

NEW IMPERIALISM AND BEYOND. WHY THE NEW IMPERIALISM WILL FAIL AND UNSEAT THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION?*

Petri Minkkinen

University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: petri.minkkinen@helsinki.fi

Recibido: 12 Febrero 2004 / Revisado: 11 Marzo 2004 / Aceptado: 30 Abril 2004 / Publicado: 15 Junio 2004

Resumen: After the terrorist attacks of S-11-2001 the US engaged in the policies of new imperialism and in the construction of a new kind of world-empire. US global policies can be divided in detached, economist, cooperative, rule-based Wilsonian Idealism and Theodore Rooseveltian Imperialism, based on aggressive nationalism, militarism, unilateralism and global governance based on direct rule, physical presence and coercion. The Bush administrations policies represent the latter and the War on Terror and Non-White Others can be seen as a First World War and an Internal Civil War in the US. It is claimed that the new imperialism will fail due to various economic, political, ethical and historical reasons and that this policy is undermining the global position of the US. In the end it is explained, how, in the context of New Peaceful Containment, the citizens of the US and the citizens of the rest of the world can use democracy against new imperialism and support democratic regime change in the US and proceed with the construction of a democratic and just world together.

Palabras Clave: Bush administrations, democracy, new imperialism, New Peaceful Containment, United States, War on Terror.

After the shock of S-11-2001 terrorist attacks the administration of George W. Bush launched a full scale global military operation supposedly to deter and root out international terrorism. Peoples around the world were shaken by the scale and arrogance of the attacks and by the equally arrogant nature of the counter-attack of the Bush administration. Immediately after the terror attacks many began to pose irritating questions and observations on the nature of attacks¹. It seemed obvious that

things were not necessarily as self-evident as supposed by the mainstream media and political pundits. It also became evident that a terror operation of this magnitude required a level of skill, resources and planning no ordinary terrorist organization could have possessed. Therefore some kind of backing by a state level actor was evidently involved.

Two possibilities emerged out of this presupposition: either the act was backed and/or ordered by an 'unfriendly' state supporting terrorist activities, or the US government itself was or some 'friendly' states were involved in one way or another. The Bush administration acted on the mixed state-terrorist organization assumption: the attacks were executed by a dangerous and skillful terrorist organization -al-Qaida run and financed by Osama bin Laden- and one or several states hostile to US interests supported the terrorists. There is also another possibility: Bush administration or its ideologues preaching for the US global supremacy knew about these attacks and did not act accordingly to stop them. A more damaging, dangerous and demoralizing version of this alternative -or subversive, if you wish- line of thought is that the government, its ideological backers, some 'friendly' state or some other actors connected to them were more directly involved with these cruel acts. Be it as it may, this is the central question related to the attacks and the world political events following them.

The article at hand does not try to resolve this still unanswered question. Interesting as it is, the arguments presented here are independent of this crucial question. They rest upon the assumption that irrespective of the Bush administrations relationship to the attacks proper, the New Right ideologues of *The Project*

for the New American Century (PNAC)² and its predecessors had planned for a heavy militarization program and for the maintenance and enhancement of US world supremacy - militarily, if necessary- well before the sad events of S-11-2001. Interestingly enough, in a report published a year before the attacks the PNAC makes itself a suspect. PNAC demanded a massive rearmament program for the US militarily 'weakened' by the Clinton administration. However, they expected that "the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some (sic) catastrophic and catalyzing event -like a new Pearl Harbor"³. The purpose of this global exercise is to inhibit the rise of any competing state or group of states capable of challenging the US global hegemony. According to the century-old geopolitical doctrines - adopted and updated by various key players in the US foreign policy establishment and inside the PNAC- the control of Eurasia or certain Central Asian countries would be essential for that purpose. Direct or indirect control, for example, of the oil resources would give the US ruling classes a possibility to exert control over the future development of the European Union, Russia and China, not to mention the Islamic countries of that area inhabited by "some stirred-up Moslems"⁴. This control allied with a military presence in the region would also allow the US to defend Israel, use the enduring Israel-Palestine conflict as a test site for the latest military technology and control the future development of the Middle-East and Eastern Mediterranean in general. Intellectual grounds for the direct or indirect control of the area in question was prepared during the 1990's by varying actors, such as the pro-imperialist PNAC or pro-hegemony scholars like Samuel "Clash of Civilizations" Huntington and Zbigniew "Trilateral Commission" Brzezinski who hold a more cooperative and more pro-transnational capitalism stance⁵.

Moreover, despite the fact that the US share of global GNP rose in the context of the "new economy" of the 1990's -based on the techno-boom and speculative global finance- the US was not anymore the only big player in the global economy. The European Union began to emerge as a global political player, promoting policies that were not necessarily in the interest of either the internationalist or nationalist sections of the US ruling classes. Likewise, the increasingly serious economical-financial collapses around the world, induced by

programs of structural adjustment and the inherent instability of the liberalized global financial markets and immoral corporate practices and crimes had seriously weakened the public trust in neo-liberal capitalist globalization. Furthermore, in the beginning of the Millennium the world was faced with the US and global recessions, and bleak economic prospects not so dissimilar to those experienced after the Stock Crash of 1929. Global civil society movements opposing the neo-liberal globalization, which had been gathering steam also in the North during the latter part of the 1990's, seemed to have emerged as a major challenge to corporate globalization and US interests. Therefore, the various political and economic interests of the US ruling classes were directly threatened in different but congruent ways in the lengthy period before the atrocities of S-11-2001. It is not necessarily farfetched to think that the "War on Terror" and New Imperialism⁶ was -mistakenly- believed to offer a way out of this *cul-de-sac*⁷.

These facts are "out there", even if it turns out that George W. Bush and his national security adviser Condoleezza Rice did not consider terrorism a sufficiently pressing problem before the S-11-2001 as suggested by Richard Clarke⁸. According to Rice -in the typically simplistic "truth-hating" Bush administration discourse- the "radical, freedom-hating terrorists" had been in war with the United States for a long time, but they did not emerge as "the terrorist threat to our nation" before the S-11-2001, though she claims that a highly classified pre-S-11-2001 National Security Presidential Directive made "the elimination of al-Qaida a high priority"⁹. As a matter of fact it would only strengthen the argument presented here, as the counterargument suggests that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein was the prime objective of their foreign policy agenda from the beginning of their period in government. Therefore, the S-11-2001 gave the administration, the PNAC-ideologues behind them and the extreme right and religious fundamentalist elements of the conservatives the opportunity to fuse their objectives through the ideology and praxis of the "War on Terror". This simple analysis is supported by Rice's statement that "Just as World War II led to a fundamental reorganization of our national defense structure and to the creation of the National Security Council, so has September 11th made possible sweeping changes in the ways we protect our homeland"¹⁰. Independently of the final truth of

the terrorist attacks, the Bush administration was quick to exploit this tragic event in a highly opportunistic way in order to promote its neoconservative, extreme rightist and neo-imperialist agenda both inside and outside of the borders of the United States¹¹.

