sudanese government rewrote the constitution and revised the legal and judicial system to reflect the party’s version of political Islam (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 18). The conflict in Darfur has roots stretching back before the Presidency of Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir. The population of Sudan’s Darfur region is comprised of several tribal groups which can be roughly categorized as agriculturalist, sedentary, cattle herding, nomadic, and semi-nomadic. It is important to note that “all of the tribes of Darfur share the same religion (Islam)” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 20). Struggles for power in Darfur have taken place within the context of land ownership which has traditionally been communal. In the 1970s, under the Presidency of Gaafar Nimeiri, “the land laws were changed and individual ownership became possible”; however, initially all land was titled in the name of the state (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 21). In order to claim legal title, one had to demonstrate they had possessed the land for at least one year, “those who did not...
have land had additional incentive to demonstrate loyalty to the Government in order to acquire it” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 21).

After enduring droughts and increased desertification in the 1970s and 1980s inter-tribal relations began to fray as tribes sought to claim scarce resources. Pastoralist tribes in search of grazing land and water for their cattle encroached on the fields of farmers leading to violent conflicts. The legal reforms under President Nimeiri which subverted the traditional power of tribal chiefs in settling disputes aggravated the problem of limited resources. When tribal chiefs settled disputes such as murder or cattle stealing, the state was seen as the neutral mediator of last resort. But with the centralization of state power under Nimeiri, “Local leaders were often chosen on the basis of their political loyalty to the regime, rather than their standing in the community. They were sometimes financed and strengthened particularly through the State’s security apparatus. This meant that when the state had to step in to resolve traditional conflicts, it was no longer seen as an impartial arbitrator” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 22).

These conflicts evolved throughout the 1980s until the main conflict was “between sedentary and nomadic tribes, and in particular between the Fur and a number of Arab nomadic tribes, which had organized themselves in a sort of alliance named the Arab Gathering, while some members of the Fur tribe had created a group called the African Belt” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 22). The United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Darfur explains that “the roots of the present conflict in Darfur are complex. In addition to the tribal feuds resulting from desertification, the availability of modern weapons, and the other factors noted above, deep layers relating to identity, governance, and the emergence of armed rebel
movements which enjoy popular support amongst certain tribes, are playing a major role in shaping the current crisis” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 22).

The report by the Commission identifies the organization of two rebel groups in early 2001 and 2002, the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) as provoking the conflict in Darfur. Initially the SLM/A “came into existence with an agenda focused on the situation of the people of Darfur” while the JEM protested that “that Darfur and its populations, as well as some populations of other regions, have been consistently marginalized and not included in influential positions in the central Government in Khartoum” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 23). In early 2003, the SLM/A and JEM organized an attack on “government installations in Kutum, Tine and El Fashir, including the military section of the airport in El Fashir where the rebels destroyed several military aircraft on the ground and killed many soldiers” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 23). The government of Sudan at the time was ill-equipped to deal with an uprising in the rural regions of the country. In fact, in order to regain control over the region, the government was forced to call “upon local tribes to assist in the fighting against the rebels,” primarily because “the rank and file of the Sudanese armed forces was largely composed of Darfurians, who were probably reluctant to fight ‘their own’ people” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 24). The local tribes who answered the Government’s call to fight the rebels were called the “Janjaweed, a traditional Darfurian term denoting an armed bandit or outlaw on a horse or camel” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 24).

The government of Sudan has been mired in a civil war between Northern and Southern Sudan since 1983, making it “the longest conflict in Africa involving serious human rights abuses and humanitarian disasters,” in which “more than 2 million persons have died and 4.5
million persons have been forcibly displaced from their homes” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 19). The Sudanese government was especially focused on the conflict in Southern Sudan in 2002 with the signing of the Machakos Protocol between the Government and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army which was the primary secessionist rebel group in Southern Sudan. The Machakos Protocol negotiated a “series of framework protocols in 2003 and 2004,” and signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) on January 9th, 2005 (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 19). The conflict between Northern and Southern Sudan has overshadowed the conflict in Darfur, located in Western Sudan, primarily because of the large oil reserves located in Southern Sudan which may soon be controlled by an autonomous government in Southern Sudan according to the CPA.

With international attention focused on the potential partitioning of Sudan, the Sudanese government located in Khartoum could not afford to publicize another problem region in their country. By discretely enlisting the support of Arab tribes in Darfur, the government was able to maintain the appearance of neutrality when carrying out attacks, and place the blame on inter-tribal conflicts which could be managed by the government’s own military forces. The government recruited the Janjaweed by paying sympathetic tribal leaders “grants and gifts on the basis of their recruitment efforts… In addition, the Government paid some of the Popular Defense Forces (a branch of the Sudan People's Armed Forces) through the tribal leaders” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 24). The government has been using the Janjaweed as its own paramilitary army and supports many of its actions with the support of the Popular Defense Forces and the Sudanese Air Force.

Amnesty International USA released a report on Sudan’s continuing human rights violations which noted:
Displaced people in Darfur continue to travel from one place to another in search of security; over the past week according to the UN more than 200 who fled Khor Abeche came to Galab Camp while other displaced people fled from the insecurity in Kass town in South Darfur to Kalma Camp near Nyala.

The government continues to arrest and torture those -- mainly from Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa groups -- whom they suspect of supporting the rebels. When charged, they are tried in the Specialised Criminal Courts in trials that fall short of international standards.

Sexual violence continues in Darfur, such as the targeting of women who leave the camp to fetch fire wood and water. In a recent report, Médecins Sans Frontières said they had treated almost 500 women who were raped between October 2004 and February 2005 and reported the arrest of women who fell pregnant as a result of rape who were subsequently charged with Zina (unlawful sexual intercourse, which is a punishable offence under the Sudan Penal Code).

The Darfur authorities have harassed the staff of international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who appear to make criticism of the government including investigating cases of rape. Several arrests have been reported (Amnesty International).

A separate Amnesty International briefing reported that “at times government troops also attacked villages alongside the Janjawid, and government aircraft have been bombing villages sometimes just before Janjawid attacks, suggesting that these were coordinated. The links
between the Sudanese armed forces and the Janjawid are incontrovertible” (Lipscomb 190). In 2005, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Darfur estimated that the violence in Darfur had led to “1.65 million internally displaced persons in Darfur, and more than 200,000 refugees from Darfur in neighbouring Chad” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 3). Darfur is a semi-autonomous region in Sudan comprising of three states; North, South and West Darfur. The entire region is home to more than 6 million people and borders three countries. Five years after the fact, the violence continues as the number of people affected by the crisis increases daily.

The Commission of Inquiry on Darfur recommended, on January 25th, 2005, that the “Security Council should refer the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court, pursuant to Article 13(b) of the Statute of the Court” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 162). The Security Council did so and on February 27th issued its first two arrest warrants against members of the government of Sudan. These warrants were issued for Ahmad Muhammad Harun, Former Minister of State for the Interior of the Government of Sudan and Former Minister of State for Humanitarian Affairs of Sudan, and Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman, the alleged leader of the Janjaweed. These two men were charged with war crimes and crimes against humanity for their wanton disregard for human life and lack of differentiation between civilian and rebel targets in the government of Sudan’s attempt to quash the SLM/A and JEM. On July 14th, 2008, the International Criminal Court’s (ICC) Chief Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo took what were seen as major strides for ending the conflict in Darfur by issuing the first arrest warrant for a sitting head of state when he charged “Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir, with genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes” (Peskin 658). Nevertheless the genocide in Darfur is ongoing and President al-Bashir and members of his
government have ignored the ICC’s summons. The purpose of this paper is to determine why ICC been unable to bring an end to the ongoing genocide in Darfur, Sudan and what can be done to bring an immediate end to the bloodshed.

II. Genocide, Darfur, and the ICC Arrest Warrants

In 1943, Raphael Lemkin created the word genocide to describe the mass murder of Jews under the Nazi regime during World War II. Genocide comes from “the Greek derivative geno, meaning ‘race’ or ‘tribe,’ together with the Latin derivative cide, from caedere, meaning ‘killing’” (Power 42). Lemkin further described genocide as having two phases, “one, destruction of the national pattern of the oppressed group; the other, the imposition of the national pattern of the oppressor” (Power 43). Interestingly, the Commission of Inquiry on Darfur did not find sufficient evidence of genocide in Darfur, stating that, “the crucial element of genocidal intent appears to be missing; at least as far as the central Government authorities are concerned. Generally speaking the policy of attacking, killing and forcibly displacing members of some tribes does not evince a specific intent to annihilate, in whole or in part, a group distinguished on racial, ethnic, national or religious grounds” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 4).

In 2005, the director of Human Rights Watch's International Justice Program chastised the United States complaining, “After labeling Darfur a genocide, the United States is now blocking the credible threat of prosecution by the International Criminal Court, which could immediately deter further violence in Darfur” (Human Rights Watch 195). With a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council, the United States has the unique ability to recommend or forestall any ICC investigation. This power position plays a large role in understanding just why the ICC’s ability to end the conflict in Darfur has been so ineffective
despite the ICC being able to raise international attention. The United States’ has an aversion to
the ICC which is “rooted in the Bush Administration’s ideological opposition to the court, which
focuses largely on fears about politically motivated prosecutions against Americans (Human
Rights Watch 195).

This fear was not unique to the Bush Administration; the Clinton Administration
professed similar aversion to the court. Both administrations were hostile to the court’s “adoption
of a territorial basis for the exercise of jurisdiction over an accused” (Christol 85). The manner in
which the Rome Statute was drafted allowed for a certain ambiguity regarding the issue of
sovereignty. This ambiguity arises in Article 12 which addresses the preconditions for the
exercise of jurisdiction. Article 12, paragraph 3, allows the ICC to exercise jurisdiction if “(a) the
State on the territory of which the conduct in question occurred or, if the crime was committed
on board a vessel or aircraft, the State of registration of that vessel or aircraft; or (b) the State of
which the person accused of the crime is a national” (United Nations, General Assembly). In
essence this gives the court the ability to exercise jurisdiction if the crime is committed within
the territory of a member state or if the crime is committed by a national of a signatory state. The
vagueness of Article 12 cited by critics as an opening for unfriendly states to “bring specious
charges against American military personnel, without any factual basis, for political purposes”
(Christol 99). In response to this perceived loss of sovereignty the Bush Administration
embarked on an ambitious round of bilateral negotiations with states party to the Rome Statute to
seek “exceptions from prosecutions in member countries of war crimes committed by American
servicemen and women” (Christol 101).

In 2005, the U.S. demonstrated its unease with the ICC when it proposed “the creation of
an ad hoc international criminal tribunal along the lines of the ICTY and the ICTR. This was
because the United States would rather pay for such an institution than grant any legitimacy to the ICC” (Cryer 201). However the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Darfur criticized the U.S. proposal, underscoring the weaknesses of ad hoc tribunals in the case of Darfur. The Commission argued that “these Tribunals, however meritorious, are very expensive. Secondly, at least so far, on a number of grounds they have been rather slow in the prosecution and punishment of the indicted persons” (United Nations, Commission of Inquiry on Darfur 146).

The United States was one of four nations that abstained from United Nations Security Council Resolution 1593 which referred the situation in Darfur to the ICC for investigation and eventual prosecution after the report by the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Darfur. This abstention stems from the general weariness of the United States in legitimizing the ICC due to fears that “the Court could bring unwarranted and politically motivated charges against U.S. troops and official” (Crook 502). Nevertheless, the U.S. did not veto Resolution 1593 and thereby allowed the ICC to begin its investigation.

ICC Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo pressed forward and charged President al-Bashir with genocide. Initially, Moreno-Ocampo’s charges of genocide were dismissed by the ICC’s Pre-Trial chamber. However, the Pre-Trial chamber reversed its initial decision, arguing in al-Bashir’s second arrest warrant that:

Omar Al Bashir is criminally responsible as an indirect perpetrator, or as an indirect co-perpetrator, under article 25(3)(a) of the Statute, for:

i. Genocide by killing, within the meaning of article 6(a) of the Statute;

ii. Genocide by causing serious bodily or mental harm, within meaning of article 6(b) of the Statute
iii. Genocide by deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction, within the meaning of article 6(c) of the Statute (International Criminal Court 8).

Initial responses to the arrest warrant were mixed; “some commentators, such as Kenneth Rodman, have argued that the prosecutor should defer to the peacemakers. ‘It is incumbent on the prosecutor to adopt a do not harm approach to any political processes that might put an end to criminal violence,’ Rodman advised” (Peskin 673).

Darfur has been a unique situation in which the United Nations Security Council Resolutions has been rendered ineffective by competing geopolitical interests. While, “The Security Council did pass a sanctions resolution (1591) two days before the ICC referral, its provisions were incommensurate with a commitment to subject the government to criminal scrutiny” (Rodman 547). UN Security Council resolution 1591 sought to increase pressure on the parties by imposing a travel ban and assets freeze on those impeding the peace process, committing human rights violations and violating measures set out in previous resolutions. However, these sanctions were largely a face-saving measure for the Security Council which was hesitant to impose stricter sanctions, such as a ban on oil exports, “which represents 90 percent of the government’s export earnings, because of the threat of a Chinese veto” (Rodman 547). Kenneth Rodman, who critiqued ICC Chief Prosecutor Moreno-Ocampo’s approach, argues that the power held by a select few members on the United Nations Security council serves as a stumbling block for international institutions like the ICC that “cannot end impunity in an ongoing war as long as states and intergovernmental organizations are unwilling to take enforcement actions” (Rodman 530). Furthermore, the issuance of arrest warrants by the ICC has done nothing to stem the level of violence perpetuated by the Government of Sudan on civilians
in Darfur, and “is unlikely to do so unless there is international political will for tough action” (Rodman 530).

