Where are we now?
The global aftermath and response to the September 11th attacks

**Introduction by Lynne Healy, CISWS Director**

*Where Are We Now?* examines issues of concern to social work in the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attack. By issuing this newsletter, the Center for International Social Work Studies hopes to continue the dialogue within our community about the impact of terrorism, global interdependence as reflected in this and other issues, human rights in the United States and Afghanistan, and our responsibilities as social workers and citizens to advocate for humane and human rights-oriented policies.

In this first newsletter, I reported on the statements issued by the International Federation of Social Workers on the events of September 11. I revisited the IFSW website on November 29th and found no mention of September 11, terrorism, Afghanistan, or any issues related to the crisis. How could this be? Two sets of thoughts emerge. One explanation is that the rest of the world does not view September 11 as the event of the century; disasters with large loss of life and economic repercussions occur frequently around the world and often command little attention in the U.S. (More than 8000 people die *each day* from AIDS and the term "ground zero" has been used to describe the epidemic in southern Africa). Indeed, some observers have said that September 11 is the day that the U.S. joined the rest of the world, in that it finally ex-
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experienced the impact of war within its own territory. While some world leaders labeled the terrorism attacks an attack on humanity, most U.S. leaders emphasized the attack on America. Thus, an opportunity for a true global response may have been diminished. The global impact of September 11 is explored in one of the articles that follow.

But, the importance of follow up to September 11 does go beyond American self-centeredness. There are important issues for the international profession in the aftermath of the attack. Where is the international social work voice on ensuring women's rights in the reconstructed Afghanistan? On the treatment of refugees fleeing the war? On provisions for humanitarian aid? And perhaps on pressuring the United States to respect the human rights and civil liberties of foreign nationals? The silence on the IFSW website should be matter of concern for professionals everywhere.

This has been Human Rights Semester at the University of Connecticut and many aspects of the topic have been explored through a rich array of programs. Several speakers offered wisdom on September 11th. Dith Pran, speaking about the Cambodian genocide, discussed the U.S. bombing campaign in Cambodia and eventual pullout from the war in Southeast Asia. After the U.S. left the region "they never looked back," ignoring Cambodia while the Khmer Rouge murdered 2 million of its own citizens--almost certainly an outcome of the destabilization caused by the war. How can we ensure that this is not repeated in Afghanistan?

A common reaction to the horrors of the terrorist attack has been to feel that we are living at the wrong time--a troubled time in history that we wish we had not had to see. Xiao Quang, executive director of Human Rights in China and speaker at the UConn Comparative Human Rights Conference, offered a different and inspiring perspective. He said that we are, in fact, living at the right time--a time when action to secure international peace and human rights
is clearly needed and can be on the right side of history. The Center hopes that our continuing dialogue will generate individual and professional action on these issues. As we continue to provide relief and support to those who lost loved ones on September 11 and those who have lost their livelihoods from the economic fallout at home, it is also important to search for understanding of the international dimensions of the crisis.

**The Global Toll**  
*By Tom Felke, CISWS Intern*

Though the September 11th attacks took place on American soil, the impact was global. A collage of pictures representing worldwide shows of sympathy and support appeared in the last newsletter produced by the Center for International Social Work Studies. What was not addressed in that issue, and what has continued to receive little coverage, is the impact the September 11th attacks have had on the global community. Citizens from all over the world tragically lost their lives in the attacks. The countries that have been darkly shaded in the graphic above represent those that suffered casualties in the attacks. According to the U.S. Department of State International Information Programs, 88 countries suffered casualties as a result of the attacks. On November 11, 2001, a flag ceremony was held at “ground zero” to commemorate the international loss of life.

The United Nations invocation of Article 5 for the first time in its history further shows the impact the attacks had on the world. In an address following the attacks, British Prime Minister Tony Blair stated that, “This is not a battle between the United States of America and ter-
rorism, but between the free and democratic world and terrorism.”

Indeed, the impact of the attacks and this battle are being felt around the world.

The World Bank and IMF have cited the possible worsening of poverty in many developing countries in the aftermath of September 11th given a pre-existing global economic slowdown. This is now complicated by other specific impacts such as increased refugee movements, reduced private investment flows due to increased risk aversion in financial markets, reduced tourism revenues. This final impact will significantly affect Latin American and Caribbean countries as well as other tourism centers. Emerging Asian countries will feel the impact of lower demands from industrial countries. In addition, the World Bank has informed Afghanistan that funds for the re-building of that country will not be released until the establishment of a centralized government.