This article claims that 9-11-2001 marked the transition from the trilateral, cooperative, and detached and economist global governance¹² toward the new imperialist¹³ policies of direct rule and domination based on military and administrative presence and consequent extra-economic appropriation and exploitation. I begin with a short historical introduction and proceed by explaining the nature of the new imperialism and of a new kind of world(-)empire. I subsequently move on to explain why new imperialism is not -and logically cannot- be a sustainable form of global governance and a serious mistake both from the global and from the US point of view. I conclude by explaining why new imperialism will fail and actually contribute to the democratic regime change in the US presidential elections of 2004.

1. HOBSON AND THE EXPANSION OF THE UNITED STATES

John A. Hobson, a British liberal critic of imperialism and a key student of imperialism made an important and topical prediction more than a hundred years ago. According to Hobson: "The entrance of the powerful and progressive nation of the United States of America upon Imperialism by the annexation of Hawaii and the taking over of the relics of ancient Spanish empire not only added a new formidable competitor for trade and territory, but changed and complicated the issues. As the focus of political attention and activity shifted more to the Pacific States, and more set upon trade with the Pacific Islands and the Asiatic coast, the same forces which were driving European States along the path of territorial expansion seemed likely to act upon the United States, leading her to a virtual abandonment of the principle of American isolation which hitherto dominated her policy"¹⁴.

Seen in retrospect Hobson's prediction was correct, at least in the sense that the United States has ever since dedicated itself to the constant transformation of our common world following on from her Eurocentric and Crusading predecessors. However disagreements are bound to arise when we think

through more carefully the methods and goals of this process. The claim presented here is that during the Bush administration, the US has moved toward a new imperialistic phase of global transformation and domination even if contemporary scholars of US imperialism may want to disagree. Frank Ninkovich, for example, believes that Hobson's prediction "was far wide of the mark" and that "by the time he made that forecast, America's imperialist moment had come and gone." According to him, "with the exception of the Caribbean, compelling motives of national security were absent" and that "in the Caribbean the nation engaged in 'pre-emptive imperialism'¹⁵. On the contrary, it is suggested here that the Bush Doctrine implies a renovation of that imperialist urge on a global scale through the politics of pre-emptive new imperialism. In the context of the Global War on Terror and Non-White Others, these national security interests now cover the whole world, including the United States.

Ninkovich joined -maybe unwillingly because his book was written before 9-11-2001- the broad chorus of critical scholars, not to mention more conventional writers, who suggest that the more "[the United States] distanced themselves from imperialism, the closer they came to reaching the promised land of a world civilization that they originally had hoped to enter by traveling the path of empire". That earthly paradise would be reached in the context of modernization and globalization that eventually replaced imperialism. However, before this virtuous phase could emerge, "Americans also had to pass through a half-century of military globalism." Despite their valuable critical studies on imperialism and US expansion, they tend at least implicitly to conceive the US global expansion in a positive light and to believe that the United States is bound to be a benevolent handmaiden of a jolly good global community, and a Patron Saint of the Global Empire of Right and Justice. A similar undertone is present in Michael Hardt's and Antonio Negri's *Empire* that builds its image of the battle between Empire and Multitude on the idea that the postmodernist and constitutionalist US Empire is fundamentally different from the previous and more traditional imperialist empires¹⁶. In a human world in which history and the future are open and not predetermined by any exact divine or human plan, this is undoubtedly possible. However, in the actually existing historical and structured world, it is also possible that the members of the

US ruling classes -especially those with a mental if not a genetic ancestry in what Mike Davis has called peripheral capitalist bloc- which specialized in the harsh criticism of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal of the 1930's and to fierce nationalism which has often been incorrectly called isolationism¹⁷, decide to move on to construct a new kind of world(-)empire.

The worldview of this bloc can be analyzed in the context of Joseph Schumpeter's discussion on the mentalities of two protagonist classes, capitalist and imperialist. According to Schumpeter, "The capitalist elite is a group of peaceful businessman whose main "exploits" are profit-making innovations. The imperialistic elite is an aristocracy whose chief reason for existence is the ever-renewed unleashing of aggressive wars"¹⁸. Even if this dualistic division into capitalist and imperialist mentalities is too general, as the categories of human sciences tend to be, it is quite instructive if it is evaluated in the broader context of Schumpeter's analysis. The Bush administration's new imperialist policies can at least partially be analyzed from this perspective as we can detect two main currents in the US foreign and global policies. On the one hand there is the "capitalist" brand of Wilsonian Idealism, based on detached, economist, cooperative, rule-based and at least superficially more peaceful global governance, on the other the "imperialist" brand of Theodore Rooseveltian Imperialism, based on aggressive nationalism, militarism, unilateralism and global governance promoted and secured by direct rule and physical presence and coercion. The new kind of world(-)empire under construction represents an attempt to combine the 'best' parts of these different modalities of global governance.

As was the case with Latin America's colonization, the Europeanization of North America was a part of the process that eventually gave birth to what Fernand Braudel has called Extended Europe¹⁹. Europeanization required the seizure of the lands of the indigenous peoples and genocidal wars of conquest against them. Therefore, despite all their possible and real merits, the North American settler colonies and the emerging Empire of Right and Justice were born through unjust colonization and land grab. Once settled, the colonizing Puritans conceived of themselves as representatives of the Last Chosen People with a destiny to turn North America into a

terrestrial heaven, and wanted to mould it into an example to the rest of the world in which "God and humanity will be reconciled at last"²⁰. The Puritans believed in liberation through hard work, the moral virtuous life and gradualist improvement instead of the cataclysmic events typical of Millenarian thought. Eventually an Empire of Right and Justice, guaranteeing a world of everlasting peace and prosperity for all, would be constructed²¹.

From this rationalized Christian mysticism emerged the expansionist 19th century ideology of Manifest Destiny that justified the forced territorial enlargement of the United States all the way to the Pacific Coast, including various forced seizures of substantial parts of Mexico's territory²². During this phase the development of a millenarian imaginary and praxis had also reached a level of sociopolitical coherence in the context of which, as Merk puts it, "[...] North America was intended by Providence to be possessed by the United States. North America was intended for a showroom to exhibit republicanism in its finest form to the oppressed of Europe"²³. The later Monroe Doctrine, which was originally meant to protect the Americas from re-colonization, invasion and political pressure by the European powers, is an outgrowth of the same mentality. In the beginning of the 21st century this doctrine become increasingly imperialistic through the Roosevelt corollary, according to which the US had a right to "maintain order" in the Caribbean and Central America. Eventually the Monroe Doctrine -and it's more sophisticated and human-faced derivatives such as the Good Neighbor Policy- evolved into mental constructs and practices that consider Latin America a part of the US sphere of influence, in one way or another.