The miscalculation of the international community was in believing that the issuance of arrest warrants by the ICC would act as a deterring factor and halt the genocide in Darfur. Instead, the key to ending criminal violence in Darfur is to undertake a policy of compellence which seeks to prevent the continuation of actions which have already been embarked upon (Rodman 531). Victor Peskin, in a 2009 article in Human Rights Quarterly, traces the prosecutorial strategy of Luis Moreno-Ocampo and identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the ICC in prosecuting war criminals. Peskin finds that the ICC is forced to rely on trials of cooperation which “launches a virtual ‘prosecution’ of a targeted state that seeks to expose and shame the state’s noncompliance in the court of international public opinion” (Peskin 660). This was the strategy Moreno-Ocampo employed when issuing the arrest warrant for al-Bashir and his associates, many of whom were still intricately involved in the inner workings of the Sudanese government at the time. However, the strategy of shaming employed by trials of cooperation is not always effective. Since trials of cooperation must be employed when the ICC seeks to prosecute sitting heads of states and members of government, there is obviously very often backlash from the government itself. “At times, shaming may actually make a targeted state more resistant because it can fuel nationalists’ claim that the tribunal is moving away from its purported focus on individual guilt to a more expansive focus on shaming and blaming the state and nation” (Peskin 661).

Not only has Moreno-Ocampo faced backlash from the Sudanese government; “Interior Minister Al-Zubayr Bashir Taha promised to ‘cut the throat of any international official . . . who tries to jail a Sudanese official in order to present him to the international justice,’” the United
Nations Security Council has also chosen to remain largely unsupportive of the ICC’s prosecution (Peskin 667). Additionally on August 26, 2008, the Government of Sudan wrote to the U.N. Secretary General stating, “Sudan does not intend to become a party to the Rome Statute. Accordingly, Sudan has no legal obligation arising from its signature on 8 September 2000” (United Nation, General Assembly). All permanent members of the UN Security Council (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) all are world superpowers who are somewhat weary of supporting international institutions which can impinge on their sovereignty. The United States, under the Bush administration, was extremely hesitant toward supporting the ICC in light of the ongoing war in Iraq. Along with Sudan, United States has refused to ratify the Rome Statute which created the ICC. This refusal to ratify has very real implications for the strength and effectiveness of the ICC in prosecuting criminals.

III. Solutions

Even with his judicial mandate in hand, ICC Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo has complained about the lack of support from the international community. After his initial arrest warrants in the spring of 2007 for two lower level Sudanese government officials, Ahmad Harun and Ali Kushayb, went ignored by the Sudanese government, Moreno-Ocampo appealed directly to the United Nations Security Council in December 2007. “Of the Security Council, Moreno-Ocampo asked four pressing questions: ‘When will be a better time to arrest Harun? How many more women, girls, have to be raped? How many persons have to be killed? Must we really wait, again, for the destruction of entire communities?’ And to the Security Council he gave the following answer: ‘The only real solution today is to request the removal and arrest of Harun as a first step to any solution’” (Peskin 671). Moreno-Ocampo admits that arrests are essential in order to preserve the credibility of the court (Peskin 665). Paradoxically, in the face of flagrant
Sudanese disregard for the ICC, Moreno-Ocampo decided to issue an arrest warrant for President al-Bashir as well. President al-Bashir has continued to ignore the summons of the court.

Without a viable coercive enforcement mechanism the ICC will be unable to bring an end to the conflict in Darfur. Moreno-Ocampo recognized the futility of his situation without international support in another speech to the United Nations Security Council as he said, “It takes a lot to commit massive crimes, it takes commanders and many executioners. But mostly, it requires that the rest of the world look away and do nothing” (Peskin 672). Indeed, this is what continues to happen in Darfur to this day. The international community is much more focused on the partitioning of Northern and Southern Sudan and has largely ignored the conflict in Darfur, worrying that any increased focus on the genocide would stymie a successful partitioning.

IV. Political-Economic Complications

Large multinational enterprises based in the China, Russia, and the United States have a vested interest in supporting an autonomous Southern Sudan; due to anticipated oil revenues, one can see, sadly, why these countries remain silent on Darfur. It is rather unfortunate that due to the powerful status accorded to permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, these nations hold considerable sway over improving the situation in Darfur. Yet, they have chosen not to do so largely out of domestic concerns. China and Sudan have a shared colonial historical figure in General Charles Gordon and “Sudan was the first sub-Saharan African country to recognize the new Communist China, in 1959” (Cockett 52). Economic ties between China and Sudan have been strengthened by a “joint-venture oil consortium, the Greater Nile Petroleum Operating Company” (Cockett 54). In fact, in the months following the issuance of President al-Bashir’s arrest warrant, the EU backed away from earlier threats to take punitive action against the Sudanese government for non-compliance (Peskin 675).
The shared quasi-colonial history of China and Sudan under Britain is an interesting note to point out, but this relationship has been radically transformed in the 21st century. Sudan is in many respects dependent on China due to China’s rapid global economic growth and seemingly insatiable demand for commodities. In “2010 China accounted for two-thirds of Sudan’s oil exports… (Additionally) China was the largest exporter of small arms and other weaponry to Sudan over the period of 2003 to 2008” (Hamilton 112-113). Rebecca Hamilton also explores the intricacies of Sudan and China’s economic relationship as she notes, “As Western donors increasingly tied their development assistance to improvements in human rights and good governance, China’s official policy if ‘noninterference’ with the countries they invest in provided Khartoum with an attractive alternative. In 2005 China’s direct foreign investment in Sudan was $352 million, making it Sudan’s largest foreign investor” (Hamilton 113). Not surprisingly, with these economic linkages, “In 2004 China had threatened to veto the very first UN Security Council resolution on Darfur… As the crisis in Darfur continued, insiders on the Security Council started to refer to China as Khartoum’s ‘heat shield’ – ensuring that other countries’ attempts to apply pressures to Sudan would ultimately be deflected by the threat of China’s veto” (Hamilton 113).

V. Intervention

China and Russia expressed similar concerns for the violation of sovereignty without consent in Libya with their abstention on UN Security Resolution 1973. This attitude is similar to their vote on a peacekeeping deployment in UN Security Council Resolution 1679 for Darfur in 2006; while “the resolution passed unanimously, China Russia and Qatar each made very clear statements after their votes… to specify that their willingness to support the resolution did not mean they would support a nonconsensual UN deployment” (Hamilton 96).
A much more effective solution for ending the genocide in Darfur has been proposed by Nsongura Udombana, Director of the Human Rights Center at the Central European University in Budapest. Udombana argues that the Government of Sudan has committed grave international crimes in Darfur which justify a humanitarian military intervention, primarily because the use of diplomacy, including the ICC, has failed in halting the mayhem (Udombana 1151). While the UN Charter enshrines the norm of sovereignty and adheres to a strict policy of nonintervention, there are two exceptions to the prohibition of the use of force by state actors. The use of force is allowed under the guidelines set forth by the UN Charter in cases of individual or collective self-defense and collective security under the authorization of the United Nations Security Council (Udombana 1160). The Security Council has the mandate to “determine the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and to take measures to maintain or restore the international peace and security, including the use of force” (Udombana 1161). Under these pretenses, a military humanitarian intervention in Darfur is justified in order to bring an end to the genocide perpetuated by the government of Sudan.

An example of a successful, U.S. planned, post-Cold War humanitarian military intervention is Operation Provide Comfort which was “in response to Iraqi repression of the Kurds in northern Iraq and the Shiites and Marsh Arabs in the south” (Udombana 1170). After the UN Security Council passed a resolution condemning Iraq and calling upon the country to bring about an end to the repression, the United States and its allies felt that “Resolution 688, plus earlier resolutions, ‘were sufficient to build a ‘legal bridge’ to Operation Provide Comfort in northern Iraq and no-fly zones in both the north and south’” (Udombana 1170).

The lack of power which the ICC faces when attempting to end the genocide in Darfur stems from the long guarded “principles of sovereignty and nonintervention [which are] essential
values of the international society, [however] a state forfeits its domestic legitimacy when it perpetrates outrages against humanity” (Udombana 1170). Unfortunately, the international community has been hesitant to push for stricter sanctions against the Sudanese government, and in earlier draft resolutions condemning Sudan, seven of the fifteen UN Security Council members were “reluctant to endorse the explicit threat of sanctions against Sudan” (Udombana 1183). It appears that after the largely mishandled U.S. intervention in Iraq and Somalia, the international community feels the urge to slowly investigate claims of international malfeasance before intervening. However, what we are witnessing in Darfur is comparable to the situation in Rwanda during the Rwandan genocide. Numerous international organizations have deplored the situation in Sudan, providing both eyewitness accounts of genocide and pictures and videos of the aftermath (Cryer 198; Happold 227; Rodman 541; Udombana 1189). Nevertheless the international communities, by which I mean the United Nations, the UN Security Council, and the African Union, have been unwilling to utilize the tools available to them.

The international community is not powerless in its ability to solve international problems such as genocide. I believe that the United States must reappraise its role in the international community and evaluate the purpose of possessing such dominant military might. The United States is the world’s sole super power; its military expenditures exceed that of the next nine nations. The United States must utilize its global power position in order to create, shape, and enforce international norms. The United States can do this by actively intervening in genocides when and where they take place. Thankfully, the United States does not need to expend effort in creating a new norm justifying military interventions to end genocide as the United Nations has already adopted this norm in the form of Responsibility to Protect.
In December 2001, the Canadian government sponsored an ad hoc commission to explore the concept of humanitarian intervention in light of the weakening norm of state sovereignty. The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty chose to avoid the term humanitarian intervention altogether and frame the debate not in terms “of a ‘right to intervene’ but of a ‘responsibility to protect’ ” (Evans and Sahnoun 11). The ICISS explored recent cases of crimes against humanity and genocide perpetuated in Rwanda, Kosovo, Bosnia, and Somalia and determined “that intervention for human protection purposes, including military intervention in extreme cases, is supportable when major harm to civilians is occurring or imminently apprehended, and the state in question is unable or unwilling to end the harm, or is itself the perpetrator” (Evans and Sahnoun 16).

Unfortunately, in the decade following the ICISS report, the U.S. has continually ignored its Responsibility to Protect. In an address before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in July of 2004, former Secretary of State Colin Powell declared “genocide has been committed in Darfur and that the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility and genocide may still be occurring” (BBC). Furthermore, in 2004 the U.S. House of Representatives issued a resolution declaring that the violence in Darfur constitutes genocide. Yet, in the face of this condemnation, the genocide is ongoing, reaffirming the major findings of Samantha Power in her Pulitzer Prize winning novel, *Problem from Hell*. In her study of six genocides which have taken place after the Holocaust, Power finds that “despite graphic media coverage, American policymakers, journalists, and citizens are extremely slow to muster the imagination needed to reckon with evil” (Power xvii). Samantha Power finds that the crucial power point which needs to be activated is in domestic politics in America. Despite seeing graphic images and video on their evening news, “American political leaders interpret society-wide silence as an indicator of
public indifference… [reasoning] that they will incur no costs if the United States remains uninvolved but will face steep (political) risks if they engage” (Power xvii).

Thankfully, the Obama Administration has taken a slightly more activist, albeit pragmatic, approach to R2P. The 2010 National Security Strategy notes that "the United States and all member states of the U.N. have endorsed the concept of the 'Responsibility to Protect.' In so doing, we have recognized that the primary responsibility for preventing genocide and mass atrocity rests with sovereign governments, but that this responsibility passes to the broader international community when sovereign governments themselves commit genocide or mass atrocities, or when they prove unable or unwilling to take necessary action to prevent or respond to such crimes inside their borders" (United States, Executive Department 48). In 2010, the U.S. Senate also acknowledged in Concurrent Resolution 71 "a responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapter VI and VIII of the United Nations Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity" (United States, Cong. Senate).

In light of these recent reaffirmations, in March 2011 the United States’, in accordance with UN Security Resolution 1973, implemented an enhanced No Fly Zone in Libya in response to Muammar Gaddafi’s decision to turn the military against a popular uprising protesting his regime. The uprising began in early February and was incited by other popular revolutions in North Africa and the Middle East in which citizens in Tunisia, Egypt, Iran, Bahrain, and Yemen called for political reforms. In response to the military crackdown, the UN called on member states to protect the Libyan people. The United States implemented the no fly zone with additional support from Britain and France, after approving the tacit approval of the UN Security Council, the African Union, and the Arab League.
In consideration of this recent intervention, there is no reason that the United States shouldn’t use this opportunity to compel the international community to take action in Darfur or compel the Sudanese government directly. The concept of compellence was developed by Thomas Schelling and can take on two forms, brute force or coercion. Brute force can be achieved through internal means, such as Paul Kagame’s Rwandan Patriotic Front, which was responsible for overthrowing the genocidal Hutu regime in Rwanda, or brute force can occur through external intervention (Rodman 531). Compellence can also “involve coercion where the goal is not to defeat the perpetrators, but to use the threat or the demonstrative infliction of punishment to change their behavior by convincing them that it is in their interest to comply with the coencer’s demands” (Rodman 531). Currently, the international community is employing a rather limited policy of compellence through coercion involving the ICC and limited sanctions “to get Khartoum to disarm the militias and accept deployment of a robust UN force to protect civilians in Darfur” (Rodman 531). Without an increased action by the United States in seeking an end to the genocide, the efforts of the international community are largely powerless and the arrest of President al-Bashir seems incredibly unlikely.