It is often said that art imitates life. However the reverse is often true as well. In the movie “The American President”, a situation develops where a foreign enemy attacks an American outpost. A military response is planned and in the briefing the President makes a painstaking decision to conduct a targeted bombing response. The President makes a poignant statement during his decision-making process, “Someday someone’s going to have to explain to me the virtue of a proportional response.” The United States has been conducting its bombing campaign for two months now. The primary target, Osama bin Laden, is still at large and his whereabouts unknown. Politicians say
that the bombing campaign was brought about due to the Taliban’s refusal to hand over bin Laden to the United States.

However, it is not just the Taliban who suffer as a result. So-called “collateral damage”, a military expression used to define civilian casualties, has claimed the lives of civilian Afghans. In addition, refugees fleeing the bombing campaign were left with little hope as all neighboring countries closed their borders with Afghanistan during the third week of September. These people now sit unsheltered waiting for safe passage or a return to what the U.S. has left of an already decimated area.

There are many that will argue that this campaign is necessary and must be undertaken to help eradicate terrorism from the world. One can only hope that our President struggled as much with his decision as did the fictional President Andrew Shepherd.

Sources: U.S. Department of State—http://usinfo.state.gov

**Women in Afghanistan**
*By Cari Carter, CISWS Intern*

The women of Afghanistan have endured a “brutal oppression” throughout the past 20 years, and as of November 13th the hope of a new beginning emerges. On the 13th of November Taliban forces pulled out of the capital city of Kabul, leaving the city and the country vulnerable to outside forces. The women of Afghanistan are fearing that tradition and/or the continuation of conservative governing will halt progress focused on

**Afghani Women**
Photo courtesy of the LA Times (2001)**
restoring women's rights.

Since the 1970's a group referred to as RAWA, the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan, has been organizing around human rights and social justice for women in Afghanistan. RAWA expanded their outreach during the Soviet occupation by becoming involved in the war resistance movement at the time. The organization also continued their work with women, focusing on the refugee women and children in Pakistan. RAWA is currently based in Pakistan, as are many other Afghan resistance movements. Due to RAWA's well known initiative, many Afghan women have become activists and have learned what they are able to do in order to seek and secure their rights as humans. Women's rights in Afghanistan continues to be an issue throughout the events following September 11, 2001. The First Lady, Laura Bush, addressed this issue of "brutal oppression" in the first ever weekly presidential radio address given entirely by the first lady. In the address Laura Bush focused on women's rights in a Taliban ruled country, she listed abuses from the State Department and reiterated that "Islam is a religion that respects women and humanity". With the outward support of the First Lady of the United States and the activism of a well known women's rights organization, RAWA, one might assume that the women of Afghanistan are finally free. Unfortunately this assumption is not accurate, women in Afghanistan have hesitated to remove their burqas and walk the streets
alone. A woman named Shazia explains why she has not taken off her burqa: “We are planning to take it off, but not now. We are a little afraid”. Another Afghan woman, Nilofar, says:
“We’re afraid there might still be some Taliban around and the policies of the new government aren’t clear.” While waiting for food in Kabul after the Taliban had left, many women were responding “yes, yes” when asked if they wanted to take off their burqas, and it is reported that a man in the crowd shouted: “No. They need food, they don’t need to take off their burqas.” The uncertainty that many women have stems from the temporary nature of the ruling forces led by the Northern Alliance. The Northern Alliance preceded the Taliban in the 1970’s communist influenced government. During their rule the country remained in a constant civil war and civil unrest and women carried a similar status as they had under Taliban rule. Many women including those who are associated with RAWA have said that they would like the former King Zahir Shah to return to Afghanistan. King Zahir Shah ruled the country for 40 years prior to fleeing to Rome, Italy when his cousin, former Prime Minister Muhammad Daud seized the throne.
With the future of Afghanistan undetermined, many women fear that their voices will again be muffled by the cumbersome burqa. However, women are cautiously finding their voice in some instances, proposing a march for women’s rights in Kabul. The women had planned to march to the United Nations office in the center of the city, but the Northern Alliance police asked the women to discontinue the march because they had not had a warning of the demonstration. The women who had gathered accepted the request and planned to gather once again the following week. Women’s rights groups, such as RAWA, have asked the United Nations to take notice of the women in Afghanistan and insists that they be a part of the new government. A RAWA representative stated: “there is no way the United Nations can ignore us (in creating a new government). We want a society that respects freedom of speech and beliefs. We want a secular
democracy that respects women’s rights and human rights. We are talking to the U.S. State Department and Congress, but we think the United Nations is most important.” There are 12 million women in Afghanistan and currently none are represented in the process that is taking place to create a new government.