During the 1890's the United States became the leading industrial economy. Even if the US began her imperialist expansion toward the Pacific at the turn of the century and participated in the First European Civil War in its later stages, she did not turn into a heavyweight global political power until the Second European Civil War²⁴. This latter conflict especially was essential for the global emergence of the United States as her major capitalist competitors in Europe and Japan effectively caused their own destruction and became *de facto* satellites of the emerging Empire of Right and Justice. During the Third Eurocentric Civil War the colonies of the

previous European colonial masters became formally independent and were re-categorized as developing countries. The Soviet Union, which had emerged as a challenger in the context of the approaching end of the previous intensive phase of capitalist globalization and during the ECW I, collapsed. After the ECW III in the 1990's the US emerged, or remained if you choose, as the lone superpower. Despite of the fact that the US was no longer as central in the world economy as in the late 1940's and 1950's, her economic expansion was impressive during the 1990's. Moreover, during the 1990's the European Union emerged as a credible political competitor though it still remained under the political patronage and mental tutelage of the United States, especially through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Culturally the US remained hegemonic, even if many others began to emerge as at least regional challengers within the global cultural industry. However, the US was a truly hegemonic superpower only in the field of military technology, military spending and global military capabilities, even if her ruling classes - and, more interestingly, substantial parts of the subordinate trilateral ruling classes - claimed and the 'new economy' with its info-tech and speculative finance booms suggested otherwise.

The fact is that despite successful self-confidence building in the European Union, the triumphalist US ruling classes still had, so to speak, more balls, and this mentality eventually led the US ruling classes into a treacherous sense of their new imperialist superiority in the aftermath of S-11-2001²⁵. This is not so much a critique of the lack of power of the former but a simple observation that the phase of community development in which the US still finds itself, favors infantile and hegemonic masculine behavior that, due to her superior material resources, inevitably has cumulative negative consequences around the world²⁶. Moreover, after the ECW III it seemed that the global community had entered a new phase in which previous antagonisms could be surpassed. In a narrow historical context in which the *ex-Commies* began to build their personal economic empires instead of challenging the capitalist West, it seemed that nothing could tame Eurocentric capitalist globalization based on "scientific economism", i.e. on the marginalist neo-classical economics and a neo-liberal (or neo-conservative) political program. History had supposedly ended with the steady globalization of representative liberal democracy, globalizing

capitalism and the expansion of the trilateral if US-led Empire of Right and Justice based on new constitutionalism and "scientific economism"²⁷. It seemed that the global community constructed on steadily increasing multiculturalism and the Euro-American civilization would open up possibilities for a completely different global polity. Similar *Zeitgeist* had prevailed during the previous intensive phase of Eurocentric capitalist globalization that eventually led to imperialism, inter-imperialist rivalry and the First European Civil War²⁸.

2. NEW WORLD(-)EMPIRE

The terror attacks created a situation in which the US expansion to Afghanistan -the national-territorial home base of the extreme Islamist Taleban movement and Al-Qaida which both more or less directly owe their existence to the US global policies during the ECW III- was more or less approved at least by the other Northern governments. The Peoples of the world felt sympathy for the victims of S-11-2001 and the Taleban had not improved their image by their contempt of cultural heritage and their maltreatment of female human beings. Accordingly, the war of revenge in Afghanistan was tolerated even if the Bush administration's nationalistic propaganda and simple-minded behavior was already by then generally despised. On the contrary, II Iraq War, a criminal and new imperialistic war of conquest legitimized by false and manufactured evidence, was widely condemned around the world. Large majorities of national populations, in many cases especially in the countries belonging to the shallow "coalition of the willing", were against the war which was not approved by the United Nations Security Council and which was considered to miss the point of the War on Terror even by those who otherwise considered the latter as a legitimate policy program. Despite this, the cataclysmic events of S-11- 2001 allowed the Bush administration to engage in a new imperialist expansion into the central areas of Eurasia, as had been previewed by various US strategists. According to Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington, both key actors of the Trilateral Commission, have adopted the century-old geopolitical doctrines that were crafted in the previous intensive phase of capitalism turned imperialism. Both believe that the control of Eurasia -"situated in the centre of the world"- is essential for global domination. In the words of Brzezinski: "who

controls that continent controls the planet". He believes that the US is the first and probably the last global superpower, and after the US hegemony he hopes for a system of cooperation between the states of the world²⁹.

Huntington and Brzezinski, despite major intellectual architects of the geopolitical doctrine prevailing in the United States, are however in favor of a more detached and cooperative governance than the openly new imperialist PNAC-ideologues of the Bush administration. Both have criticized the present policies because of the dangers of alienating other Northern powers, a stance that is coherent with their previous advocacy of sharing the burden of global governance with more or less like-minded trilateral ruling classes. They can be conceived as hawkish Wilsonian Idealists that believe in detached, economist, cooperative, rule-based global governance under the guidance of the US as the first among almost equals but who are willing to resort to physical coercion when necessary. On the other hand, the Bush administration's new imperialists have opted for nationalist unilateralism, internal and external coercion and global governance based on direct rule and physical and material presence.

What, then, is the nature of the new kind of world(-)empire under construction? The answer can at least partially be derived from the discussions on hegemony and the forms of global governance of world-system analysis (WSA) and transnational historical materialism (THM)³⁰. According to Immanuel Wallerstein, representing WSA, we must make a distinction between a world-economy and a world-empire. For him the world- economy "is an economic but not a political entity" that comprises different kinds of political entities such as empires, nation-states and city-states, but is larger than any of these political entities. Moreover, it is a world-economy "because the basic linkage between the parts of the system is economic, although this was reinforced to some extent by cultural links and eventually [...] by political arrangements". On the contrary, "political empires are primitive means of economic domination", centralized political units that guarantee the economic flows from the periphery to the center by force and monopolistic advantages. The political structure and bureaucracy of a world-empire was needed "because repression and exploitation bred revolt which increased military expenditures" and

tended to "absorb too much of the profit". The novelty of the modern world-system -the capitalist world-economy- is that its qualities allow profit-making without an expensive, centralized, coercive political structure. According to Wallerstein, the modern world-system could also have turned into a world-empire but the capitalist world-economy does not allow the emergence of a real world-empire because the economic costs would be too high³¹.

