

1992

El Salvador officials and rebel leaders sign the Chapultepec Peace Accords in Mexico City, Mexico ending the 12-year Salvadoran Civil War that claimed at least 75,000 lives.

2001

Congolese President Laurent-Désiré Kabila is **assassinated** by one of his own bodyguards.



2001

US President **Bill Clinton** awards former President Theodore Roosevelt a posthumous Medal of Honor for his service in the Spanish-American War.

2002

The UN Security Council unanimously establishes an arms embargo and the freezing of assets of **Osama bin Laden**, Al Qaeda, and the remaining members of the Taliban.

America's wars

acts must be encouraged

Most egregiously, his snap decision during a telephone call with President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey betrayed our Kurdish partners who led the fight against the Islamic State and risked being exposed to assault by Turkey and the Syrian regime.

A more responsible course would have been to use the prospect of an eventual American withdrawal to help avert a subsequent conflict between the Kurds and their adversaries. If, as he is now suggesting, the president withdraws the troops more gradually rather than right away, that opportunity might still exist.

It requires Trump to use that time wisely. He should start by abandoning the dangerous notion of Turkey seizing areas controlled by Kurdish forces and instead allow the Kurds – in the absence of long-term American protection – to negotiate an understanding with the Syrian regime. This might entail returning some aspects of the Syrian state to northeast Syria, Kurdish forces retaining their military capacity but lowering its profile and a degree of self-governance for the region.

In Afghanistan too, Trump's bottom line was correct. After more than 17 years of combat and a virtual stalemate, at best, for more than a decade, there is little rationale for continuing to expend American blood and treasure on a conflict trending

Trump is correct that the better course is to extricate ourselves from Syria, but his fatal error has been in its implementation.

badly, with unclear objectives. But here too, the self-proclaimed "great negotiator" erred in folding America's limited cards for nothing in return, rather than using his willingness to withdraw as an incentive for the Taliban – currently locked in negotiations with Trump's own diplomats – to make peace.

So much is objectionable about the Trump era that it is hard for critics to know which targets to strike. But principled opposition requires that progressive opponents of Trump not distort their beliefs for quick rhetorical wins. Whatever administration eventually follows will have many messes to clean up and will need to distinguish those that truly matter.

Inevitably, the United States will face threats that will require

the use of military force. But we ought to continually question our enduring involvement in faraway conflicts, particularly when they come at a terrible cost to the United States and local populations as in Afghanistan and Iraq; make us complicit in abuses as in Yemen; entangle us with unsavoury partners as occurred with some elements of the Syrian opposition; or exacerbate anti-American sentiment as our broader counterterrorism campaign often did.

Troop withdrawals can be messy and costly even in the best of circumstances. But that is not a reason to drift into forever wars while searching for the perfect exit. It is a reason to be disciplined about objectives and judicious about intervening in the first place.

Trump's Syria and Afghanistan decisions, assuming he sticks to them, may well lead to disastrous outcomes because of how they were executed, their timing, the complete lack of consultation with allies and experts and his utter failure to leverage them. All of that justifies a verdict of malpractice. But one can render that judgment while acknowledging that done differently, withdrawing is the right thing to do.

(Jon Finer, an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, was the chief of staff and director of policy planning at the State Department.)

y's had them for decades

German laws dictate that workers at large companies elect up to half the members of supervisory boards, which make high-level strategic decisions.

could have a decisive effect on matters like whether to use a tax windfall to buy back stock, or whether to approve bonuses for company leadership. (In 2015, the typical German chief executive made \$5.6 million while his American counterpart took home \$14.9 million.)

Worker representatives would not win all of these votes, but their presence would disrupt the power dynamics of corporate boards, and workers at all levels of the company would be more aware of what's happening in the boardroom. This could help to revitalise labour organising, which could lead to better pay, benefits and job security.

But co-determination was never simply about wages and profits. It is about giving workers more power. "Co-determination is just like democracy," the political scientist Stephen J Silvia told me. It isn't justified on economic terms. "We have a democracy so that people have a voice in public affairs. Co-determination extends that principle so that people have a voice in the workplace as well."

American workers are in a crisis that stems, in part, from having no voice in their economic lives. For decades, American corporations have been run exclusively for the benefit of shareholders, and that model has enabled rising inequality, stagnant wages, runaway executive compensation and underinvestment in research and innovation.

Would all this be different if workers had seats in the boardroom? Not overnight. But renewing America's experiment with co-determination would help workers feel valued, and that is a necessary starting point for change.