Noted Darfur specialist Rebecca Hamilton concurs with former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Jendayi Frazer who declared, “We don’t need consent when they’re conducting genocide” (Hamilton 112). Hamilton clarifies Fazer’s comment with respect to R2P noting that, “When atrocities are underway, the protection of civilians should trump sovereignty” (Hamilton 112). However, Hamilton acknowledges that United States’ Responsibility to Act faces realist constraints as she states “R2P was still just a theory when a strong state like Sudan was concerned” (Hamilton 112). The realist explanation for U.S. and international inaction to the ongoing genocide is given by Jean-Marie Guéhenno the former head of the UN’s Department of
Peacekeeping Operations: “If Sudan did not consent... you could not deploy a ‘peacekeeping mission’ as the phrase is generally defined” (Hamilton 112).

Hamilton argues that “any mission to protect civilians using outside forces without the consent of the Sudanese government would not only be tantamount to invasion in rhetorical and legal terms, it would bring with it logistical and military complications rising near the level of practical impossibility. No country, not even the United States, was willing to fight a real war with real costs in terms of lives lost in order to protect Darfuris” (Hamilton 121). However, I believe the recent multilateral response to state-sponsored violence in Libya provides an answer to Hamilton’s cost-benefit analysis. In President Obama’s Address to the Nation on Libya, the President makes an allusion to the doctrine of R2P stating, “Mindful of the risks and costs of military action, we are naturally reluctant to use force to solve the world’s many challenges. But when our interests and values are at stake, we have a responsibility to act. That’s what happened in Libya over the course of these last six weeks” (Obama).

It is time that the United States, in conjunction with the United Nations, change tactics and authorize a humanitarian military intervention into Sudan to forcibly disarm the Janjaweed militias, protect civilians in Darfur, and arrest members of the Sudanese government, such as President al-Bashir, who refuse to comply with the ICC. The ICC has been rendered powerless by the norm of sovereignty which is jealously guarded by nation-states, especially those on the United Nations Security Council. The ICC lacks proper coercive power to end the genocide in Darfur primarily because it lacks the ability to enforce its jurisdictive authority; however, the United Nations has the clout to grant these capabilities yet refuses to do so not only out of respect for the sovereignty of the Sudanese government, but because of competing geopolitical interests, namely oil interests in Southern Sudan. While the ICC can choose to try President al-
Bashir and his cronies in absentia, this would do nothing to end the genocide in Darfur unless the perpetrators are captured.

In the face of these obstacles, the ICC is currently an ineffective tool for the United Nations to utilize in halting an ongoing genocide and as such, the United Nations Security Council should authorize a humanitarian military intervention into Darfur. If China or Russia threatens to veto a humanitarian intervention, it falls upon the United States to consider unilateral intervention. The United States must heed the words of President Carter: “Out of our memory...of the Holocaust we must forge an unshakeable oath with all civilized people that never again will the world stand silent, never again will the world...fail to act in time to prevent this terrible crime of genocide....we must harness the outrage of our own memories to stamp out oppression wherever it exists. We must understand that human rights and human dignity are indivisible” (Carter).
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I. Introduction and History

Russia has been waging a heavy-handed Second War in the Republic of Chechnya under the banner of counterterrorist operations ever since 1999. In the beginning of the war, the second Russian President, Vladimir Putin, “vowed to defeat the Chechen terrorists within two weeks” (Bowker 75). Yet today, as Russia moves into the 21st century, it “continues to have the Chechnya problem in tow…bombings, sabotage, and terrorist attacks have not stopped. Rather these tactics have reached new levels of daring and intensity” (Trenin and Malashenko 14). This pioneers the question as to whether Russian counterterrorist policy in the Second Chechen War proves at all effective against the Chechens or if their heavy-handed tactics only further breed the terrorism that they seek to stop. Furthermore, there is also evidence that the Second War in Chechnya is not a counterterrorist war, but merely a political stratagem seeking revenge for the humiliation and defeat of the Russian army in the First War. This paper contends that the Second Chechen War was a conflict derived from political motives rather than counterterrorist action, and that the First Chechen War and Second Chechen War were ineffective in quashing the terrorist threat in the North Caucus region. This paper also briefly challenges current U.S. strategies in asymmetric conflicts, such as the War in Iraq, by observing the successes and failures of the Russian army in Chechnya.

Since the early 1990s, Chechnya has consumed the attention of the Russian army and has been the focus of modern Russian counterterrorist policy. Although Chechnya has again become
a focal point of Russian security, Chechen history has been tied to Russia’s for centuries and their historical relationship proves crucial when trying to understand their current one. Russia first took Chechnya into the Tsarist Empire in the early 1860s (Bowker 69). The Chechens, however, “never accepted their assimilation into the empire and took every opportunity to escape its control” (Bowker 69). They were first successful in escaping after the chaos of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution before again being forced back into the Soviet Union in 1922. Their insubordination and rebellion led to a deep mistrust of the Chechen people in Moscow. Thus, fearing another revolution during World War II in 1944, Joseph Stalin publicly accused the Chechens of conspiring with the Nazis and thus forced the entire population of Chechnya off their own land in a brutal mass exile to Kazakhstan and Siberia (Muraviev 155). Stalin’s deportation of the Chechens was a political time-bomb. It “prevented the Chechens from forming a consolidated, self-confident, Soviet elite that could have peacefully resolved the situation when the Soviet Union started to fall apart” (Trenin and Malashenko 26). The troubled history in Chechnya leading up to the late 20th century, coupled with the high levels of unemployment and rapid criminalization of the Chechen Republic contributed to the separatist agenda of the 1980s and later the extremist agenda of the 1990s (Muraviev 160).

The rise of separatist military theory and the extremist agenda in Chechnya directly correlates with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the massive amount of weaponry and ammunition left by Russia after their withdrawal from the Republic in 1992. The enormous stockpiles of military hardware left by the Russians, along with a significant number of Chechen soldiers that were trained by the Russian army to fight in Afghanistan, enabled the Chechens to form a “potent standing force comprising 2 brigades, 7 independent regiments, and 3 independent battalions of 5,000-6,000 personnel…with 42 main battle tanks, 66 armored
vehicles, 123 mortars and guns, and 40 air defense systems” (Muraviev 160). This well-armed Chechen force of nationalist-inspired and well-trained soldiers posed a military threat that would instigate the First Chechen War.

II. The First Chechen War

Towards the end of the Soviet Union, a new wave of nationalism returned swiftly to the Chechen citizens. In November of 1991, even before the final dissolution of the Soviet Union, former Soviet Air Force general Dzhokhar Dudayev, a respected Chechen leader as well as the eventual first president of the Chechen Republic, declared Chechnya’s independence from Russia (Bowker 71). Moscow’s decision to extinguish Chechen independence came on December 2 1994. When asked why the Russians sought to suppress the Republic’s independence, Russian leaders cited the “irresponsibility of Chechen authorities, the almost total breakdown of law and order with the republic (which created a direct threat of the expansion of crime and terrorism), the large-scale human rights abuses, and the increasingly violent and repressive nature of Dudayev’s regime” (Cimbala and Rainow 114). Nine days later, the ground assault on Grozny began which marked the beginning of the First Chechen War, a war that would be remembered infamously in Moscow.

The Russian command “was convinced that the highly decentralized Chechen formation could not stand against the regular [Russian] army” (Cimbala and Rainow 115). They were wrong. The Russians overestimated their military might and underestimated the dangers of asymmetrical warfare. Despite a complete “mastery of the skies and an advantage on the ground of almost three to one, the Russians attack on Grozny was easily repelled by the Rebels” (Bowker 72). The Russians found themselves stuck in a losing war finding it extremely difficult to apply its obvious advantages with an opposition that “operated out of the general population
[and used] guerilla tactics, sabotage, and terrorism…The Chechens hit and ran, staged surprise attacks on military convoys, laid ambushes on the roads, used snipers, and laid mines” (Muraviev 125). This asymmetrical style of warfare slowly yet successfully exhausted the resources of the Russian army. In a bloody debacle, Russia finally took the Chechen capital of Grozny in January of 1995 and “forced the separatist rebels to retreat into the mountains in the south to prepare for a mix of guerilla warfare and terrorist attack against the Russian occupiers” (Bowker 72). In effect, after Moscow took control of the Chechen lowlands, and the rebels were confined to the forested mountains, the “conflict became one between an elephant and a whale, each invincible in its own medium. Tellingly, the most wanted Chechen separatists and terrorists were still running free” (Trenin and Malashenko 42).

Although Grozny did finally fall to the Russians, the victory came at a stiff cost to both sides. For the Chechens, the city of Grozny, previously home to half a million civilians was completely destroyed as Russian troops “indiscriminately pounded the Chechen capitol…with massive artillery and aerial bombardment” (Gilligan 2). After witnessing the extent of Russian cruelty on the streets of Grozny, Sergei Kovalev, Russia’s human rights commissioner, angrily appealed to Russian President Boris Yeltsin: “Only you are in a position to stop this senseless war…Every day, with our own eyes, we see planes bombing residential buildings. Every day, we see the corpses of peaceful civilians, fragments of people, some without heads and others without legs” (Gilligan 2). The Chechens fought and won the first war “primarily under the banner of ethnic nationalism,” yet the heavy handed and unethical tactics of the Russians “pushed many Chechens to adopt the language of jihads and radical Islam” which increased the terrorist threat already pressing on Russia (Muraviev 163; Gilligan 14).
Towards the end of the war, Chechens launched a series of terrorist raids that outraged the Russian public. The most notable and notorious example of Chechen terrorism against Russia during the First war occurred in June of 1995 when a group of Chechen militants seized a hospital in Russia of over a thousand patients and employees. Over a hundred hostages were killed in two failed attempts by the Russians to take back the hospital by force. In the end, much to the embarrassment of President Yeltsin, the terrorists were allowed to walk free back to Chechnya (Bowker 72).

III. Post-War Chechnya: Anarchy and Terrorist Growth

Increased Chechen terrorism was not the only root of Russian post-war frustration. The First Chechen War left Russia defeated in the eyes of the world as the Russian media, “freed from the censorship of the Soviet days, broadcast a deeply embarrassing tale of failure and incompetence which further undermined public support for the army. There was also an increasing number of reports in the media detailing human rights violations committed by Russian forces (Bowker 72). While most Russians were grateful that the nightmare of Chechnya was finally over, “sections of the military viewed it as a humiliating defeat for Russia” and forced the nation to again face the reality that the military might of the Soviet Union had faded and that resources of the Russian army were ineffective in dealing with an asymmetrical Chechen resistance fighting on their own territory (Bowker 73). Russia went home from Chechnya embarrassed and scandalized as the Russian Army could not overtake the small forces of the Chechens.

Although Russia still would not recognize the independence of Chechnya after the first war, “[the republic] was accorded with a high level of autonomy, and most importantly, all Russian troops had to be withdrawn by November 1996” (Muraviev 164). With the Russian
army completely withdrawn from Chechnya in 1997, Aslan Maskhadov was elected the Chechen president. Despite the corrupt election, Moscow welcomed the new president because he “was desperate to restore stability to the republic. [He] promised the Russian president that ‘there would be no place for terrorists in Chechnya’” (Bowker 73). However, his promise quickly unraveled. The new president could not establish control over the republic and “the virtually lawless enclave became a safe haven for extremists and terrorists, who often had international connections” (Trenin and Malashenko 13). As the republic spiraled out of control, “warlords set themselves up across the republic and grew rich through organized crime and kidnapping. A number of foreign Islamists also arrived in Chechnya with their own jihadist agenda and Chechnya became one of the most dangerous places in the world” (Bowker 72). As the republic descended into full anarchy, Maskhadov destroyed the elected parliament and introduced a government of Shariah law\footnote{Shariah is the sacred law of Islam as set forth by the Qur’an.} that alienated moderates within Chechnya and allowed radical Wahhabists\footnote{Wahhabi is a Sunni Islamic teaching deriving from the teachings of Muhammad ibn Abd-al-Wahhab. He advocated purging Islam of what he considers impurities. It is the dominant form of Islam in Saudi Arabia. Wahhabi teachings are often manipulated by terrorists such as Osama bin Laden to support global jihad.} to operate freely (Bowker 74).

Chechnya specifically became an area of strategic interest for Osama bin Laden and his close aid Ayman al-Zawahiri as a possible training ground for Al Qaeda because of convenient geography such as tough mountainous terrain and large areas covered by forests and bush. Chechnya provided a lawless and strategic location at the crossroads of a major trading route connecting Central Asia with Transcaucasia and the Balkans, as well as a population of Chechen locals likely to endorse al Qaeda’s extremist ideology (Muraviev 164). Among major initiatives undertaken by Al Qaeda’s affiliates in Chechnya was the “decision to set up a comprehensive
terrorist training network with an objective to train local militants, as well as recruits from overseas, in conventional military operations, specialized terrorist activities, and asymmetrical operational methodologies” (Muraviev 167). The network consisted of seven permanent terrorist training centers within Chechnya that could train up to 4,000 young men at once with “specialized courses in urban and field warfare, including the use of heavy armaments such as main battle tanks, armored vehicles, artillery systems, and other, special terrorist activities” (Muraviev 167). Russian intelligence claimed that the external financial assistance for terrorist training activities in Chechnya during the interwar period of 1997 to 1999 regularly reached and exceeded $5 million U.S. Dollars per month (Muraviev 167). Two prominent leaders of the Chechen terrorist movement, Ibn Al-Khattab and Shamil Basayev, publically declared the long-term aim to be “the creation of a union between Chechnya and Dagestan under Islamic rule and the expulsion of Russia from the entire Caucasus region” (Bowker 74). The terrorist threat in Russia was real and serious, yet at this point, Russian counterterrorist policy in Chechnya was not a national priority as “there was no suggestion in Moscow of pursuing rebels into Chechnya” (Bowker 74). However, this all changed in September of 1999 when Chechen terrorists bombarded Russia with a series of brutal terrorist attacks.