In the narrow historical context of neo-liberal capitalist globalization the capitalist world-economy has developed into an existing world-wide capitalist system. Accordingly, the claim presented here is that the Bush administration, influenced by the PNAC-ideologues, is trying to do something that cannot be done cost-effectively; transform the global capitalist system, with multiple political systems and centers into a world- empire with a centralized political structure. The decisions regarding the global police and military operations in particular would be made by the US ruling classes with clear nationalistic tendencies. The Bush administration is trying to create a new kind of global world(-)empire which would combine the "benefits" of the detached economic and economist governance and profit-making of capitalism with the "benefits" of the new imperialist direct rule, based on physical presence and extra-economic expropriation secured through superior military force and monopoly rights for US enterprises³². In principle this could be considered as a novel innovation for global governance. However, it is, in fact, an attempt to combine elements that are in uneasy relationship with each other. The legitimacy of global capitalism and global governance have suffered serious blowbacks due to economic crises, increasing global social polarization, de-democratization of liberal democracy and corporate crimes with almost guaranteed impunity. Now, in this precarious situation in which the new costs of militarization and direct rule are increasing the US public indebtedness far beyond the sustainable level, it is quite improbable that the building of new kind of world(-)empire will succeed. Moreover, due to an increasing understanding of the unviable nature of new imperialism and the quest for this new kind of world(-)empire -not only within the global civil society and the majority of world leaders, but also among the US citizens- the likelihood of the failure of this project increases significantly.

The latter is related not only to the economically –not to mention ethically- unsustainable nature of the new imperialism, but also to the fatal loss of global goodwill that the United States has enjoyed in the minds of global population. This is due to the successful construction of benevolent image of the United States with the help of a dominant culture industry and the fact that her vigorous internal market, her position in the global economy and the position of US Dollar's as a global reserve currency the United States has been able to provide riches to her ruling classes and relative affluence to the middle classes, especially those of European descent. This loss can be explained with the help of Antonio Gramsci's conception of hegemony, incorporated into the study of global political economy by the transnational historical materialists. Gramsci's conception differs considerably from that of the WSA, which builds on the idea of comparative economic advantage, i.e. that certain economic activities are typical for the states in the core, semi-periphery or periphery of the world-system. The varying combinations of economic activities and the positions of the states in the production chains together with political and military strength are decisive for the changing positions of the states in the hierarchy of world-economy and global state- system. Therefore the positions of countries in the hierarchy do change. According to Chase-Dunn, the rise of the hegemonic core states occurs when emerging leading sectors of core production are concentrated in one state which then becomes the leading core state. Accordingly, "decline sets in when the hegemon loses its ability to develop lead industries ahead of its competitors"³³. These changes take place in the broader context of historical tendencies and cyclical and conjunctural changes in the world- system, and typically in the context of major wars or corresponding major upheavals.

Transnational historical materialists have developed Gramsci's conception of hegemony - originally coined for the use in the national-territorial context of Italy, though Gramsci was aware of his concepts wider political usefulness- to be applicable also in the global context. A hegemonic situation exists when a given historical bloc can establish and maintain a dominant and widely shared world-view and impose corresponding social practices, world-orders and forms of state. Gramsci made a clear division into a political society (state) and a civil society (economic actors, churches, family etc.).

This division corresponds to the functional divisions of Western, bourgeois capitalist society in which public sphere and private sphere have been separated but which, nevertheless, form a coherent compact of governance that makes a hegemonic situation possible. According to Gramsci, hegemony consists of coercion and consent. The public political society, state, provides the legal-judicial structure and forceful coercion that is in the ideal hegemonic situation merely latent, whereas the private sphere of civil society forms the context in which the hegemonic ideas and consent to them are created and sustained³⁴. A hegemonic situation or historical context emerges when the subordinated social classes comply with the hegemonic ideas and social practices by and for the hegemonic classes, for instance in a situation in which the social majorities accept the formative norms and values of a social order even if they are well aware that the existing order favors disproportionately the interests of the ruling strata³⁵.

According to the THM, history since the beginning of 19th century can be divided into hegemonic and non-hegemonic eras. For them, the US achieved a hegemonic position after the ECV II and the hegemonic period of the US ended in the early 1970's after which the leading members of the internationally oriented US ruling classes decided to move beyond the state-centric hegemony. They began the construction of transnational and trilateral hegemony in which the like-minded ruling classes and intellectuals of Western Europe and Japan are incorporated in a transnational hegemonic bloc in which the internationalist US ruling classes still hold the commanding heights³⁶. This transnational bloc succeeded relatively well in fusing Wilsonian idealism, neo-classical marginalist economics and a neo-liberal (neo-conservative) political program into a worldview, that in the context of neo-liberal transformative and consolidating politics eventually became semi-hegemonic or even hegemonic (especially among the dominating economic, political, administrative circles and like-minded more or less organic intellectuals) during the 1990's. The hegemony was not, however, complete because the counter-hegemonic forces had already begun to emerge during the 1980's in the South (e.g. the IMF-riots) and during the latter part of the 1990's in the North. As I have already suggested, in this context, possibilities may have opened up for

more civilized alternatives had there been political will among the transnational ruling classes to engage in serious debate and transformational activity³⁷.

However, after the bust of the most recent bubble-economy, and especially after S-11-2001, the Bush administration activated the regressive plans of the PNAC and oriented herself to new imperialist wars and to the construction of a new kind of world(-)empire. There is no room here for a summary of the events leading to the II Iraq War and US muscle flexing in other parts of the world. The claim presented here is that due to the politics of the Bush administration, the United States has already lost the vital consent element of hegemony that she exercised through trilateral-transnational hegemony. It is now in a no-win situation in which the Bush administration is trying, without the consent of the transnational ruling classes and global civil society, to impose a new imperialist mode of domination through coercive physical force and blackmail, especially but not only in the non-White and non-Christian parts of the world³⁸.

This policy is inherently unethical, un-Christian, and blinkered as a form of global governance. Even many US strategists in favor of continuing US global preeminence believe that the last qualifier is especially true. If the Europeans had to learn that US power, especially coercive power, increased in comparison to the strengthening European Union during the 1990's, the United States is now in a situation in which the Bush administration has wasted the strategic assets of consent and good-will and is also about to hasten the loss of economic and material advantage valued in the world-system analyses conception of hegemony³⁹. Militarist and new imperialist policies are too expensive even for a rich country such as the US, and with these present policies the US is entering into a serious growth and sustainability-hindering debt trap in the middle and long terms. Therefore, the well-known hubris of imperial over-stretch and the problems and economic inefficiency of a world-empire suggested by Wallerstein, are consequently undermining also the economic, material and coercive component of the US global domination.

3. "WAR ON TERROR": FIRST WORLD WAR AND AN INTERNAL CIVIL WAR⁴⁰

As I have explained, the Bush administrations War on Terror and Non-White Others can, independently of the final truth of the atrocities of S-11- 2001, be analyzed as a new imperialist war aiming to replace global governance based on the relative consent of populations and cooperation of the transnational ruling classes with a mode of global governance based on physical force and repression. It is also based on the contempt for human rights, citizen rights and personal rights of not only the non-white others - which would in itself be enough to comprehensively condemn these policies from every ethical angle - but also the rights of the US and other Northern citizens, including educated, white, protestant and heterosexual males such as the writer of this article.