(Susan R Holmberg is a political economist and a fellow at the Roosevelt Institute, where she researches inequality, corporate governance and climate change.)

German political party. What would co-determination look like in the United States? If workers elect up to two-fifths of the members of a corporate board, their representatives

Wide Angle

Websites for verifying truth: A growing need



JOEL INDRUPATI

"Let them eat cake". Did Queen Marie Antoinette really say these words? "You must be the change you wish to see in the world". Did Mahatma Gandhi really say this? "Elementary, my dear Watson. Elementary". Did Sherlock Holmes say this, in any one those many books by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle?

The answer to all the above three questions is a big 'No'. There is no credible evidence for any of the above. These words have neither been said nor written by any of those above mentioned people, anywhere.

But, for years, people have been quoting them – actually, misquoting them – and contributing towards the spread of misinformation.

Long before the advent of Internet, my high school teacher had once given us all an assignment – to go to the library, and to collect quotations on a given list of topics. We had to submit not only the relevant sayings but also the names of the persons who said it, and where.

As a school student, that was the first time I had seen "Bartlett's Book of Familiar Quotations". And also the 'Oxford Dictionary of Quotations', and 'Webster's Book of Quotations'.

We were amazed at the orderly fashion in which hundreds of quotes were arranged in those books, in a topical index, with various keywords and cross references – leading us to extra information on each quote and its origin.

Most importantly, in small print at the end of the book, we saw lists of published sources, including dates of publication and names of publishing companies with cities they were head-quartered in.

Thanks to my teacher's creative assignment, we had understood the value of references, of citations, and of attributions of facts to verifiable sources.

We had learnt that reliable quotation books, dictionaries and encyclopaedias cite sources such as other books, magazines and journals, which we can always check for veracity.

Today, Internet is giving us ginormous amounts of information. But it is becoming harder and harder for us to wade through it all, and to recognize truth from falsehoods.

Anybody, with a little knowledge of graphic design, and website building tools, today, can wreak havoc by spreading untruths.

Many mobile phones apps are available today, with which – without special skills – pictures can be manipulated, quotes can be mis-attributed, and even videos can be morphed, by changing people's faces in video frames.

We are drifting into a dangerous world of tangled information, from which extricating ourselves, without help, seems difficult. We can find the truth ourselves, by effective online searching and researching. But, it takes time.

Thankfully, we are seeing the rise of some web-based companies which are getting to the bottom of the truth.

A few days ago someone sent me a bizarre video-clip, saying it's from a US television series of the 1950s. In that black and white video, I saw a con-man, named Trump, saying he will build a wall, and save the people of Texas!

I thought it was a silly joke. But I was shocked to discover – on Snopes.com – that what I received was true. And that there really was a CBS TV episode called "The End of The World", premiered on May 9, 1958, in which, a con man named Walter Trump, played by one Lawrence Dobkin, attempts to scam an entire town, saying he will build a wall with their money.

Websites like snopes.com, factcheck.org, politifact.com, hoax-slayer.com, and altnews.in are among those helping us debunk internet rumour by verifying the truth.

While websites like 'quote investigator' check for misattributed quotes, others like quetext, turnitin, and grammarly are effectively checking plagiarism.

In this post-truth era – with fake news, doctored tapes, and alternative facts – we need these truth-verifying websites more than ever.



TOP
4
TWEETS

01



A big new Caravan is heading up to our Southern Border from Honduras. Tell Nancy and Chuck that a drone flying around will not stop them. Only a Wall will work. Only a Wall, or Steel Barrier, will keep our Country safe! Stop playing political games and end the Shutdown!

@realDonaldTrump

02



Today, India is growing rapidly. This is powered by the hard-work & talent of the people of our nation. From economy to ease of doing business & from start-ups to satellites, we are achieving great progress in each sector.

@narendramodi

03



The irony – or tragedy – is that Trump's annoyance at NATO "ripping the US off" is based on a complete misunderstanding of how the alliance is financed. He keeps saying the same wrong thing he said in the campaign.

@GlennKesslerWP

04



President Trump's attorneys rebuffed Special Counsel Robert Mueller's request in recent weeks for an in person session with Trump to ask follow up questions. The request was made after Trump's team submitted answers to a limited number of questions from Mueller's team.

@ShimonPro

Disclaimer: (Views expressed by columnists are personal and need not necessarily reflect our editorial stances)