IV. The Second Chechen War

The bombings of apartment buildings in Moscow and two other Russian cities claimed over three hundred lives. These attacks also created a need for Russian counterterrorist action and gave a “second campaign against Chechnya both popular support and the unmistakable tenor of a campaign against terrorism” (Trenin and Malashenko 36). Although Chechen terrorists as well as Al Qaeda operatives were a direct threat to Moscow, and “the terrorists from Chechnya were responsible for the September attacks…there was little doubt that the Russians used them
as an opportunity to go to war” to avenge the Russian loss from only years before in the First War (Bowker 74). It is important to understand that “while terrorism was certainly present in the republic, it is not the dominating element for a second war in Chechnya. Rather, terrorism existed alongside separatism and ordinary banditry (Trenin and Malashenko 3). Despite this, the Second Chechen War was sold and explained to the Russian people as a mop-up counterterrorist operation. While foreign mercenaries “were in Chechnya supporting the right wing of the separatist movement, it was not on the scale purported” by the Russians (Gilligan 206). Through the disenfranchisement of the Chechen government, and “casting it as a supporter of international terrorism, the Russian government legitimated its strong tactics as the price and rigors of a counterterrorist operation” (Gilligan 207). In the past, the Chechens have been cast as bandits. The Russian government took this engrained sentiment and simply extrapolated to labeling the Chechen population as terrorists. When asked how he would describe the wife of a Chechen fighter, Russian General Shamanov responded, “she is a female bandit” (Gilligan 207). It is this same prejudiced outlook that helps explain the punishment inflicted on the Chechens. Though there was a definite need for Russian counterterrorist action in 1999, the war that Moscow forged against Chechnya by no means sought to suppress only the terrorist threat.

The Second Chechen War was also a political strategy by Vlatimir Putin to gain support from the Russian population. Even mainstream analysts “believe that the Kremlin planners of presidential succession skillfully exploited a developing situation” (Trenin and Malashenko 35). Members of the Putin entourage agree that this second war in Chechnya offered “an opportunity for Putin to make his name. He was little known when he was appointed Prime Minister by Yeltsin in August 1999, but his uncompromising stance on Chechnya after the apartment

---

4 The Kremlin is the Russian equivalent of the White House. It is known as the center of government.
bombings certainly raised his profile” (Bowker 74). Whatever the reality behind the motives of the second invasion into Chechnya, “Putin’s conduct of the war won him considerable public support and contributed to his subsequent victory in the spring 2000 presidential elections” (Bowker 75). In many ways, Vladimir Putin’s skyrocket accession to presidency was the main result of the second campaign in Chechnya.

To Russia’s credit, the second campaign was much better planned and organized than the first; however, it was much more brutal. The Russian military extensively bombed Chechen targets and introduced ground troops to take back Chechen territory. At the height of the conflict, it was estimated that over 100,000 Russian ground troops were fighting in Chechnya, two and a half times the Russian force of the first war (Bowker 75). Despite the number of troops, the main assault on Grozny in December 1999 was again beaten back by the rebels. This occurred prior to Putin’s election as President, and as such he was “determined to take Grozny before the election in March and he subsequently acted with considerable brutality to achieve his aim” of proving the Russian military strength (Bowker 75). In order to effectively counter the asymmetrical strategies of guerilla warfare that the Chechens used, the Russian military resorted to fighting an indirect war that ended up turning the city of Grozny, in the words of a Russian newspaper, into a slaughterhouse (Bowker 75).

These inhumane tactics were possible in the Second War because “in 1999 many constraints were removed and the military was given a freer hand” (Trenin and Malashenko 125). As evidence to Putin’s heavy-handed war, local officials in Chechnya “have confirmed the existence of forty-nine mass graves containing the remains of nearly 3,000 civilians” (Gilligan 3). Russian troops are also “responsible for murders of all kinds, rape, mutilation, torture, and other cruel treatment” against civilians and combatants (Gilligan 7). More disturbingly, the Russian
government sanctioned many of the above atrocities in the 1998 federal law No. 130-FZ titled *On the Fight against Terrorism* (Gilligan 7). To cover up Russia’s actions in Chechnya, the Second War also saw a tightening of Russian media rights to shelter the public from the brutal truth about Chechnya. The second campaign in terms of information control was the exact “opposite of the first. Journalists were given selective access to information…the military leadership began to work actively with journalists, gaining their cooperation in creating a positive image of the army” (Trenin and Malashenko 145). Yet even these Soviet era propaganda techniques could not conjure support for this war that still plagues Russia and Chechnya even today.

Fighting between Russian troops and Chechen rebels continues today and has never ceased since the beginning of the Second War, yet in 2001, Russia set out to convince the general public that the Second Chechen War had decisively ended with a victory for Moscow. As proof of the victory, Russia immediately withdrew 40% of the estimated 70,000-80,000 troops stationed in Chechnya. In truth though, “escalating brutality has demonstrated that there has been no military solution to the conflict” and that the war between the rebels and the Russian army has again come to a stalemate (Trenin and Malashenko 42). Due to the asymmetric nature of the conflict in Chechnya, the Russian army only effectively managed to disperse the groups of armed Chechens to the mountains where they resort to acts of night ambushes and terrorism that the Russians cannot stop (Trenin and Malashenko 42). Though Putin asserts that there is no war being fought in Chechnya today, the North Caucus is still sparking deadly fire that Russia cannot seem to douse with military might.

V. Lessons Applied to Russian and U.S. Foreign Policy
There are many lessons to be learned from Russia’s successes and failures in the Second Chechen War, some of which can be applied to the foreign policy of the United States. Firstly, this war has illuminated a deep crisis in Russian military strategy caused by the disappearance of a traditional enemy and an inability to clearly define or locate the immediate threats to Russian security. This is a crisis also facing the U.S. army today in the War on Terror. Similar to Russia, the U.S. is involved in the “Southern arc where they could expect to face powerful asymmetrical threats from a series of regional players—Iran and Iraq” (Reynolds 303). Historically, just like the U.S., Russia’s army has “taken on the world’s strongest military powers, but in post-Soviet Russia, the military is needed for smaller scale engagements…actions that require a different military ideology and a different training system for officers and men” (Trenin and Malashenko 100). When dealing with terrorists and rebels as a military power, traditional military strategy designed to combat another major army is not sufficient as evidenced by the Vietnam War, the Second Chechen War, and the War in Iraq today. Military specialists “call for fundamental structural changes in the military” for nations such as Russia or the U.S. to defeat indirect threats such as Al Qaeda or the Chechen rebels (Trenin and Malashenko 125). Specifically, drawing on the Chechyan experience, “they [military specialists] argued for modifying the force structure. While not calling for the abandonment of regiments and divisions, they demanded increased flexibility” to fight an ever-changing enemy (Trenin and Malashenko 127).

Today in Iraq, the U.S. finds its army in a similar situation to that of the Russian military in Chechnya. Like in Chechnya, the current surge in Iraq “is about winning the neighborhood and the insurgent action is coming largely from forces within the neighborhood” (Reynolds 303). These insurgents use the same tactics as Chechen rebels used against the Russian soldiers in Chechnya and thus the U.S. army can learn various lessons from the Second Chechen War.
Though I argued that the primary motive of the Second Chechen War was not to combat terrorism, the Russian army still encountered frequent terrorism from international terrorists, Chechen extremists and separatists. Russia chose to counter an indirect threat by bringing indirect tactics to Chechnya. The Russian army used media censorship to cover up the complete military destruction of cities all across Chechnya as well as the other atrocities and mass killings of innocent Chechen civilians. When Sergei Kovalev arrived in the U.S. to speak to the Council on Foreign Relations he argued that “a centrally organized system of death squads had been established in Chechnya, in line with a coordinated general policy” that truly fought the Chechen terrorist threat by attempting to terrorize the Chechen population (Gilligan 2). The Russians attempted to fight indirect guerilla and terrorist tactics with inhumane tactics and ultimately, it backfired.

In the case of Russia, reverting to indirect tactics caused more harm than good. Russia’s Second War with the use of “heavy weaponry and the resulting destruction of homes rarely led to the destruction of rebel forces; instead it guaranteed local hostility to the Russian military” and most likely only bred another generation of separatists (Trenin and Malashenko 126). As Akhmed Zakeav, President Maskhadov’s special envoy to Europe wrote, “How can anyone then be surprised that our youth—a brother whose sister was raped, a son whose father was tortured to death—do not heed our sermons of moderation, and join the ranks of desperate suicide avengers?” (Gilligan 14). If we as Americans ever hope to win the war on terrorism, a war defined not by military might, but instead by ideas, we must learn to win the hearts and minds of our enemies. Yet even the U.S. cannot maintain its moral high ground as “America’s human rights violations in Iraq and at Guantanamo Bay, and the [American] outsourcing of torture to Syria, Egypt and Jordan” are not any more acceptable than the crimes being committed in
Conflicts such as the Russia-Chechnya Wars further emphasize that “those who must deal with Islamic separatists, extremists, and terrorists, must emphasize, even as they continue to fight, the nonmilitary dimensions of their policies in order to prevent isolated conflicts from developing into a clash of civilizations” (Trenin and Malashenko 12). Chechnya was an example of such a clash.

Countries such as Russia or the U.S. experiencing a clash with asymmetric threats and extremists must do a better job of emphasizing what General Charles Kulak calls the three-block war where the military “balances high intensity combat together with low intensity peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance” (Reynolds 332). America must begin to match high conflict military might with more tender humanitarian care because otherwise, the citizens of Iraq, Afghanistan, and even past-Vietnam will never side with our cause, no matter how good or justified. The only way to put an end to a multinational and non-state terrorist organization such as Al Qaeda is to undermine public support to squash their recruitment opportunities. Thus, it is crucial to obtain the support of the people in the war-torn nations. In the future, the U.S. will need to redesign the training process for the armed forces to make the army more flexible, versatile, and comprehensive to become better at humanitarian duties as well. World War II and Cold War style militaries are now useless against a new non-state threat and the U.S. needs to innovate to avoid a situation similar to Russia in the North Caucus.

Like Russia in the North Caucus, the U.S. fights an unpredictable and ever-changing enemy very similar to the Russians. The U.S. must learn from the Russian’s faults and refine their military strategy to deal with “new world conditions such as regional contingencies, ethnic strife, disaster and humanitarian needs, and operations other than war”, all of which have played a large role in the War in Iraq (Durso and Scott 111). From a tactical standpoint, the United
States “land forces will have to be much smaller, more mobile, and more self contained, relying on streamlined logistics, support, and effective, decentralized command and control” (Durso and Scott 119). This will allow troops to effectively respond to an ever-changing threat. On the other hand, troops must also become better educated about the cultures of the states they occupy. This will allow troops to more effectively cooperate with citizens on the ground and make it much easier to provide humanitarian aid if necessary.

More specific to the Russian-Chechen conflict, the U.S. army can study the patterns of the Chechen rebels in order to better understand their opponents on the ground in Iraq as the “local Islamists and foreign insurgents in Iraq utilize Chechen methodologies to the full. Among them were tactics of engaging mechanized regular units in the urban environment, ambushing military convoys, suicide attacks, hostage taking, and videotaped executions” (Muraviev 175). Some of the Chechen soldiers that fought in the Second war are fighting in the Iraq war today. These Chechen veterans that made their way to Iraq proved to be “highly effective and dangerous fighters who took part in a number of major engagements, including the second Battle of Fallujah… two Chechen snipers killed 15 marines during a single day in Fallujah and have been terrorizing the US army in the same ways that they terrorized the Russians about 10 years ago (Muraviev 174). Throughout the first decade of the 20th century, Chechen veterans have been adding combat adrenaline to the Islamic resistance in Iraq and all across the southern arc. The U.S. army is fighting the same soldiers that “mastered guerilla warfare tactics in Chechnya. They now effectively use that experience in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq” (Muraviev 174).

Favorable “conditions in the theater of Chechnya allowed Al Qaeda to experiment with asymmetric means of terrorism” that they employ in full force in the Middle East today (Muraviev 174). The U.S. can take Russia’s few successes and apply them towards the war in
Iraq. Specifically, the Russians did a great job at “breaking up command-and-control structures, dismantling the fighting capacity of the militancy in Chechnya, and securing territory” which immediately dispersed the rebels from the area (Muraviev 170). Taking this strategy and editing it to cater to U.S. strengths by integrating a more information and technology-based strategy may prove effective. Recent American successes when compared to Russian failure paint a brighter and more optimistic picture for the War in Iraq compared to the Second Chechen War. However, the U.S. army must focus on constantly innovating to stay ahead of the ever-morphing enemy.