When global attention was focused on the emerging First World War and especially its hottest areas in Eurasia, the Bush administration also intensified its regressive policies in Latin America and inside the US. Most visible of the former strategy was the attempt to promote a regime change in Venezuela through the proxy of the local ruling classes then, and still after the failed coup attempt, in political opposition⁴¹. Because the US has a long history of illegal regime changes and coups against democratically elected and other kinds of foreign governments⁴², the regressive and repressive change inside the United States itself may be even more significant for the future development of the global community. As suggested by William Safire, a conservative New York Times columnist, the Bush administration is in the process of creating a paranoid society⁴³ in which everybody is a potential suspect⁴⁴. This is visible in the government calling for the development of collective intra-community vigilance, the generalized system of neighborhood watch and informants supporting the repressive law and order machinery. Historically, governance systems of this variety have been typical for the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, that is, countries governed either by extreme right or extreme left fascist and antidemocratic regimes distrust of their own citizens. Under such regimes, both citizens and foreigners with varying immigrant status are deprived of their basic human rights, citizen rights and personal and intimacy rights that belong to them constitutionally. Such governments are also adept in exploiting and creating emergency situations which allow them to inflame nationalist hysteria and fear for political reasons.

After S-11-2001 Bush administration succeeded in creating a situation in which members of Congress -neither House representatives nor senators but very rare exceptions- did not dare to challenge the government's repressive and anti-constitutional policies for fear of being accused of being anti- American and unpatriotic. During the darkest periods the critics faced a possibility of becoming targets of lynching mentality of the masses indoctrinated by fierce nationalistic hate and anger. All attempts to point at the inhuman, unethical and illegal nature of the policies of the Bush administration were marginalized in this climate and dissent was effectively silenced. Various new laws and anti-terrorist law and order institutions were created and given new possibilities to loosen the constitutional protection of human, political and civil rights. To add further ethical complication, many of the leaders of these new institutions such as John Poindexter, as well as many Bush administrations political appointees to foreign policy and diplomatic posts, had themselves been criminal suspects before⁴⁵. Besides being anti-constitutional, these new law and order policies were based on racial profiling and targeted especially against nationals and foreigners of Arabic and Arab-Semitic physical appearance domestically, at entry points to the US, and globally⁴⁶. Moreover, the new rules gave a very flexible definition of terrorism and terrorist activities, effectively opening up possibilities for the strategic control and suppression of dissent that had been increasing between the WTO-farce of Seattle 1999 and the S-11-2001.

Between S-11-2001 and the beginning of the II Iraq War in March 2003, it seemed evident that the Bush administration was in the process of turning the United States into an authoritarian fascist state, possessing massive amounts of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. It seemed that the worst fears of George Orwell were becoming a reality, with the possibilities of modern technology making all previous tyrants green of envy. Moreover, it was becoming obvious that the Bush administration's promise of an eternal War on Terror and Non-White Others was turning the whole world into a camp, explained by Giorgio Agamben, in which the state of emergency becomes the normal state of affairs⁴⁷. To be sure, the nature of this permanent manufactured normality would be different inside and outside, but the basic features of the normalization of

exceptionality, control and repression would affect us all. Yet, the spectacular rise of global civil society in opposing the new imperialist war in Iraq, and the slow awakening US public opinion that had been silenced by the repressive fear creation of the Bush administration, began to reclaim their constitutional rights of free speech. They also began to criticize the governments' internal and foreign policies, the disastrous nature and failure of which was becoming evident even to the Republicans who do not want to undermine the formative values of their country nor her global position.

The Bush administration is now cornered and on the defensive⁴⁸. The II Iraq War is turning into a major disaster⁴⁹, the US economy's middle and long term prospects are dim, the US global reputation as a benevolent guardian of the global system is effectively eroded and difficult to regain, and the reactivated S-11-2001 hearings are making it quite clear that the Bush administration does not even have the support of the people previously belonging to it (though not to its ideological inner circles). Therefore, they are in a situation in which they must, in order to save face, continue to wrap their message in a package that is hiding their true colors⁵⁰. For example, according to Condoleezza Rice, the USA PATRIOT ACT and other repressive and control oriented Law and Order measures are "consistent with protecting America's cherished civil liberties and with preserving our character as a free and open society⁵¹." Assuming she is right -which is not and cannot be the case- a more conventional, ethical and liberal (in the European and the US meaning of the term) idea of civil rights and liberties and open society as something in diametrical opposition to a police and surveillance state must be abandoned. If the end result is a society in which the curtailing of civil, human and personal rights -especially of those belonging to a 'wrong' ethnic group- is allowed for a long period of time if not eternally, it would be irrational, counterintuitive and anti-American to accept Dr. Rice's definition of a free and open society. As reminded by Quentin Skinner, "We are again being urged to recognize that, in times of emergency, civil liberties must bow to national security. [...] These arguments are of course put to us in the name of freedom and democracy. But it is worth recalling that, according to the American Founding Fathers, and to the democratical gentlemen by whom they were so greatly influenced, this is to speak the language of tyranny"⁵².

4. WHY THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA WILL ABANDON NEW IMPERIALISM

First of all, the United States emerged as a state through an anti-colonial war against its colonial master. Citizens of the US have, in their backbones, a belief that they can change the world through their own positive example and not through imperialist adventures and coercion. This is the basic reason for the change taking place among the citizens of the US: they are better than the simple-minded new imperialist policies of the Bush administration suggest and they know that they can make a difference, in cooperation with the citizens of other countries and with the global civil society.

Secondly, it is becoming clear that you cannot impose democracy by force in a country that (a) does not have democratic traditions, (b) whose citizens resist being occupied, (c) who know that Saddam Hussein used to be an ally of the US ruling classes, (d) is in itself an artificial creature of British imperialism, (e) whose population, including the "moderates" are getting suspicious and angry with the occupier, and finally, (f) the occupation of which is creating unnecessary anti-Western, anti-Christian, anti-Israeli, and anti-US anger not only in Muslim countries but also in other non-rich and non-white countries. The immediate result of the new imperialist war, based on insufficient knowledge of even the basic facts of the target country, is a large number of dead Iraqis and a considerable number of dead US and 'coalition' soldiers.

Thirdly, the Bush administration's policies are undermining the goodwill and consent crucial to the US global position and increases anger at the ordinary US citizens whom are not responsible for the falsely-based adventures of their national ruling classes. There were neither weapons of mass destruction nor any other kinds of smoking guns in Iraq. Saddam Hussein was neither involved in 9-11-2001 nor was he, a secular dictator supported by the US, cooperating with religious fundamentalist al-Qaida. People do not like being lied to and it is hard to think that US citizens would differ in this respect.

