

Civilisation is unmasking its government-approved vandalism, not just in the protected distant spheres, from the Arctic region to the rain forest, and from the depth of the ocean to the depth of space -- oh no, these days even the sphere of the mind and intellectual debate is under threat: „Political Correctness“ is granting lies normality!

Plea for a New Quality of Being Human

by Wolfgang Fischer

We imagine ourselves to be enlightened. The connection between procreation and the emergence of new life has been common knowledge for quite some time now. We also know, for instance, that as a matter of course frogs beget frogs and birds beget birds. From the fertilised egg of a dinosaur we can expect little dinosaurs to emerge, whilst from the fertilised egg of a chimpanzee a young chimp will come into being.

There can be no doubt about this kind of connection, or rather: up until now there was no doubt about it. For in June of the year 2001 no less a person than the President of the Max-Planck Society made the statement that he did not consider a fertilised human egg to be human!

Now this outstanding representative of the scientific establishment certainly is not making such a statement in ignorance. He surely knows that to this day nothing other than a human has ever grown from a fertilised human egg cell. Yet despite knowing this he maintains that this egg cell is not a human being. Why is he doing that? He wants to ease the conscience of those doing research in the field of gene technology whilst confusing its critics. He wants to make others believe that cannibalism isn't cannibalism as long as it brings an advantage (after all, where is the difference between eating members of one's own species and utilising their cells in some other way?). He wants to make others believe that the fertilised human egg cell, i.e. the combination of egg cell and sperm, becomes human only at a later time. So what is it until then? Vegetable? Or neutral - neo-liberal perhaps?

This is pure sophistry, motivated by irresponsible greed for money and omnipotence. For what else besides the egg cell of the mother and the sperm of the father, should constitute the human child? A divine breath about two weeks after fertilisation? Poor science! Such a pronouncement from one of your champions in this 21st century! Why, oh why are you thus throwing yourself uncritically into Mammon's jaws?

Stop! I can hear a voice calling. After all, this isn't about cannibalism but about curing life in the future. - Yet is this really true?

Recently, concerning the issue of genetic engineering the Churches announced: A cure not at any price! But who can say that genetic engineering will bring any cure or benefit at all? Didn't nuclear technology also once promise to solve all energy problems for all time?

It really seems we are regressing back to the times of Babylonian Confusion. Are we humans or aren't we (as yet)? The next question will be: ethics or bio-ethics! Just as if there were a different ethics outside the sphere of life - in other words, two ethics? And just like, besides the wars of the 'rogue nations', there are supposed to be also just and humane wars? Here the lawless rogue nations and there the self-righteous alliances of Capital!

Here the supremacy of the market and the rejection of socially needed subsidies, and there tax concessions for all the corporations who are exploiting our labour and the environment whilst increasing their profits to astronomical heights! This is the ethics of power and money that's presently responsible for the pollution and desertification of the globe.

Today this ethics is even being sanctified by the very nation who is leading the world in the reckless consumption of resources (1) - and seems unwilling to listen to reason - and from there, this ethics

is being exported with repressive means throughout the world! After the failure of MAI, the Multilateral Agreement about Investment, the very same propositions are being propagated unilaterally via WTO regulations, against the resistance of the populations. A new bogey is being created by indiscriminately criminalizing all those who demonstrate against the destruction of our basic necessities and social safety measures. Cause and effect are being confused by declaring those who speak out against the threats to be a threat themselves. The media, subservient to the system, facilitate the spiralling of violence by concentrating on the reporting of acts of violence rather than positions of dissent. In the long run the situation is rendered totally confused due to the attempt to blame certain groups of demonstrators for vandalism organised by government forces, as happened in Genoa recently (2).

In general, the lack of a clear orientation is evidenced also by the fact that murderers are in one place supported and celebrated as freedom fighters and elsewhere persecuted as rebels. "To stabilize the Balkan region" Yugoslavia was asked to admit NATO troops into its own sovereign territory and because of its refusal subjected to "humane" aerial warfare, which only aggravated the existing misery of the population whilst delaying the peace process. At the same time the war in the Middle East has been left to terrorise the local population for decades. In this case Israel's consistent refusal to admit foreign observers is willingly accepted by Washington's preachers of morality. Throughout the globe this kind of double standard is disproving the pretended sincerity of the superpower who, brandishing the name of Almighty God, is even claiming to be engaged in a fight against evil.

In the sphere of domestic politics, too, the rationalising argumentation concerning problematic issues like nuclear power, gene technology, food, air, water, military deployment etc. is causing unending confusion. The media's strategy of confusing the public through their use of language is exemplified by the headline: "German Economy under Threat of Stagnation!" (Süddeutsche Zeitung of 11 /7/ 2001) By contrast, a sports writer would never dream of talking about stagnation or threat of collapse in the case of an athlete who, unable to increase his speed any further, was running at the same speed or even somewhat slower than previously. The sentence reads as though all wheels, chimneys and finance streams were threatened by immediate stoppage. Whether intentionally or not, the reader is being made to feel insecure and afraid. He loses his critical rebelliousness and becomes obedient. This very same tendency is further illustrated by another headline from the same day; "Germans expected to relinquish Wages and Annual Leave" (Die Welt).

A further instrument for creating confusion is the interpreting of statistics to the benefit of those in power.