VI. Conclusion

Although the Second Chechen War was not identical to the War in Iraq, the war illuminates some of the major issues that the U.S. faces today in dealing with unpredictable and asymmetrical terrorist threats. The Russian military went into both wars with every military advantage over the Chechens, and nevertheless came out of both conflicts discouraged and exhausted by guerilla tactics and terrorism. The case of Russia against the Chechens points to the fact that to defeat a threat such as Al Qaeda or the Chechen rebels, the United States and others cannot rely on conventional war tactics. We must emphasize innovation, but innovation of a different nature. We must relearn and restructure how we define our military forces and we must begin reallocating resources to better train and prepare soldiers for obscure and unpredictable conflicts. Russia’s failure to suppress the Chechens is evidence that Cold War tactics are obsolete in a “multiplex or uni-multipolar world that offers a geostrategic picture of great complexity…Threat assessment is clouded by new international polarization made more difficult by porous borders and internationalization of domestic security threats” such as terrorism (Cimbala and Rainow 135). Military might alone no longer guarantees victory. We have entered an age where ideas seem to prove more powerful than a weapons arsenal. Russia attempted to
fight an ideological battle with strictly military power and failed, only further exposing themselves to terrorist threats.
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I. Introduction

Fantastical myths in world mythology are sacred stories that contain highly developed characters and symbols that focus on how ancient cultures dealt with natural and supernatural events, common life experiences, religious narratives, cultural traditions, social norms, and power sharing. Sacred myths often focus on universal themes such as creation, immortality, fertility, spirituality, relationships, warfare, sustenance, and health. One of the most important themes in world mythology to analyze is the concept of justice. Many of the authority figures and iconic images of justice trace their roots to world mythology and they serve as reliable guideposts to the alert observer as to how a culture structures its laws, maintains order, and administers rewards and punishments. Studying the characters and symbols of justice in world mythology not only broadens one’s knowledge of the subject matter, but it also fosters a deeper understanding of what a society believes is just. It is apparent from the sacred stories of justice in world mythology that there is a common desire in all humans to create order out of chaos. The icons of justice in the ancient world reveal the timeless aspiration of the human spirit to administer laws in a fair and reasonable manner, which is a critical first step in the evolutionary process to guarantee the long-term viability of all members in society. Moreover, world mythologies emphasize stories about prominent authority figures, laws on stone tablets, weapon symbols to enforce laws, weather signs to invoke people’s natural fears, supernatural beings
protecting innocents from harm, and enlightened spiritual leaders, who provide guidance in the areas of moral and social conduct, because they are the most effective and enduring methods for promoting justice in society. Justice is a direct reflection of the fair and equitable distribution of power by influential leaders in the world’s earliest civilizations.

II. Sacred Myths

Myths are familiar stories from the ancient world that have been handed down through oral and written tradition. The word myth comes from the Greek word, *muthos*, which means to tell a story (O’Connell 70). Myths are generally regarded as religious narratives that transcend the possibilities of a culture’s common experiences (Leeming 11). Myths of justice are found in literature, art, music, dance, architecture, rituals, and artifacts, and they highlight the richness and diversity of past civilizations. The concept of justice encompasses a wide array of idealistic principles, such as the belief in equity, honor, reason, righteousness, standards, truth, and wisdom. In the ancient world, justice also connotes judgment, oppression, punishment, retaliation, verdict, retribution, and vengeance. Polemarchus discussed the nature of justice in Plato’s *Republic*, postulating that, “Justice is the art which gives good to friends and evil to enemies” (Plato 10). On the other hand, Thrasymachus argued with Socrates regarding the definition of justice saying, “Justice is the interest of the stronger” (Plato 19). Socrates eventually refuted their simplified views on justice, himself asserting that “justice is working at that which [one] is naturally best suited” (Plato 385). The characters and symbols of justice in world mythology provide tremendous insight into the psyche of the ancient rulers, the laws they enact, and the weapons they brandish to enforce rules. The Roman philosopher, Lucius Seneca, believed that unjust civilizations were destined to fail as he stated, “A kingdom founded on injustice never lasts.” Based on Seneca’s astute observation on the nature of justice, it is logical
to assume that humans strive for righteousness in society, because it is vital to their survival. Injustice always perishes, because humans share a basic need for self-preservation. World mythologies reveal that past cultures view justice as a rationale, dynamic, and deliberate process of fairly distributing merited rewards, punishments, and resources to the public by trusted influential leaders. Before embarking on a journey into classical world of mythology, one must first become acquainted with ancient, sacred symbols of justice.

III. Archetypal Symbols of Justice

Throughout human history, people have used symbols to convey the meanings of ordinary life experiences. Symbols can be depicted as colors, designs, drawings, engravings, etchings, icons, ideograms, gestures, logos, models, motifs, pictures, and signs. The Chinese sage, Confucius, taught the value of symbols as he said, “Signs and symbols rule the world, not words or laws” (O’Connell 2). The symbols of justice in world mythology are the keys to deciphering the universal codes of law and order. Carl Jung, a student of Sigmund Freud, believed that symbols denote cultural identity, when he said, “Archetypes give events symbolic meaning...Symbols are common to all humanity and they are completely independent of race, time, or place” (O’Connell 50-52). Semiotics is the study of the cultural process in signs, symbols, metaphors, signification, and communication. One of the fathers of 20th century semiotics, linguistics, and structuralism was the Swiss-born philosopher, Ferdinand de Saussure, who expressed the idea that in all cultures throughout history, the human mind utilized some kind of structuring principle to organize and make sense of cultural phenomena. The major means to express and understand cultural phenomena would be through societal signs and symbols, and the storing of such signs in the human mind was necessarily tied to linguistic structures for de Saussure. This implies that there is a universal nature in the signs and symbols
of justice in world mythology. Based on my critical analysis of sacred stories in world mythology, the most widely recognizable symbols of justice (in alphabetical order) include: axes, balanced scales, bells, blindfolds, books, canopies, chains, chariots, clubs, crescents, crocodiles, crooks, crosiers, crosses, daggers, discs, dolphins, dragons, drums, eagles, fasces, fire, fish, flags, flails, floods, hammers, hands, hats, jaguars, lamps, laws, leopards, lightning, lions, lotuses, maces, moon, number four, ostrich feathers, pebbles, pens, pillars, rain, rattles, rings, robes, rocks, scepters, scrolls, serpents, shells, shields, sieves, snakes, spears, stars, stone tablets, sun, swords, tents, thrones, thunderbirds, thunderbolts, totem poles, trees, wheels, and whips. Moreover, the words that are most associated with justice include: agreement, authority, balance, charity, code, commandment, enlightenment, equity, fairness, freedom, impartiality, judgment, law, liberty, mediation, mercy, order, power, protection, prudence, punishment, rank, reason, reward, righteousness, salvation, and truth (Cotterell 56-101; Hamilton 38-45; Leeming 23-28; Luce 42-49; O’Connell 207-249; Philip 41-63; Remler 101-103). These words provide evidence that humans view the concept of justice as a positive and necessary force for good in society.

IV. Laws on Clay, Stone, and Metal Tablets

Many of the first symbols of justice are written on clay, stone, and metal tablets. The word “symbol” comes from the Greek word symballein, which means “to throw together,” and the expression symbola means “a missing part of a whole” (O’Connell 2). In Sumerian myths, clay tablets are broken and the pieces are given to legal parties as contracts, and stone tablets are used to display formal laws in the public square (O’Connell 12). In Mesopotamia, in the eighteenth century B.C., King Hammurabi wrote the Law Code of Hammurabi in cuneiform script on a stone tablet to unify the laws and customs of Babylon (Leeming 42). In the thirteenth century B.C., Moses received the Ten Commandments at Mount Sinai on stone tablets. Pharaohs
of Upper and Lower Egypt engraved laws on stone tablets, pillars, statues, hieroglyphs, and pyramids (Cotterell 307). In the pre-Columbian Mesoamerican myths, Mayan and Aztec rulers inscribed laws on stone sun-shaped discs, tablets, slabs, and pyramids (O’Connell 30). In the sixth century B.C., Persian kings commanded armies of ten thousand men, called the Keepers of the Law, to maintain order based on laws written on stone tablets (Leeming 25). In the Qin Dynasty, 221 - 206 B.C., the First Chinese Emperor, Qin Shi Huang Di, carved the Qin Law Code on stone and metal tablets in the public square for millions of people to see (O’Connell 29). In the Han Dynasty, 206 B.C. - 220 A.D., codified laws were engraved in stone, and violators of laws were punished and non-violators rewarded (Morrison 48). In the Tang Dynasty, 618 A.D. – 907 A.D., the Tang Code of Law was engraved on stone and metal tablets, and laws made the severity of a punishment depend on the criminal’s relationship to the victim (Morrison 30). In Nordic myths, symbols of justice were etched into sacred stones, mountains, swords, spears, and rings to symbolize a king’s power, courage, and authority (Philip 70). The Latin word, *lex*, meaning law, was carved on Roman stone tablets, pillars, columns, friezes, and statues, and displayed in the public square (Cotterell 80). The Easter Island stone statues represent political power, spiritual protection, and royal authority (O’Connell 29). In West African and Native American myths, social behavior is reinforced with the use of sacred stones, statuettes, rock slabs, wood carvings, shells, rattles, totems, and fetishes, which are infused with the supernatural powers of the shaman leaders (O’Connell 24). The Voodoo gods of Haiti, Cuba, Africa, and Brazil use sacred stones, pebbles, gems, rattles, medicines, and animal spirits in their rituals to settle disputes and heal the sick (Philip 90). In South American legends, priests use sun stones, gems, and cosmology myths to appease the gods (O’Connell 30). In the indigenous oceanic traditions of Australia, New Zealand, Polynesia, Melanesia, Micronesia, and the Malay
Archipelago, tribal chiefs employ the power of “Mana,” and use sacred stones, wood carvings, tattoos, drums, shells, herbs, crocodiles, and serpents to show royal power and authority (O’Connell 28). Myths using clay, stone, and metal tablets reveal that the quintessential idea for permanence in the ancient world is to have laws “set in stone,” and be considered “rock-solid” in order to preserve the most important social, political, and religious views of the culture. These historical artifacts not only highlight the technological advancements of the ages, but they also indicate the types of motifs that are used by prominent rulers and spiritual leaders to convey the priorities and values of the civilization. Laws written on stone tablets preserve the earliest religious narratives and political philosophies in the society. Smaller objects like pebbles, stones, and shells are portable items, so they can be carried away to distant lands to promote the spread of religious and political views throughout the world. Storytellers and lawmakers are very effective at using these iconic images to ensure the eternality of ancient laws, cultural norms, and religious narratives.

V. Weapons of Justice

Many of the most recognizable symbols in world mythology are weapons of justice. Weapon symbols are often used to intimidate people into obeying laws. Common weapons of justice in world mythology include: axes, chains, crosses, fasces, fires, flails, floods, hammers, lightening, mace, ropes, serpents, shields, spears, stones, swords, thunderbolts, and whips. In ancient Rome, threatening weapons of authority, called fasces, were made from fastened birch bundles with an axe on top, and they were used by lictors to carry out severe punishments like decapitations (O’Connell 69). Fasces were later adopted as symbols of political rebellion in Italy, Germany, and the West. Depictions of Roman fasces (without the axe) are displayed in the United States Supreme Court pylon, *The Defense of Human Rights and the Safeguard of the*
Liberties and Rights of the People, which represent the first ten Amendments in the United States Constitution. The sword is another iconic weapon of justice in world mythology, because of its association with power, strength, and authority. Odin, the Nordic god of Justice, swings his mighty sword, axe, shield, chain, and magic spear, named Gungnir, made from the sacred wood of the cosmic tree, Yggdrasil, to maintain law and order (Cotterell 216). In pagan Europe, the Celtic sword, signifies royal power, authority, liberty, and justice (Cotterell 122). In Greek mythology, the goddess, Themis, La Justica, raises a sword to symbolize power, protection, equity, and justice (Leeming 378). Manjushri, a member of the Buddhist pantheon in China, wields a sword of wisdom to destroy ignorance (Cotterell 385). Egyptian myths use swords, flails, mace, ropes, serpents, spears, swords, and whips as signs of a pharaoh’s royal authority (O’Connell 14). Oceanic and tribal myths make use of swords, spears, knives, and axes in rituals to show strength, power, and authority (O’Connell 242). Fasces, swords, and other ominous weapons are powerful symbols of justice in world mythology, because they teach people to obey the norms of society or face the consequences of their wrongful actions. Fear of bodily harm was a real concern for people in the ancient world, so the use of weapon symbols was an effective strategy for maintaining order.

VI. Weather Signs

Some of the most intriguing symbols of justice in world mythology are the weather signs. People living in ancient times were superstitious and they often believed that they provoked the anger of the gods whenever they experience natural weather phenomenon like thunder, lightening, and floods (Hamilton 313). In Greek mythology, Zeus, the god of Justice, hurls thunderbolts, hail, snow, and rain to earth to enforce his laws, but he also protects Greece by aiding travelers and punishing the violators of the laws of hospitality (Grant 418). The Roman
god, Jupiter, frequently launches thunderstorms and lightening to earth to preserve law and order (Cotterell 58). The Chinese god of Thunder, Lei Shen, or Lei Gong, heaves thunderbolts to earth to scold people for crimes of earthly laws (Fisher 37). The Chinese goddess of Lightening, Dian Mu, and the god of Rain, Yu Shi, display weather signs in the sky when people waste food (Fisher 38). The Norse god of Thunder, Thor, heaves thunderbolts, iron gauntlets, and a magic hammer, named Mjollnir, when he needs to protect his people from the giants (Cotterell 234). The ancient Aztecs, Mayans, Amazonians, and Native Americans send thunderbolts, lightening, rain, and floods to reinforce the rules of social conduct, and the Aztec god, Ehecatl, is the god of Strong Winds, who encourages people to obey laws (O’Connell 30). Other gods, who wield thunderbolts to earth to teach people lessons include: Indra, in Hindu myths, Shango, the god of Thunder in West African myths, and the Thunderbird god in Native American legends (Leeming 33; O’Connell 198; Philip 86). Weather signs are important symbols of justice in world mythology, because they teach people the indispensible rules of moral and social conduct that may help guarantee a person’s long-term survival. This strategy is especially useful in geographic regions that are prone to natural disasters like floods, fires, drought, lightening strikes, earthquakes, avalanches, sand storms, tsunamis, and volcanic eruptions.