Fourthly, as suggested by world-systems analysis, new imperialist direct rule is too expensive and forceful economic exploitation is an inefficient form of economic appropriation. Imperialist wars and excessive military spending

in combination with unhealthy military-Keynesianism -i.e. a policy that utilizes military spending as a counter-cyclical tool against economic recession- increase the federal public debt of the United States. When military spending is combined with taxation policies offering tax-cuts to the rich, whose increased income is not necessarily channeled into growth- creating consumption, and to the costly effects of the ageing population, it is easy to understand that these policies are not economically viable in the middle and long term. However, it is the middle and long term negative development of public and private debt that is believed to expose the US economy to a major corrective adjustment. Moreover, this is in line with the more general downward trend of the US position in the world-economy, as suggested by the WSA. It is good to remember that if not only some irritating critical scholars but also the Federal Reserve, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations and a legion of Nobel economists who agree that the growing public debt of the US is a serious problem for the US and to the global economy⁵³. Moreover, a deflationary situation similar to that of Japan can not be ruled out.

Fifthly, the Bush administration is turning the rest of the world against the United States. It is also quite embarrassing to them that in the new imperialist fervor the Bush administration did not bother to analyze the ways in which the rest of the world can, given the political will, punish the US ruling classes for their arrogant behavior. However the economic methods, if used unprofessionally and in uncoordinated manner, could have negative consequences to the ordinary US citizens and to the global economy. Therefore, it would be in the interest of the US citizens as well as in the interest of the citizens of the other countries of the world were the US citizens to live up to their historical mission and try to change the world through positive example and action. The first step in the right direction would be a democratic regime change in the forthcoming federal elections.

5. FUTURE OF THE WORLD AT STAKE: WHAT THE REST OF THE WORLD CAN DO?

I hope to have made a case suggesting that the new imperialist policies, aiming to construct a new kind of world(-)empire, are not sustainable ethically, politically or economically. The objective of the criticism presented here is not

only to show the unsustainable nature of these policies, but also -following the constructive tradition of critical theory- to point at alternative and better possibilities according to my normative judgment. I will now explain what the rest of the world can do, and in conclusion I will explain how to proceed in our common quest for a better world. I have suggested that the rest of the world could embrace a policy I have chosen to call *New Peaceful Containment (NPC)*. If the meaning of the original policy of containment, suggested by US diplomat George Kennan, was to change the Soviet system and to reintegrate Russia to the sphere of private accumulation of capital, the purpose of the NPC is to show why the US must renounce the new imperialist policies and reintegrate the US to the world. The US must become a constructive actor of the global community, dedicated to policies which promote and respect democracy, social solidarity and human rights, not to mention the respect of international law and commitment the peaceful international cooperation especially through the United Nations system, despised and undermined by the US since at least the Reagan administration. During the ECW II, in 1944, Kennan urged the US leaders to work with the British and other allied leaders to draw a line "beyond which we cannot afford to permit the Russians to exercise unchallenged power"⁵⁴. NPC urges the world leaders and the global civil society to draw a line beyond which we cannot afford to permit the US new imperialist ruling classes to exercise unchallenged power.

The global community cannot afford to permit policies that would wreck the post ECW II global order based on the illegality of aggressive wars against other members of the state-system, especially without the mandate of the UN Security Council⁵⁵. It is not, and, if the global community so decides, will not be in the future, legal to engage in pre-emptive wars resembling the previous policies of pre-emptive imperialism. As suggested before, the citizens of the United States should not let themselves to be turned into the pariahs of the global community by letting their ruling classes engage in unethical and short-sighted new imperialist policies, as we know they can do better than that. The global community denies the simple-minded dualism of "With Or Against Us" type slogans and responds: "You Can Join Us And Help Us In The Building Of A Better World Instead Of Wrecking And Spoiling It". What then can the rest of the world do, according to *New Peaceful Containment*?

The rest of the world can proceed without the US with the global democratic and social reforms that had gained currency before the US policies of unilateralist new imperialism.

The rest of the world can support the anti-militarist, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist opposition in the United States that has steadily gained currency, and help US citizens to use democracy against new imperialism.

The rest of the world can intentionally weaken the global position of the US.

Canadians and the Mexicans can help themselves, the ordinary US citizens and the rest of the world by promoting regional democracy against new imperialism. This can be done by promoting social, developmental and democratic regionalism in North America⁵⁶.

The United States is too powerful to be ignored completely, even if many emancipating policies such as Currency Transaction Tax (CTT) and International Criminal Court (ICC) can be promoted without the US, even if it would be better to have the US inside these global reforms from the very beginning⁵⁷. Because the purpose of NPC is peaceful, the foremost and best way to proceed would be to use democracy against new imperialism by supporting the anti-imperialist US opposition and to use democracy against new imperialism by promoting regional democracy in North America. Given the fact that the US has frequently resorted to legal and illegal methods and, when necessary, military coups in order to influence the internal politics of other countries, the rest of the world has now a legitimate right to support the US opposition to perform a democratic regime change in the US. For example the European Union could promote the campaign finance reform and the electoral system reform in the US, given the problems in the previous presidential elections. The EU could also support more openly a candidate who is against new imperialism and more willing to co-operate with the rest of the world. Scholars and other thinkers could use their brains and pencils to show and explain why to present policies are not sustainable, and so on. The development of democratic regionalism in North America is a middle and long term method in which the political community between Mexico, the US and Canada would make it more difficult for the US to resort to new imperialist policies and open up

possibilities for Mexico and Canada to cooperate more in order to stand up the US and to pressure of the US to participate and not to obstruct the process in which a more democratic and more equal of North America is made possible⁵⁸.

It is, however, essential to show what kinds of methods of pressure and punishment the rest of the world has at its disposal in order to make it clear that the new imperialist policies will not be tolerated. It is already evident that the failures of the Bush administration's policies, the pressure of the rest of the world and the awakening of the critical discussion in the US have forced the Bush administration to relent and to seek help from the UN, a move which would have been unimaginable between September 11-2001 and March 2003.