The RAWA suggests that a new government be established by holding a free and fair election and encompass democratic values that ensure “…freedom of thought, religion and political expression while safeguarding women’s rights.” As all Afghans wait to see what the future holds for them; women are finding the voice beneath the confines of the burqa.

Sources: First Lady Denounces Treatment of Afghan Women by: Schott Lindlaw—AP 11/18/2001
RAWA website www.rawa.org

Profile of the Northern Alliance
By Cari Carter, CISWS Intern

The Northern Alliance is a combination of ethnic minorities originating from northern Afghanistan. The Alliance made its first appearance in Afghanistan in the early 1970’s after the U.S. and Soviet Union withdrew their troops from the country. The post-communist Afghanistan was a wanted country by Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and India. Bordering countries wanted to secure their interests by installing their own government, but there was also an internal interest known as the Northern Alliance. In March of 1993 the Peshawar Accord was implemented, placing ethnic Tajiks and Uzbeks in power. The Accord outlined a transitional government to be placed in Afghanistan for a two year period. The transitional government also appointed leaders that would reside in Kabul, the capital city, for a period of 4 months. The key players in this transitional government are also the key players in the current
Northern Alliance. The key players were and are Burhanuddin Rabbani, a professor of Islamic law at Kabul University who became the interim president, Ahmad Shah Masoud, a famous Mujahideen military commander, Abdul Rashid Dostum, a general and founder of the National Islamic Movement a largely Uzbek group and Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, Prime Minister in the transitional government.

The interim government fulfilled their two year goal, but were forced out of power by a Pashtun-dominated Taliban. In 1994 civil war broke out between the interim government, made up of ethnic minorities such as the Tajiks, Uzbeks and Hazras, and the Taliban, made up of the ethnic majority Pashtuns. The Taliban won the capital city of Kabul sending the Northern Alliance fleeing to northern Afghanistan. The Alliance fell apart amidst the civil war, but reassembled shortly after fleeing north. Rabbani remained Afghanistan’s representative in the United Nations and president of the Northern Alliance. Other members resumed their role in the Alliance; although conflict was involved in the restructuring of the group. The Alliance has since taken over the capital once again with help from the U.S. bombing campaign in Afghanistan. Residents of Afghanistan are uncertain whether or not they want the Alliance in power, due to the actions taken in their first attempt at power.

Sources: Excite News: www.news.excite.com
Encarta On-line: www.encarta.com

Profile: King Zahir Shah
By Cari Carter, CISWS Intern

King Zahir Shah became king of Afghanistan in 1946 following a lineage of royal family. In 1880 Abd-ar-Rahman Khan became king of Afghanistan amidst its struggle with British occupation. His son, Haibullah, took the throne in 1901 and introduced modern education for the first time in Afghanistan. Haibullah’s son, Amanullah succeeded his father in 1926. Dur-
ing Amanullah’s reign, Afghanistan became free from British control. With this new freedom, King Amanullah created social reforms that allowed women to cease wearing the burqa and encouraged men to wear western clothing. These reforms offended conservative religious and ethnic leaders and instigated a revolt in 1929; Amanullah fled the country as a result. In 1930, Amanullah’s brother Muhammad Nadir Shah became king and was assassinated three years later. His son, Muhammad Zahir Shah, succeeded him and at nineteen King Zahir assumed control of the warring country. Zahir followed the lead of his predecessors by implementing social reforms, only this time the king slowly introduced the social reforms so as not to antagonize the conservative religious and ethnic leaders in the country. In 1946, under King Zahir’s rule, Afghanistan became a member of the United Nations. Years following Zahir began the process of reorganizing the current monarchy and instituting a new constitution. In 1964 the king created what was called a “constitutional monarchy” consisting of a new constitution and a parliament. The parliament was made up of educated people from throughout the country. The constitutional monarchy consisted of independent branches, such as the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The king ruled that the leaders of these branches would not be relatives of the king or of the royal family. Zahir also established political parties and free press. The problems found within the new parliament ranged from leadership to familiarity with a constitutional government. The new members of the parliament were not familiar with the way a constitutional monarchy operated. Many members were conservative landowners, tribal and religious leaders, with little background in parliament procedures. The second problem concerned the power distribution between the parliament and the king. If the parliament was un-
able to pass a bill or a budget the king would intervene and rule on a decision. This type of intervention also made it difficult for leadership to form within the parliament, leaving the parliament powerless. Although the problems within the governance of the country existed, outside of the ruling parties people in Afghanistan were pleased with King Zahir Shah. The country’s growth was at its highest, women had more freedoms than ever before and citizens were generally pleased with the constitution and parliament policies. In 1971 a drought hit Afghanistan and economic conditions worsened. This opened up an opportunity for Daud Khan, former prime minister and cousin of the king, to seize control of the country while the king was visiting Europe. Muhammad Daud Khan had been asked to step down as prime minister in 1963, due to the decisions he made regarding trade with Pakistan that resulted in border closing and disruption of trade. Daud also accepted aid from the Soviet Union to build a strong military in Afghanistan. When Daud Khan seized control he proclaimed the end of monarchy and the creation of a republic, naming himself the first president and prime minister. King Zahir fled to Rome, Italy where he continues to live today.