VII. Religious Symbols

Many iconic symbols of justice are found in the religious narratives in world mythology. The most identifiable symbols in the religion of Islam are the Qur’an, Mohammed, star, crescent moon, mosque, water, black stones, black velvet cloth, amulet, angel, and the rules of moral principles, which signify Allah’s authority, laws, and rules on charity, fasting, and submission (O’Connell 48). In Judaism, the symbols of the Holy Ark, Torah, Tablets of Decalogue, synagogue, scroll, lamp, blue cord, star, sphere, ram horn trumpet, mezuzah, tefillin, and
yarmulke represent Yahweh’s authority, formal laws, and rules of submission (O’Connell 44). In Christianity, the motifs of Jesus Christ, Eucharist, cross, church, fish, labarum, triqueta, shepherd, crozier, dove, keys, shroud, robe, lamp, sun, star, halo, angel, crown, spear, cloak, water, lily, rose, rock, fasting, and garden signify authority, justice, love, charity, and mercy (O’Connell 46). In China, in 551 B.C., Confucius taught of the “Golden Mean,” a universal moral order that all people are urged to follow. According to Confucius, a moral person exemplifies the universal moral order and a vulgar person contradicts it. Confucianism teaches that human behavior is regulated by sacred knowledge of the natural laws of universal reason, called *li*, which offers rewards and punishments to encourage right behavior (Nardo 94). In India, in 528 B.C., Siddhártha Gautama, later known as Buddha, the Enlightened One, introduced the “Noble Eightfold Path,” and the Eight-spoked Wheel of Law, called Dharma chakra, which guides a person toward the attainment of nirvana and enlightenment (Beck 714; Nardo 73). In Hinduism, the gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, and the symbols of the Vedas, Puranas, Guru, priest, holy man, Om, trident, hands, lotus, lamp, conch shell, and soul symbolize light, purity, respect, honor, and truth, while the golden mace and discus of Vishnu denote the power of mind to reason (Philip 110). These religious myths reveal the inherent desire in people to seek truth, morality, and justice, which are essential human qualities that promote ethical decision-making, which is necessary for the creation of civil societies. Other related symbols of justice in world mythology are scrolls and books, which represent knowledge, reason, and wisdom (O’Connell 210-240). Scepters, crooks, crosiers, staffs, canopies, hats, robes, hands, and rings indicate royal power and spiritual authority (O’Connell 219-243). Thrones, chairs, raised platforms, and chariots signify the seat of power (O’Connell 95). Chakra combats evil and lamps signify triumph over evil (O’Connell 40). Flags, spheres, rings, stars and seals denote identity
Parallel lines indicate equality, vertical lines reflect spiritual authority, closed circles mean greatness, quadrangles are signs of military buildings, pentagons are associated with justice, and the cube is a symbol of truth (O’Connell 107-113). Taking oaths, raising flags, and meeting in ritualistic spaces are associated with allegiances (O’Connell 224). Gateway doors and arches are symbols of power, salvation, and triumph (O’Connell 208). Lotus flowers signify enlightenment and truth (O’Connell 232). The Greek Pythagorean theory is associated with integrity, and the number four corresponds to order and stability (O’Connell 105). Trees connote stability and fairness, regal birds represent power and leadership, and sieves separate the good from evil (O’Connell 209). These sacred symbols and motifs of justice in world mythology reflect the collective knowledge of what people believe is just, and their unwavering commitment to advance religious narratives and political systems that are based on moral and logical principles.

VIII. Archetypal Characters

Archetypal characters in world mythology represent the larger-than-life authority figures, supernatural deities, and mythological creatures, who serve as the purveyors of justice. Authority figures include the law makers, judges, rulers, emperors, pharaohs, kings, queens, priests, and shamans of the ancient world. The supernatural deities are the gods and goddesses, and the mythological creatures include the half-human, half-animal beings, animal spirits, or inanimate objects that possess special powers. These archetypal characters create laws, teach moral lessons, calm people’s fears, reward heroes, and administer punishments to evildoers. Carl Jung believed that “archetypes in myths are universally familiar human motifs that strike familiar chords in people everywhere” (Leeming 27). The archetypal characters in world mythology are a mirror
image of a culture’s view on justice, and they are often represented as divine creatures or prominent leaders.

IX. Lady Justices and Gods of Justice

Lady Justices are some of the most recognizable characters of justice in world mythology. The archetype is based on the belief in the Great Mother or Mother Nature, who creates all life and judges all beings (Leeming 9). Lady Justices holding balanced scales signify the impartial deliberation of legal disputes. One of the most famous “Lady Justices” is the Egyptian goddess, Maat. She is a tall, stately goddess, who maintains order on earth and Heaven. Maat is depicted in hieroglyphs wearing a long gown, wings, and a single ostrich feather on her head, which is an ideogram of divine reason and truth (Leeming 243). After a person dies in Egypt their soul is weighted on balanced scales against the feather of Maat, which signifies the soul’s moment of truth or judgment (O’Connell 14). Forty-two other gods of judgment also preside over the destination of the soul, but only Maat, acts as the final judge, because she represents divine reason, truth, and mercy (Philip 12-17). In Greek mythology, Themis is the Titaness Oracle of Law, Order, Divine Right, and Justice. Themis sits on a throne holding balanced scales and exemplifies the laws of good governance (Mutén 65). In Roman myths, Libra is the goddess of Justice, who holds balanced scales and symbolizes righteousness, equality, and fairness. Aequitas is the Roman goddess of Fair Dealing, who lifts balanced scales to show fairness and equity (Philip 150). Images of Lady Justices and balanced scales are displayed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the friezes, *Equity, Divine Inspiration, Liberty*, and on the *Youth’s* shield. Other goddesses associated with justice are Horae, or Dike, the Greek goddess of Justice, and Eunomia, the Greek goddess of Order (Mutén 18). Nemesis, is the Greek goddess of vengeance, who directs her anger against people guilty of hubris (Cotterell 65). The Greek
goddess Athena stands for justice, truth, and wisdom, and the Roman goddess, Minerva, symbolizes truth, reason, and wisdom (Hamilton 29). The Roman Furies are winged-goddesses, who signify punishment and retribution (Cotterell 44). The Roman Fates’ and Greek Moerae goddesses determine the destiny of males (Cotterell 44). Brigid, a Celtic goddess of Reason, represents open-mindedness (O’Connell 128). Kaladevi is the Tibetan female protector of Buddha’s laws and Sanjna is the goddess of Conscience in Hindu Vedic myths (Cotterell 375). The Lady Justices reveal the critical role that female deities play in world myths and their infinite capacity to teach people how to be more optimistic, reasonable, truthful, and fair.

The male gods of justice play a major role in world myths, because they create the laws and enforce them. In China, the First Spirit Ruler god was known to be Huang Di, god of Law and Order, called the Yellow Emperor, who made the first laws, invented time, maintained order, and ensured all happiness (Fisher 37). In Babylonian myths, Shamash is the god of Divination, Kittu is the god of Justice, and Misharu is the god of Law and Righteousness, and they all work to expose injustices (Cotterell 318). The Hindu god, Yama, the Lord of Justice, maintains order (Leeming 406). The pre-Islamic god, Anbay is the Lord of Justice, who acts as an oracle to enforce laws (Cotterell 264). In Iranian mythology, the servants of the Supreme god, Ahura Mazda, are the Zoroastrian Heavenly Hierarchy deities, and they are Asha Vahishta, god of Righteousness, and Rashnu, god of Judgment (Cotterell 502). In India, Katavul is the judge of mankind, who rewards and punishes people according to their deeds (Cotterell 377). In Hindu myths, the first Manu produces the “Laws of Man,” and the Sanskrit word *darma* includes laws that fulfill societal and moral obligations (Leeming 252). Zeus is the Greek god of Law and Order, who creates laws and enforces them, and Jupiter is his Roman counterpart (Cotterell 496). In *The Republic*, Plato writes, “We had better be ruled by divine wisdom dwelling within him; or
by an external authority, that we may be all, under the same government, friends and equals”
(Plato 358). These examples reveal that the patriarchal authoritarian gods of Justice in world
mythology have a heavenly and earthly mandate to create the laws and enforce them.

X. Animism and Mythological Creatures

Animism and mythological creatures also symbolize justice in world mythology. In
cultures with oceanic traditions like the Greeks, Scandinavians, Celts, Australians, Mayans, Aztecs, Chinese, Japanese, Siberians, Inuit, Nabataean Arabs, Africans, Egyptians, Melanesians, Micronesians, Minoans, and Native Americans, the dolphin, crocodile, and fish are symbols of justice, power, wisdom, protection, authority, and truth (O’Connell 182). The Egyptian feline predator goddess of Justice, Mafdet, represents execution, and Wadjet, the cobra goddess, symbolizes a pharaoh’s royal authority (Cotterell 266; Remler 101). Gao Yao, the Chinese god of Judgment, appears as a phoenix, and he uses goats to detect injustices (Leeming 406). Dragons and serpents are symbols of power in China and Japan, and lions, jaguars, leopards, and cobras denote authority in West Africa, South America, and India (O’Connell 30). Eagles and falcons represent imperial power in Greco-Roman, Hindu, and Egyptian myths (O’Connell 221). Marduk is a supreme Babylon god, who is depicted as a bull or dragon (Leeming 252). In the second century B.C., Lady Dai’s funeral banner incorporates Chinese dragons and serpents to show the power of emperors (Morrison 15). Native North Americans revere the bison, bear, eagle, fish, falcon, owl, and thunderbird to connote power, rank, and social status (O’Connell 32-33). In the Central and South America, priests use images of jaguars, leopards, vultures, serpents, crocodiles, dogs, and animal spirits to show royal power and spiritual authority (O’Connell 30). In Arctic myths, bears are symbols of justice, and they are used in magical songs and dances as a sign of cosmic law and order (O’Connell 34). In South-East Asia, insignias of dragons, serpents,
and pheasants symbolize justice (O’Connell 26). Amairgen, a Druid shaman in Ireland, commands a serpent, and Arawn commands a pack of dogs to rule over the Welsh otherworld (Cotterell 99). Nordic myths employ serpents, dragons, and wolves to signify royal authority (Philip 70). In Egypt, the jackal-headed god, Anubis, asks the monster, Ammut, to eat a dead person’s soul if their heart is too heavy after being balanced against Maat’s feather (Philip 16).

Animals, animal spirits, and mythological creatures are featured prominently in world myths to enlighten people to the fact that justice is sometimes as swift, cunning, and unforgiving as the menacing beasts living in the natural world.

XI. Tricksters

Tricksters are archetypal characters that represent challenges to authority and the willful disobedience of laws. Tricksters are depicted as interesting characters like spiders, wolves, rabbits, human fools, court jesters, and clowns. Some of the tricksters in world mythology include the Brer Rabbit in Native America, Hare Rabbit in Yoruba myths, and Anansi, the spider-woman, in Ashanti myths (O’Connell 71; Philip 86). Loki is the Germanic trickster god, who is bound in a cave for eternity, because he initiated violence against the gods (Cotterell 208). Coyotes, wolves, and ravens are trickster gods in Russian mythologies. Trickster gods serve a vital purpose in society, because they teach people that there is no escape from the judgment of the gods for intentional acts of defiance.

XII. The Indomitable Power of the Motifs of Justice in Contemporary Society

Vestiges of the archetypal characters and symbols of justice in world mythology are imbued in our national identity and collective unconsciousness, and they serve as tangible reminders to all citizens and visitors of the United States of America that our nation shares a profound commitment with the ancients to be practical, prudent, and just. Our republic’s
existence is rooted on the principles of justice, freedom, and liberty—ideals that stem from the common cultural experiences, ethical decision-making, and governance observed in the earliest civilizations. Humanity’s concept of justice has been preserved perfectly in the sacred stories of world mythology, and our nation aptly understands the political, cultural, and economic power of incorporating these legendary signs, symbols, and characters of justice in its national iconography.

One of the most important symbols of justice in American history is the Declaration of Independence. In 1776, the Declaration of Independence was penned with an ostrich feather (an Egyptian symbol of justice) by the most notable members of the Continental Congress, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams. In this historic document, thirteen states proclaimed their right to self-governance. Inspired by Western philosophical thinking, the Founding Fathers decided to dissolve the political bonds of British rule, because of the injustices they have endured, such as, taxation without representation. The historic document declares that people have “certain unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness…And that all men are created equal” (Brinkley 129). In 1788, liberty and justice was further strengthened with the ratification of the Constitution of the United States of America, which states, “We the People of the United States of America, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice…And secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity” (Brinkley A-12). The first Ten Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, were ratified in 1791, and they outlined additional natural rights and limitations to the powers of the federal government. The Bill of Rights is considered a national symbol of law, justice, and freedom. Since 1935, the three most treasured and studied documents of the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, Constitution of the United States, and Bill of Rights has been on
public display in the Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom in the National Archives Building, located north of the National Mall in Washington, D.C. These iconic symbols of justice are so vital to our national identity that they are protected from man-made and natural disasters with bullet-proof glass casings, armed guards, and an impenetrable 50-ton vault. Today, Washington D.C. remains a major tourist destination for millions of visitors each year. While public viewings of the historic documents are free of charge, paper replicas are available for approximately ten dollars. Billions of dollars are spent annually in the United States to protect, defend, and secure democracy in America and around the world, and preserve its most precious artifacts of justice.