The main forms of pressure are economic. The rest of the world can, were it to consider the European Union at least as a slightly more tolerable global player, strengthen the move away from US Dollar toward the Euro. One reason behind the invasion of Iraq, besides Iraqi oil and its geopolitical importance, was that Iraq had shifted to use Euro as the trading currency of the limited oil trade allowed by the United Nations' "Food for Oil" policies. Due to the changes of exchange rates, Euro use turned out to be beneficial for Iraq, and it is believed that the ruling classes of the US feared that other oil exporting countries would follow suit and undermine the position of the US Dollar not only as a central currency of oil trade⁵⁹ but possibly also as a global reserve currency. As I have suggested before, the Euro has turned into a serious challenger to the post- ECW II position of the US Dollar as a global reserve currency, which has been an important factor supporting US hegemony through the seigneur advantages it has given to the US⁶⁰. The Dollar's position has allowed the US to finance her internal policies by printing dollars -an inflationary policy denied from others- thus the US monetary and financial policies have had intentional and unintentional consequences in the global economy. Moreover, due to the Dollars position the rest of the world has effectively given development loans -that the US does not necessarily even have to pay back- with no or very small interest rate. By choosing the Euro, the rest of the world could pull the rug from under the US economy, which is increasingly vulnerable due to the debt trap policies of Bush administration.

Secondly, the rich countries and private investors -especially Japan and other Asian countries- have invested heavily in US federal government bonds. Moreover, especially during the high-tech bubble, foreign direct and portfolio investments to the emerging info-tech, bio-tech and gene-tech industries boomed, giving thus another massive dose to the development and maintenance of the leading position of the US in the emerging profitable and emerging sectors. Together with the Dollars position, these investments (and the continuing brain drain to the US, even if the trend has slightly been reversed due to the changes in global production and the burgeoning habit of using non-national brain power outside the national borders) have created a situation in which the rest of the world has effectively financed the post-ECW II economic development of the US, and thus her hegemonic position and presently her new imperialist policies. This is at the same time when the present global economy, ever more a zero-sum-game, is undermining the economic prospects in many parts of the "developing world". Through withdrawing or even by suggesting the possibility of withdrawal of these foreign investments, the rest of the world has major tools of pressure at its disposal. One could quite easily imagine more tools of pressure. However, I believe that even these are credible enough to make the Bush administration behave in at least a slightly more civilized manner, and to explain to the citizens of the United States that it is in their and in the worlds interest to realize a democratic regime change in the US.

6. CONCLUSION: MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN DIGNITY

I have explained why the new imperialist policies and a new kind of world(-)empire are unviable forms of global governance. Moreover, I have made some proposals in the context of *New Peaceful Containment* that the citizens of the United States and the World can work on together in order to undo new imperialism and to promote a democratic regime change that would remove from office an administration that has committed crimes against the international law and human dignity. Before such a regime change the Bush administration still has a possibility to change its policies in order to make an orderly development in Iraq possible, and to prepare the way for a more cooperative administration. Indeed, Condoleezza Rice does

not serve the cause of global cooperation by declaring her support to the eternal war: "[...] under President Bush's leadership, we will remain at the war until the terrorist threat to our nation is ended". The global majority wants the root causes -i.e. poverty, repression, humiliation and the physical destruction of human habitat- of terrorism resolved. Dr. Rice's solution is exactly the opposite: "we must address the source of the problem. We must stay on offence, to find and defeat the terrorists wherever they live, hide, and plot around the world"⁶¹. The Bush administration has trapped itself in a circular reasoning in which violence produced by violence is 'cured' by more violence. Make no mistake, the Bush administration's vision and praxis will guarantee the eternal state of emergency and the spiral of revenge.

A reversal is urgently needed. The first thing to do is to prepare Iraq's independent and peaceful development through the strengthened involvement of the global community and the United Nations. The mistake has already been made and it cannot be undone. Therefore, we must (1) make sure that the Iraqis regain real sovereign control of their country as soon as possible. Moreover, it is, (2) in order to prevent Iraq falling into a miserable civil war, still necessary to have international troops under UN leadership in Iraq to facilitate this transition. However, (3) the Bush administration -which caused this miserable and illegal mess in the first place- must also in the future pay the cost of transition and reconstruction, despite the sad fact that the payers will be the ordinary US tax payers. The US must (4) renounce new imperialism and support the fulfillment of the original purpose of the United Nations: the creation a global military force of the global commons, independent of all imperial pressure and aspirations and capable to act rapidly especially in genocidal situations. Meanwhile, we must continue the construction of a democratic and just global community, together.

NOTAS

* This article is based on its author's various articles in Finnish and a forthcoming book *Critical Research of Open Historical Contexts and Transformative Politics* (in Finnish), especially its chapter "Global Dystopia: New Imperialism and New Kind of World(-)Empire". I thank Gavan Titley for his suggestions on my English language and Teivo Teivainen for his comments. They are not, however, responsible either for the remaining errors or the claims presented in the article.

¹ See e.g. Ahmed, Nafeez Mossadeq, *The War of Freedom: How and Why America was Attacked 9.11.2001*. London, Tree of Life Publications, 2002 and Chossudovsky, Michel, *War and Globalization. The Truth Behind September 11*. Oakland, Global Outlook Publishing, 2002.

² See <<http://www.newamericancentury.org>> for PNAC's principles, objectives and key members

³ PNAC, *Rebuilding America's Defences. Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century. A Report of The Project for a New American Century*, (september 2000) [report on line]. Available from Internet

at: <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefences.pdf>>.

⁴ "Quelques excites islamistes", in the French original, translated by William Blum. This pejorative expression was used by ex-national policy adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski in an article (Les revelations d'un ancien conseiller de Carter. Janvert, Vincent, "Qui, la CIA est entrée en Afghanistan avant les Russes". *Nouvel Observateur Hebdo*, 1732 (15/1/1988) that reveals the US plans to give "the USSR it's Vietnam War" in Afganistan.

⁵ Huntington, Samuel, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London, Touchstone Books, 1996. It is good to remember that Huntington's other major task has been the roll-back of "excessive" democracy in the countries of liberal democratic capitalist West. See Crozier, Michel; Huntington, Samuel P. and Watanuki, Joji, *The Crisis of Democracy. Report on the Governability to the Trilateral Commission*. New York, New York University Press, 1975. Nelson Rockefeller asked Brzezinski to create the Trilateral Commission in 1973 in order to oppose Nixon administrations nationalist policies and to incorporate like-minded Japanese into the informal and trilateral global governance (see Gill, Stephen, *American Hegemony and Trilateral Commission*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990).

⁶ A nice summary of the reappearance of pro-imperialist discourse in the US is Bellamy Foster, John, "The Rediscovery of Imperialism". *Monthly Review* (november 2002).

⁷ A world-historical perspective shows how various forms of anti-difference, anti-rebellion and "anti-terrorist" activities have been a standard procedure of the different kinds of national and imperial ruling strata's during historical turning points and situations in which their dominant and hegemonic position has been threatened.

⁸ *Testimony of Richard A. Clarke Before the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States* (March 24, 2004), [document on line]. Available from Internet at: <http://www.9-11commission.gov/hearings/hearing8/clarke_statement.pdf>. Clarke was appointed as National Coordinator for Counter Terrorism in 1998.