Sources: Federation of American Scientists: www.fas.org
Afgha On-line: www.afgha.com

**Civil Liberties at Risk**
*By Tom Felke, CISWS Intern*

The question of civil liberties has been interjected into the aftermath of the September 11th attacks since the President’s signing of the USA Patriot Act. As the President and U.S. Attorney General ask for broader power in obtaining information and performing questioning, civil liberties groups are asking the question, “Where do we draw the line?” In the wake of the events and the questioning of the operations of U.S. intelligence agencies, requests are being made and actions taken that have outraged many civil liberties groups as well as the public. Is-
sues such as wiretapping, basic legal protections and detention have come to the fore only to be hidden by the U.S.’ continued bombing campaign in Afghanistan. Even the newly appointed Director of the Office of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, has acknowledged the fact that these efforts raise questions regarding privacy and civil liberties.

Law enforcement officials have detained more than 1,100 people since the September 11th attacks. None of these people have been charged with any crime linked to the terrorist attacks and many have not been allowed legal representation. Lawyers for these detainees complain that they have difficulty contacting their clients and in some cases do not know where they are being held. Rather than releasing these detainees back to their families, they are charged on immigration violations and turned over to the INS for deportation. Moreover, little is known about the detainees or the reasons for which they are being held. Attempts by civil liberty groups to obtain this information under the Freedom of Information Act have gone unheeded by the Justice Department and INS. What makes this situation even more reprehensible is that many of these detainees are held on nothing more than their physical appearance and/or the xenophobia of a civilian. With Attorney General John Ashcroft’s vague statement asking the public to “remain vigilant”, an increased number of calls have poured in to local police and FBI throughout the nation. Questioning, detention and arrest of the accused usually follows.

The Justice Department has also sought to question 5,000 foreigners - all men between the ages of 18 to 33 from mostly Middle Eastern countries - who legally migrated to the United States on non-immigrant visas after January 1, 2000. The list of names has been sent to the 94 U.S. attorney’s offices,
which will then divide up the list with local police and others on anti-terrorist task forces. In a related effort, the Department of Justice has announced the Responsible Cooperator Program, a new initiative that provides immigration benefits to non-citizens who furnish information to help apprehend terrorists or to stop terrorist attacks. In return for this information, the Department of Justice will assist nonresident aliens in obtaining visas, which are available when the information provided is critical and reliable and the person is placed in danger as a result of sharing that information. Those who provide useful and reliable information but are not technically eligible for visas will receive assistance in seeking either parole or deferred action status, which would allow them to reside legally within the United States. They may then work through the normal immigration channels in order to seek permanent residency in the United States.