One can say that the founding of the United States of America is mythological in nature. This is due in part to our nation’s unwavering commitment to the principles and practice of democracy, which trace their roots to the ancient city state of Athens, Greece, among other reasons. Fifth century B.C. Athens was considered the cultural and intellectual center of Greece, and many of its citizens, philosophers, and politicians created the world’s first democracy. One factor that allowed Athenians to differentiate themselves from other Greek counterparts like Sparta was the virtuous mindset they receive from their patron goddess, Athena. Athena is the Greek goddess of wisdom and strategy, and as such, the Athenians dedicated themselves to the pursuit of mental and martial perfection. The renowned Greek general, Pericles, treasured the classical way of life, and he described the drive in the Athenian people as, “wisdom without softening of character” (Cohen 15). Although Sparta was the first civilization to develop a constitution, the Athenians were inspired by their goddess to fashion the first democratic system of government. Democracy in the United States was founded on Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman principles. Judeo-Christian principles are morally based, and share the Biblical view, “God is the source of the law and the only legitimate law derives from God” (Sterling). Greco-
Roman law was evidentiary based, and this form of self-regulated government believes, “The origin of law can be no higher than man himself” (Sterling). Common motifs of justice in contemporary American society that have origins in Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman mythologies include: blindfolded Lady Justices, scales of justice, stone tablets, black-robed judges, gavels, books, lamps, scrolls, raised chairs, Bibles, and pillars. These familiar icons of law and order have been engrained in the human psyche for thousands of years, and they embody the finest ideals of American democracy and jurisprudence: impartiality, equal justice under the law, standards, reason, authority, and truth. Relics and icons of justice are essential to preserve, because the lessons learned in the past are our most trusted and thoughtful guidelines for understanding what is true moral and civic duty. Thomas Paine, author of *Common Sense* and *Rights of Man*, believed that the United States had transcended the greatness of ancient Greece and Rome as he stated that “I have no notion of yielding the palm of the United States to any Grecians or Romans that were ever born. We have equaled the bravest in times of danger, and excelled the wisest in the construction of civil governments…The Grecians and Romans were strongly possessed of the *Spirit* of Liberty but not the *principle*” (Paine 108-109). Paine also wrote, “Had it not been for America there had been no such thing as freedom left throughout the whole universe” (Paine 109). These statements by Paine highlight the distinction between democracy in theory and the reality of democracy in practice. Despite our nation’s failings at times, each generation of Americans is inspired to create a more perfect union, so that our nation can continue to be a symbol of hope, liberty, and justice in the world.

Many iconic symbols and characters of justice in world mythology are visible in the artwork, archives, and architecture in modern society, and they reflect the indomitable spirit of the American people and their steadfast commitment to democracy. For example, an exterior
frieze on the West face of the U.S. Supreme Court includes the words, “Equal Justice under the Law,” etched in stone. The frieze also includes familiar icons of law and order from world mythology: sitting justices, fasces, swords, scales in balance, robes, crowns, helmets, shields, and books of knowledge. The stone pillars below the exterior frieze signify, “mercy and justice.” Prominent stone statues in front of the U.S. Supreme Court Building depict two figures sitting on thrones (symbols of superior rank, justice, and authority) with one figure holding a stone tablet in one hand with the Roman word, *Lex* (law), and a sword (authority, justice, and wrath personified) in the other. Another statue holds a smaller figure, which means protection of the innocent. The Seal of the Supreme Court depicts an outstretched eagle (universal sign of imperial power) with its head facing left towards peace and victory (olive branch), and away from war on the right (bundled arrows pointing upward). In Native American mythology, bundled arrows pointing upwards also symbolize peace, so it can be argued that peace is represented on both sides of the eagle. The outstretched eagle on the Seal of the Supreme Court is also depicted like a mythological phoenix (symbol of indomitable spirit) with a shield (escutcheon) that has alternating stripes in red (war) and white (peace) and a top bar in blue (democracy). The eagle holds a ceremonial banner in its beak, which says, “E Pluribus Unum,” which means, “Out of Many One,” and above its head are thirteen stars representing the original states in a sun-shaped pattern (divine power) and cloud motif, which means revelation and happiness. These examples highlight America’s respect for the ancient symbols of justice and democracy in the earliest civilizations, and their inherent meanings.

One of the most legendary archetypal characters of justice in American history is President George Washington. A heroic leader of the Continental Army, President Washington was immortalized in the elaborate fresco, *Apotheosis of George Washington*, painted by
Constantino Brumidi in 1865. Located in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol Building, the fresco depicts President Washington being raised to the heavens by a multitude of angels. Washington is surrounded on all sides by the gods and goddesses, Minerva, Neptune, Mercury, Vulcan, and Ceres of Roman mythology, and Freedom, or Columbia, directly below him. Other symbols of justice in the fresco include: fasces, swords, shields, scrolls, laurel wreaths, olive branches, trumpets, lamps, and eagles. The goddess Liberty, to Washington’s right, wears a red Phrygian cap, which symbolizes emancipation. Each of the original thirteen colonies is personified as maidens encircling Washington, a motif that is used in the star patterns in the first U.S. flag and U.S. Seal. An interesting feature in the fresco is that several of the maidens have their backs turned away from President Washington, which may represent the division in the country between the North and the South during the time of the Civil War when the fresco is painted. The perspective of the fresco gives the viewer the impression that President Washington is looking down at them from upon high, which is similar to the god-like status that is attributed to mythological heroes. President Washington’s image is also featured on the U.S. one dollar bill, along with an eagle, stars and stripes, laurel wreaths, arrows, chevron (representing balance and military rank), thirteen stars, thirteen rows in the pyramid (original states), all seeing eye of God, and the Latin phrases, *Annuit Coeptis* (God favors our undertakings), and *Novus Ordo Seclorum* (New Order of the Ages). The imagery in *Apotheosis of George Washington* and other national symbols of justice reflects our shared values for independence, religious tolerance, heroic journeys, peace through military strength, and belief in Divine Providence in the founding of our nation.

Another prominent archetypal leader in American history is President Abraham Lincoln. The Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., depicts the Great Emancipator, *Honest Abe*, sitting
on a raised chair (seat of power) with two prominent fasces as decorations (symbols of ultimate military authority). To the alert observer, the positioning of Lincoln’s clenched hands on the chair resembles the outline of Roman axes found on the tops of fasces. In mythological terms, one can interpret the meaning of this posture as “holding power in one hand and wielding power in the other,” a trait attributed to heroic figures in world myths. The Lincoln Memorial symbolizes the unification of the North and South following the Civil War. Lincoln’s image and his Memorial are depicted on the U.S. penny and five dollar bill. The five dollar bill also includes the iconic symbols of justice: balanced scales, stars and stripes, arches, eagle, chevron, key, wreaths, and the words, “In God We Trust.” In 2011, the U.S. Supreme Court of the United States determined that the slogan, “In God We Trust,” is ceremonial and patriotic in nature, and not an endorsement of any religion. As a result, the Court refused to hear the case of an atheist, Dr. Michael Newdow, who wanted the removal of all references to God on U.S. coins and bills on the grounds of “separation of church and state” outlined in the religious clauses of the First Amendment. Removing references to a Divine power on bills and coins invalidates thousands of years of moral and social traditions on justice.

The *Watchdog Seal* of the U.S. Treasury Department depicts Nero, a watchdog of our nation’s wealth, guarding a strongbox with a lock and key (secular symbols of authority), alongside scales in balance (equal justice), and two large fasces. The image is unusual, because it includes the axes on the tops of the fasces (Roman weapons of decapitation). Fasces are often used as revolutionary symbols, but modern day versions exclude the axes. Fasces are commonly depicted in paintings, wood carvings, and stone engravings in many national landmarks, and they signify America’s revolutionary beginnings. One can differentiate fasces from other similar looking objects like book bindings and stone pillars by the presence of the leather straps. Paper
bindings are much thinner in size than birch-tree groupings, and stone pillars do not have leather straps. Although fasces are peculiar symbols of justice, they highlight our national posture to protect freedom, liberty and justice through military, economic, and political strength.

Snakes are ancient symbols of royal power, wisdom, justice, and protection, and they have been used during difficult periods in American history as symbols of shared political identity, especially when people feel oppressed. In 1741, Benjamin Franklin made a suggestion that colonists send snakes back to England after the British sent felons to America, and in 1754, Franklin’s newspaper, *Pennsylvania Gazette*, published an editorial cartoon of a rattlesnake with the words, “Join, or Die,” to garner support for inter-colonial unity during the French and Indian War (Brinkley 105). Snakes are Biblical symbols of evil, and a disjointed snake motif is based on the superstition that snakes cut into pieces come back to life when joined back together before sunset. The Boston Gazette also used the image of a snake and added the words, “Unite and Conquer,” and subsequently, dozens of rattlesnake images began to appear on buttons, drums, flags, clothes, and military Seals. In 1780, the Gadsden flag depicted the image of a coiled rattlesnake with the words, “Don’t Tread on Me,” and it became a national symbol of unity and justice. The snake is a metaphor for retaliation, because it strikes only when stepped upon. In contemporary society, the snake has reemerged as a symbol of political oppression. In 2010, on tax day, Tea Party Movement activists waved the Gadsden flag in protest of excessive federal taxation. In 2011, in Madison, Wisconsin, public union activists waved the Gadsden flag in opposition to cuts in their salaries, benefits, and collective bargaining rights. The Rotunda of the Chicago Cultural Center includes a large frieze of two Gadsden snakes with flags, shields, helmets, swords, and the banner, “Don’t Tread on Me.” The use of snake imagery reveals that
Americans understand the power of using mythological symbols to express their political positions, especially when oppressed.

Bells and flags are cultural and national symbols of justice in America. Bells are symbols of “truth, good news, and impending danger” in Buddhist, Hindu, Islamic, and Christian traditions (O’Connell 209). Philadelphia’s Liberty Bell is considered a national treasure, because it rang out at Independence Hall with the first reading of the Declaration of Independence. In 1837, the Liberty Bell gains national status when abolitionists adopt it as a symbol of the anti-slavery movement. Since 2003, descendants of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, tap the bell thirteen times on Independence Day to honor the original states. Flags are universal symbols of allegiance and patriotism, and the American flag reflects our national identity. The American flag has 50 white state stars (purity and peace) on a blue background (democracy) and thirteen alternating stripes of red (war) and white (peace) representing the original thirteen colonies. Hundreds of millions of flags are sold each year in America, and they are displayed in the lawns of government buildings, public homes, and private businesses. Folded flags are given to families at funerals as a sign of respect for a person’s military service, and they are flown at half-staff during times of national importance, such as, funerals of prominent military, cultural, and political leaders. Bells and flags are symbols of national unity and pride in America and around the world.

Many people are unaware that America’s national anthem has roots in world mythology. The Star-Spangled Banner, originally entitled, In Defense of Fort Henry, was written on the back of an envelope by Francis Scott Key in 1814, and it is emblematic of our revolutionary beginnings. The song is set to the melody of “To Anacreon in Heaven,” written by John Smith in 1776 as a British drinking song with the words, “May our Sons flourish Happy, United, and
Free,” and it is based on the 5th century B.C. Greek poet, Anacreon’s erotic poem, “The Myrtle of Venus with Bacchus Vine.” Bacchus is the Roman equivalent of the Greek god, Dionysus, the god of wine making, fertility, freedom, ecstatic joy, and savior of savage brutality (Leeming 43). Dionysus, also known as Eleutherios, the Liberator, freed people from their cares and the oppressive restraints of the powerful with his intoxicating wine at Dionysia festivals (Hamilton 59). After drinking the wine of Dionysus, “Weary cares of men leave every heart. We travel to a land that never was, where the poor grow rich, and the rich grow great of heart” (Hamilton 62). In Roman mythology, the Latin word, “Liber,” (Free One) when paired with “Liber Pater,” (Free Father) refers to the god of wine-making in the ancient festivals of Liberalia, which are associated with free speech, human rights, and freedom from oppression (Hamilton 296; Leeming 238). Based on these examples from world mythology, one can conclude that there is a strong historical connection between Greco-Roman and British-American drinking songs and the origins of Freedom and Liberty. Today, Americans stand to face the flag, and place their right hands over their hearts at the playing of the Star-Spangled Banner as a national sign of respect. The Star Spangled Banner is played before sporting events, many government functions, and after U.S. Gold medal performances at the Olympic Games. The Star-Spangled Banner has been translated into numerous languages. From ancient Greece, to Rome, to Britain, and to America, this lively melody has leaped across time to commemorate, and reinforce conventionally, the indomitable power in every human heart to seek liberty, freedom, and justice for all.