Pointing out a lack of scientific proof, existing causal connections are denied until it is too late anyhow to do anything about the issue in question, and then what happens was "as far as humanly possible to say, in all probability" not preventable. So there's no change.

The discrepancy between claims made and actual reality will become evident if we open up an extensive debate concerning the issue of guaranteed basic rights, e.g., the right of non-injury (Article 2,2 of the German constitution). The drinking water, for example,

has in many regions by now become undrinkable not just as such, but because its protection through political initiatives remains subordinate to the greed of the polluters (in this case, the agrochemical giants). And for the same reason we find the same constellation everywhere: industrially 'refined' food is becoming potentially poisonous, the air we breathe is enriched with incalculable pollutants, all-pervasive radiation from radioactive and electromagnetic sources keeps increasing, the vital balance of the atmosphere is being disturbed, diseases and health disturbances induced by multifactors are becoming uncontrollable.

A far-reaching debate about values is essential, in order to demonstrate that the protection of life and nature takes precedence over all other interests. It is unacceptable that our Constitution continues to be distorted through laws that are contradictory to its spirit. The Federal Constitutional Court should unequivocally oppose any tendency in this direction. Otherwise we might as well throw the German Constitution out the window and resign ourselves to its daily redefining by those who swore "to increase benefit and minimise harm" - an oath which has prevented neither the scaling back of past social gains nor the destruction of the ecological balance: i.e. by the politicians in league with their powerful allies from the multinational corporations who are calling the shots. The politicians' distance from the actual political necessities and the extent of their alienation from the electorate may be measured by the width of the 'security zones' allotted to them for protection at their globalisation meetings.

For every day provides new proof that the 'ordinary citizen' is no longer in charge of the situation. Just take the issue concerning the PDS (the party formed by the ex-Communists in former East Germany). This political party is being treated by the others as though it represented the scum of the earth. They completely fail to notice that, having gained seats in democratic elections, it is representative of a significant percentage of our fellow citizens. Are all of these, too, then the 'scum of the earth'? If so, then the politicians from the established parties who think so ought to say it openly - although that would definitely not be the way to practice confrontation in a democracy. Positions that run counter to established opinion cannot just be eradicated with Cold War methods like isolating, denouncing or criminalizing one's opponents.

Any party or politician upholding the principles of the Constitution ought to be able on this basis to move freely, so as to be noticed in the political debate and gain public support through programmes upholding those principles. That way the informed citizen who according to Article 20 of the Constitution is manifesting his sovereignty through exercising his right to vote, might at last - after 52 years' existence of the Constitution - become a political reality!

Irrespective of whether or not we are willing to acknowledge the many problems currently threatening us: solutions to them will only be found in open, unprejudiced debate inspired by concern about the public welfare on a global scale. In the current globalisation policy of the WTO the virtual sphere of stock market trends or the artificially created laws governing trade are considered of equal importance to the laws of nature - if not even taking precedence over the actual needs of the environment or society: - proof of a far-reaching, mortally dangerous loss of a sense of reality, if ever such were needed! If democracy is to have any future, all organisa-

tions representing the people will need to seriously examine all the goals and aspirations of WTO and IMF, who so far lack any democratic legitimization. Once we begin to question their strategies (3) it will be seen clearly that they are dictated solely by the interests of capital and their destructive effects on society and nature alike will become evident.

The emergence of the non-human as well as the continuing destruction of life can be prevented only if we begin to make the well-being of all people and of nature with its diverse interdependent balances the yardstick of our actions. A superior quality of being human will quite naturally be achieved by a different form of globalisation - one where our priorities are turned around so that the life of our globe again takes precedence over the products of humans such as society, the market and the economy.

(1) The US comprise 5% of the global population and are consuming 25% of global energy.

(2) The tactical reasons for such a strategy, well proven in totalitarian states, are first of all, to influence public opinion against the demonstrators and their cause, and secondly, to split the front of the demonstrators (divide et impera!). In the end, a situation aggravated in this way will also provide a useful argument for militarising the police force even further whilst reducing democratic rights, etc. etc.

(3) The Scottish parliament will be the first in the world to debate the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS)

recommended reading:

- Belen Balanya, Ann Doherty, Olivier Hoedeman, Adam Ma'anit & Erik Wesselius, EUROPE INC: Regional & Global Restructuring and the Rise of Corporate Power. London, Pluto Press, 2000
deutsch: "Konzern Europa - Die unkontrollierte Macht der Unternehmen", 392 Seiten, Broschur, sFr/DM 36.-; öS 263.- (ab 2002: 18 Euro), ISBN: 3-85869-216-6, Rotpunkt Verlag
- Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nick Faraclas und Claudia von Werlhof (Hg), There is an Alternative. Subsistence and worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization, London, zed press, 2001
- Michel Chossudovsky, The Globalisation of Poverty. Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms, Third World Network, Penang, Malaysia 1997
- Michel Chossudovsky, Disarming the New World Order [http://www.transnational.org/forum/meet/seattle.html]
- Saral Sarkar, Eco-Socialism or Eco-Capitalism? A critical analysis of humanity's fundamental choices, Zed Books, London 1999

Emanzipation Humanum, version 4. 2002, translation from german to english by Rainer Taëni. Criticism, suggestions as to form and content, dialogue, translation into other languages are all desired