Another present debate is the issuing of visas to international students. The Senate is currently debating proposals regarding the tracking of international students in the United States. Proposals range from issuing these students “SmartVisas”, which contain biometric data such as finger and iris scans, to requiring schools to report statistics to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The ironic thing is that the proposals mentioned often have a lead-in of “long proposed” and “more closely scrutinizing”. If we knew this was a problem, why was nothing done previously? Why are we still responding retroactively to these problems? We obviously knew the potential existed if these proposals were in existence in some previous form. And what about domestic terrorists? We have seen a number of school shootings in the past few years. Are these measures going to work or are they just another panacea? While keeping qualified students out of the U.S. that could contribute to the field of academics, the U.S. is content to forcing terrorists to look for other types of visas for entry while turning a blind eye.
to domestic terrorism.

In an unprecedented move, President Bush issued an executive order allowing special military tribunals to try non-citizens charged with terrorism. The tribunals would even reach non-citizens in the United States, including lawful permanent residents. The use of military tribunals would apparently authorize secret trials without a jury and without the requirement of a unanimous verdict and would limit a defendant's opportunities to confront the evidence against him and choose his own lawyer. What's worse, these important legal protections would be removed in a situation where defendants may very well be facing the death penalty. It is difficult to understand how the Administration can justify the use of a tribunal when the United States has successfully tried in our courts non-citizens accused of terrorist acts, organized crime, and others in situations where the safety of jurors and the disclosure of government intelligence methods were at issue. As the prosecutions of the 1993 World Trade Center bombers and Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh demonstrate, the government has managed to protect the safety and identity of jurors while achieving convictions in terrorism cases. And there is already a system established to handle classified information in the course of a trial; it is called the Classified Information Procedures Act. The government has not said that CIPA procedures would not be adequate in these circumstances as well. Further, it would be hypocritical of the United States to impose such a tribunal when we have repeatedly protested the use of such courts against U.S. citizens abroad.

In line with the Senate's proposed requirement of "SmartVisa" for international students, the Air Transport Association has also recommended the creation of a federally issued "traveler's ID". The proposed cards would be "voluntary" for American citizens and mandatory for foreign visitors. However, the use of biometric data accomplishes very little. They do not
help decide who should get that piece of plastic in the first place and they do not prove anything about their owners, including their real identity. The cards are only as good as the documents and procedures used to decide who should get one. It remains extremely easy in this country to steal another person's identity. Moreover, someone planning a terrorist attack would get one if, like Timothy McVeigh or most of the September 11 hijackers, there are no red flags in their record. It would seem that we are slowly closing the open door that the United States once boasted as one of its best qualities.

Sources: Visa Crackdown Worries Colleges, Hartford Courant by G. Merritt (12/2/01)
Plan to Expand U.S. Powers Alarming Some in Colorado, NY Times by Tim Egan (10/3/01)
Sacrifices must be made—but not of core freedoms, Guardian Unlimited by H. Young (10/2/01)
The Price of Vigilance, Hartford Courant by D. Altimari & J. Dolan (11/18/01)

**The Office of Homeland Security**
By Tom Felke, CISWS Intern

Former Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge was appointed as the first head of the Office of Homeland Security on October 8, 2001. A Vietnam Veteran and war hero, Tom Ridge is respected by politicians as a strong and capable leader for such a task. The mission of the Office for Homeland Security is to develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks. The Office will coordinate the executive branch's efforts to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks within the United States. Currently, the main focus of this office is on retaliatory terrorist attacks and the current Anthrax cases. Hopefully the office will be reminded that up until September 11th,
2001, the largest terrorist attack on United States soil was conducted not by a foreign adversary but from within our own borders. In bombing the Alfred R Murrah building in Oklahoma City in 1995, Timothy McVeigh put a face to the terrorists within our own borders. The face was not one of color or economic disparity. McVeigh was a veteran of the Gulf War and regarded as a war hero. As this newly created office works toward its mission, it is hoped that a serious look is given to the problems within our country and a balanced commitment to fighting both international and domestic terrorism is undertaken.


**INFORMATIONAL LINKS**

For further information please visit the websites listed below:

Global Response to Terrorism sponsored by the U.S. Consulate—Istanbul
http://usconsulate-istanbul.org.tr/reppub/terror/terror.html

International Security sponsored by the U.S. Department of State
http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/homepage.htm

Legislation Related to the Events of September 11th sponsored by THOMAS
http://thomas.loc.gov/home/terrorleg.htm

The Office of Homeland Security
http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/

The Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan
http://www.rawa.org

Resources Relating to the Events of September 11th
http://www.freepint.com/gary/91101.html

United Nations Online
http://www.un.org

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."

-President James Madison, 1822
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