XIII. Conclusion

The legendary characters and symbols of justice in world mythology are like windows into the soul of humanity, because they represent the inherent desire in all humans to create order out of chaos. Symbols etched on stone tablets demonstrate the need to create laws that are clearly
understood, well-publicized, and fairly applied. Weapon symbols and weather signs invoke people’s natural fears, so they are used to persuade people to obey clearly defined laws. Religious myths offer people guidance in areas of moral and social conduct, and they encourage individuals to feel a divine connection between themselves and the universe. Archetypal characters like the Lady Justices holding balanced scales inspire people to be more equitable, reasonable, and honest. The gods of Justice symbolize patriarchal strength and authority, and they serve to protect innocent people from harm. Animals, mythological creatures, and tricksters train people to behave appropriately or face the consequences of their actions. America’s revolutionary beginnings embody our nation’s mythological quest for independence, liberty, and justice, and our national icons of justice demonstrate our profound respect for the collective wisdom of the ancient lawmakers, philosophers, and storytellers. The continued presence of the legendary motifs of justice in contemporary society reveals an undeniable recognition for the global iconic images, and the innate desire in all humans to preserve the sacred stories, legends, and myths for future generations. By identifying the characters and symbols of justice in world mythology, one can begin to decipher the underlying meaning of the messages and learn to appreciate the nature of justice, which is the purist ideal of the human spirit to be civil, moral, and just.
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University of Southern California

Dean Howard Gillman

What are your educational background and areas of expertise?
I received my BA, MA, and PhD from UCLA. (Don't worry, the president knew this before he appointed me dean!) My research and teaching focuses on constitutionalism, the U.S. Supreme Court, judicial politics, and American political development (in other words, how our political system has changed over time).

How did you become interested in the field of Political Science? Who or what inspires your work?
During my teenage years a lot was going on in politics: Vietnam, the civil rights movement, and especially the Watergate Crisis. Watergate was the first sustained political drama that I paid a lot of attention to, and I'm sure it had something to do with my eventual interest in "constitutional politics" in the United States. (Really, you had to be there! A corrupt president driven from office for abuse of constitutional powers by a determined Congress and judiciary.) In high school I had an AP History teacher who reinforced these interests. As an undergrad I was hooked after I took my first classes in The Supreme Court and Constitution Law.

What classes do you currently teach? Which one is your favorite?
The responsibilities of being Dean of USC's largest, most diverse, and most important academic unit prevent me from having time to teach -- which is the biggest sacrifice I have to make for this job. Teaching is something I'm passionate about and that I take very seriously, which is why one of my proudest accomplishments was to win USC's highest award for teaching, the USC Associates Award for Excellence in Teaching. I'm hopeful I'll be back in the classroom before long. I love teaching many different classes, but especially POSC 130 Law and Public Policy, POSC 340 Constitutional Law, POSC 426 The Supreme Court, and a course I created about 10 years ago, POSC 443 Law in Film.
If you had 10 minutes in front of an audience, what you speak about?
As dean I have to speak a LOT of front of audiences! Right now my favorite topic is to speak about the vital importance of a broad and rigorous liberal arts education and the most important foundation for personal development and professional success. The biggest mistakes students make is to think of their undergraduate years as like a pre-vocational school. Students need to immerse themselves in the world of letters, arts, and sciences -- to engage the best that has ever been thought, created, or discovered across the humanities, social sciences, and sciences.

What are three books that everyone should read, and why? What is your favorite assigned reading?
Falling in love with books is the best gift that you can give yourself, and once you fall in love with books then it is impossible to just recommend three. It's vital to push against every development that is encouraging students to consume arguments in small sound bites and express themselves in 144 characters. The human condition is deeply complex and nuanced. Rather than 3 books I'll recommend 3 genres: great novels (I like Nabokov and Tolstoy, but it doesn't matter, start reading things you LOVE), real philosophy (I started with Richard Rorty), and sophisticated long-form essays (e.g., get a subscription to The New York Review of Books).

What are you currently working on outside of the classroom? Are there any future projects you are interested in pursuing?
I'm finishing a very large 2-volume treatise, written with my old friends of mine, on the nature of constitutional politics in the United States, entitled simply, American Constitutionalism.

What is one issue everyone should be informed about?
One issue? Hey, we're social beings; we have a responsibility to have working knowledge of the major issues facing our community and our world. Citizens of a democracy can't afford to know just one thing. Start getting interested in lots of things, especially issues that are outside your comfort zone.

What is the greatest issue currently facing the U.S.? In the next 20 years?
Let's see, hmm, which should I pick? The question of whether the financial system is capable of efficiently allocating resources without creating catastrophic conditions of boom and bust? The "great stagnation" in living standards for the typical American household? National security? Sustainability? Civil rights? The proper functioning of our democratic institutions? The condition of women in developing countries? You want me to pick one -- which of these should be eliminated? I can't pick.

**Outside of academia, what are your hobbies?**
Reading (mostly novels) and movies (mostly off-the-beaten path). Haven't had as much time for the latter as I would like; by contrast, it's really important to me to be reading some kind of fiction at all times.

**What do you wish to instill in your students?**
A passion for inquiry, an unquenchable curiosity, a deep respect for scholarly values as the only antidote for sloppy thinking and mindless ideology.

**As Dean of the College of Letters, Arts & Sciences, how and where do you believe Political Science fits into a liberal arts education?**
We are committed to the liberal arts because it is the only path for an individual to reach to full potential as a human being -- and one of our obligations as fully-developed human beings is to be caretakers of our communities. We are more than mere individuals; we are a social species, and we were lucky enough to develop the precious but incredibly fragile idea that it is our collective responsibility to establish institutions that serve the well-being of the people. It's not someone else's job to ensure that this happens, and -- I promise you -- there is absolutely no reason to think that political systems will promote the general welfare automatically. We develop ourselves as human beings so that, among other things, we can do our duty to ensure that the exercise of power reflects human needs and values.

**What is your vision for USC in the next five years? For the Political Science department?**
To build on our extraordinary successes and ascend to the ranks of undisputed excellence in higher education. The world needs what great universities have to offer, and we want to have a
strong an impact as we can on human progress and enlightenment. Political science will continue to develop strength within the faculty on outstanding rigorous research on important political issues, and our academic programs will provide our students increasing opportunities for research as well as engagement with the real-world of politics.

**How has earning a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in Political Science contributed to your goals?**

By the time I was an undergraduate I knew that the world of a great university -- this world that nurtures an endless cycle of curiosity, inquiry, discovery, skepticism (repeat ad infinitum) -- was where I belonged (which is strange since my parents never had the privilege of going to College), and I knew that the only want for me to have that kind of life was to get a Ph.D. And so those degrees allowed me to realize that goal. I am so very grateful that I was able to enter this world of ideas. I hope that students during their undergraduate years remember to value this experience -- and that they under take it for granted.
What is your educational background and areas of expertise?
As an undergraduate, I went to Fordham University, double majoring in Political Science and History, with an unofficial minor in Economics (four classes). Then I went to NYU for an interdisciplinary Masters in Humanities and Social Thought; after that, a Masters and a PhD in Government and Politics from the University of Maryland.

How did you become interested in the political science field? Who or what inspires your work?
I’m Greek—politics is in my blood (laughs). My grandfather, whose name I bear, was a partisan in World War II. He fought the fascists with great courage and we were made to understand that he was a great man; indeed he was. I’ve been trying to live up to that ever since. Also, going to a Greek-American parochial school until the 8th grade, you practice your language skills reading like Plato, Homer, Sophocles, as well as Greek national history. It’s kind of impossible not to have an interest in politics for me. Then again, plenty of Greeks don’t have an interest in politics. In all seriousness, I wanted to understand everything, and I felt political philosophy was the best path.

What classes do you currently teach? Which one is your favorite?
I currently teach POSC 371 - European Political Thought II, POSC 110 – Ideology and Conflict, and POSC 381 – Sex, Power, and Politics. My favorite class to teach would be European Political Thought II, mostly because many of my favorite books are required for that class.

If you had 10 minutes in front of an audience, what would you speak about?
Well, I typically spend an hour and twenty minutes to two hours in front of an audience speaking about political philosophy, so I would imagine much of the same.

What are three books that everyone should read and why? What is your favorite assigned reading?
Three books everyone should read and why? *The Stranger*, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, and the *Iliad*… why you ask—read them and you’ll see! Plato’s *Republic* would be my favorite assigned reading—it is such a rich text.

**What are you currently working on outside of the classroom? Are there any future projects you are interested in pursuing?**
Yes, I’m finishing up a paper on ideology which contains a revised critical theory approach to ideology and political myth. I’m also preparing to write an essay on Cormac McCarthy’s *Blood Meridian*; I’m looking at the political and philosophical significance of the characters and the allegory woven through the novel.

**What is one issue everyone should be informed about?**
The progressive and regressive nature and forms of socio-political violence; I guess what I’m thinking about is linked to both formal and informal power.

**What is the greatest issue facing the U.S. now? In the next twenty years?**
I’m not entirely sure whether to frame it as undeserved poverty or undeserved wealth; in the end, it’s two sides of the same coin.

**Outside of academia, what are your hobbies?**
Aikido and Jiu-Jitsu.

**What do you wish to instill in your students?**
The self-confidence to not be just students anymore—in some ways it is good to remain a student in life, but in other ways they will need to be more. What we read in class, I believe, helps a great deal.

**Why did you decide to teach?**
I don’t think I ever decided; it perhaps chose me. I think it’s just something that I do because it feels right. And if I wasn’t being paid to do it I’d probably be talking about the same exact things that I talk about in class on a park bench with whoever is willing to have a conversation.
What is the biggest problem facing academia today, especially as an institution?
The pressure of the market.

What is the biggest problem for political science as an academic discipline in the U.S.?
Without losing sight of the statement above, the lack of appreciation for normative, qualitative, politico-philosophic learning and analysis.
Professor John Barnes

What is your educational background and areas of expertise?
B.A. in History from Brown, J.D. from University of Chicago, M.A. in Political Science, Ph.D. in Political Science from Berkeley, and special training in statistical methods at University of Michigan

How did you become interested in the political science field? Who or what inspires your work?
I was told as a senior in college to be academic only if I could think of nothing else to do, so I tried the law and realized that I really wanted to be a professor—that that’s what I really wanted to do, and I was always interested in politics. My life unfolded by a series of accidents, and it became a question of the heart not head—it just felt right.

What classes do you currently teach? Which one is your favorite?
POSC 130, 100, 334, and graduate classes on courts and American politics. POSC 334 is my favorite because it’s new and the smallest undergraduate class I’ve ever taught.

If you had 10 minutes in front of an audience, what would you speak about?
Professionally, I would speak about the cost of specialization in the study of American politics. We divide ourselves into certain fields in a system of government that’s designed to interact. We need a more interdisciplinary approach.

What are three books that everyone should read and why? What is your favorite assigned reading?
Gordon Wood’s *Empire of Liberty*—the story of how our early institutions were formed.
Robert Dahl’s *Who Governs*—it gives us a way of thinking about power in society
Chuck Epp’s book *Making Rights Real*—helps us understand how laws on the books become part of our life.
What are you currently working on outside of the classroom? Are there any future projects you are interested in pursuing?
I just finished a book on a recent political history of the asbestos crisis. In the future, I have a book under contract that will look more broadly on our reliance on litigation and how it shapes politics. And I have an interest in writing a book on qualitative methods.

What is one issue everyone should be informed about?
Everyone should be informed about the deficit.

What is the greatest issue facing the U.S. now? In the next twenty years?
Climate change is the great world issue of our age.
If we don’t do something soon, the toothpaste is going to be out of the tube.

Outside of academia, what are your hobbies?
I surf. I cook. I play with my kids. I do yoga.

What do you wish to instill in your students?
I want my students to learn to love the questions more than the answers to explore what verbs, what activities, what things interest them to get them out of the mindset that what their life goals are a series of nouns, but more it’s about the things that you do with your life.
Professor Darry Sragow

What is your educational background and areas of expertise?
Georgetown University, J.D.
Political Campaigns, Elections.

How did you become interested in the Political Science field? Who or what inspires your work?
I became interested in the field through involvement in campaigns.
Martin Luther King, Jacqueline Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt. People who’ve made a difference in their lives.

What classes do you currently teach? Which one is your favorite?
Currently just POSC 347 - Environmental Law.
Legislative Process would be my favorite. It really shows the working part of legislations, the process is fascinating, papers are interesting, and students really enjoy it.

If you had 10 minutes in front of an audience, what would you speak about?
It would vary according to the audience.

What are three books that everyone should read and why? What is your favorite assigned reading?
*Hardball* by Chris Matthews, because it shows practical politics, and the rules of applying politics.
*Behaviorism* by BF Skinner, it is my favorite reading. It is about the way humans behave, how reward and punishment shapes behavior.
*Old Man and the Sea* by Ernest Hemingway because it shows how to write sparingly.

What are you currently working on outside of the classroom? Are there any future projects you are interested in pursuing?
A Law Office.
What is one issue everyone should be informed about?
Environmental issues because it permeates every aspect of our lives.
Ethics - appropriate human behavior.

What is the greatest issue facing the U.S. now? In the next twenty years?
Work is going to become valuable in the future. Currently, you work, get paid, and earn money for your work. We are going to hit a stage where there is going to be not enough work for people, because of advancements in jobs where people are no longer needed. We are going to have to face this challenge in the future.

Outside of academia, what are your hobbies?
Hiking, photography, reading

What do you wish to instill in your students?
Integrity and curiosity
## External Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USC Department of Political Science</td>
<td>dornsife.usc.edu/politicalscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC School of Philosophy</td>
<td>dornsife.usc.edu/phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</td>
<td>plato.stanford.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy</td>
<td>iep.utm.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhilPapers</td>
<td>philpapers.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>jstor.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association</td>
<td>apsanet.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Association</td>
<td>apaoonline.org</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>