⁹ National Security Advisor Dr. Condoleezza Rice, *Opening Remarks, the National Commission on*

Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (April 8, 2004), [document on line]. Available from Internet at:

<http://www.9-11commission.gov/hearings/hearing9/rice_statement.pdf>, 1. It is, of course, possible that in a situation which is very important for the legitimacy of Bush administration, truth may be treated as a relative and not absolute value by the key members of the Bush administration and PNAC.

¹⁰ *Testimony of Condoleezza Rice*, op. cit., 8-9.

¹¹ Norman Mailer was one of the first courageous persons to speak out on this in the context of the nationalist hysteria created by the terror attacks and advanced for political reasons by the Bush administration.

¹² Trilateral refers to the attempts to build trilateral (US, Western Europe and Japan) world hegemony by the internationalists of the Trilateral Commission, whose mode of global governance differs considerably from the Bush administrations unilateral, nationalist, xenophobic and new imperialistic policies.

¹³ I use here the term new imperialism in order to refer at policies whose methods are increasingly based on direct rule instead of detached rule implied by the terms neo-colonialism and also neo-imperialism.

¹⁴ Hobson, John A., *Imperialism. A study*. London, 1968 (1902), 22.

¹⁵ Ninkovich, Frank, *The United States and Imperialism*. Malden/Oxford, Blackwell, 2001, especially chapter 6.

¹⁶ Hardt, Michael; Negri, Antonio, *Empire*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2000. This division is also built into Immanuel Wallerstein's separation of the new world-system i.e. the capitalist world-economy from the pre-modern world-empires, though in quite a different fashion. (*The Modern World-System. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York, Academic Press, 1974)

¹⁷ Davis, Mike, "The New Right's Road to Power". *New Left Review*, 128 (1981), 35.

¹⁸ Schumpeter, Joseph, *Imperialism. Social Classes*. New York, Meridian Books, 1951 (originally published in German in 1919). The citation is from the introduction by Bert Hoselitz. Here it is instructive to remember that due to the intra-class breeding, the intellectual capabilities of the aristocracies have tended to weaken.

¹⁹ Braudel, Fernand, "Euroopan ulkopuoliset Euroopat" (Europe's External Europas), in Braudel, Fernand et al., *Europe*. Tampere, Vastapaino, 1992.

²⁰ Stephansson, Anders, *Manifest Destiny and the Empire of Right*. New York, Wang and Hill, 2000, 7.

²¹ *Ibid.*, especially chapter 1.

²² Of the land seizures, see Zoraida Vázquez, Josefina, *México y el Mundo. Historia de sus Relaciones Exteriores*. Tomo I. México, Senado de la República, 2000.

²³ Merk, Fredrick, *Monroe Doctrine and the American Expansionism 1843-1849*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1966, 74.

²⁴ In my non-Eurocentric vocabulary "First and Second World Wars and Cold War" are renamed as First, Second and Third European or Eurocentric civil wars of the 20th century (thereafter also ECW I, II, III). I believe renaming is important due to the fact that these wars were fought between the representatives of different versions (liberal-social democratic capitalist, fascist capitalist and state capitalist or state communist) of the essentially the same modern Eurocentric economic growth ideology and praxis. Accordingly, the Bush administrations Global War on Terror and Non-White Others can be seen as the first real World War.

²⁵ Even if the nostalgic planning for a New American Century had began in the context of PNAC and its predecessors already in the early 1990's and some were supporting the return of Colonialism (e.g. Johnson, Paul, "Colonialism's Back and Not a Moment Too Soon". *New York Times Magazine*, April 18, 1993).

²⁶ As the reader sees, this wording is quite Spenglerian. This is not to claim that each civilization must go through similar paths of internal developmental. It is, however, possible that similarities exist especially if the members of that particular civilization stubbornly resist all the civilizing impulses the outside world has to offer as seems to be the case with the conservative elements of the US population and ruling classes.

²⁷ On New Constitutionalism see Gill, Stephen, "The Emerging World Order and European Change: The Political Economy European Union", in Miliband, Ralph; Panitch, Leo (ed.), *Socialist Register 1992*. London, The Merlin Press, 1992. On economism see Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1971; Teivainen, Teivo, *Enter Economics, Exit Politics: Experts, Economic Policy and the Damage to Democracy*. London, Zed Books, 2002.

²⁸ The Berlin conference of 1878 and the following "scramble for Africa" can be seen as a turning point. Moreover, as Eric Hobsbawn (*The Age of Empire, 1875-1914*. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987, 159) has suggested, from the 1870's the world economy turned more into a "zero-sum-game" instead of a world economy that could benefit all nation-states. In other words, for Hobsbawn the year 1875 marked a change from "The Age of Capital" to "The Age of Empire". It is worth noting that approximately a hundred years later, in the early 1970's the Bretton Woods system was reconstructed and the post-war economic "miracle" came to an end.

²⁹ "Entretien avec un impérialiste américain sans complexes. De la bonne façon de dominer le monde". *Nouvel Observateur Hebdo*, 1730 (1/1/1998). Brzezinski's post-trilateralist and americo-centric view is, to be sure, arrogant but consistent with his worldview and one can agree with him in that no new global superpower is needed and that a

future world of cooperation [without a superpower?] would be a major improvement in comparison to the present situation, though his ideal world would probably not be the best possible alternative world.

³⁰ In this article it is not possible to engage in deeper discussion on the nature of WSA and THM. My version of the historical, reflexive and critical study, i.e. Critical Research of Open Historical Contexts suggests, however, that due to transformations in the really existing historical world it is possible to overcome some of the basic ontological and epistemological -or as I have chosen to formulate it, onto-epistemological- disagreements of these compacts of critical theorizing. Here I shall use some key concepts of WSA and THM only to show in a quite rudimentary manner how we can capture some features of the present order of things.

³¹ Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World-System...*, op. cit, 15-17; *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979, 5-6.

³² Now the centre of gravity of new imperialism is in Eurasia but through the global network of military bases the US is in a position that allows her ruling classes to exercise blackmail and coercion around the world. This imperial over-stretch is getting excessively expensive and counterproductive to the wider interests of the US citizens. That is the reason why the US wants the European Union to share the burden of global policing even if the US does not want the EU to build independent military forces - that could possibly disrupt the nostalgic plans for a New American Century.

³³ Chase-Dunn, Christopher, *Global Formation. Structures of the World-Economy*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989, 171-173.

³⁴ Here it is not possible to engage in the multifaceted discussion on the nature and interconnections of the spheres of public, private and the intimate.

³⁵ Gramsci, Antonio, "Selections from...", op. cit.; cf. Anderson, Perry, "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci". *New Left Review*, 100 (1977), 5-79; Cox, Robert W., "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method". *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, XII-2 (1983), 162-175.

³⁶ Ibid., op. cit.; Gill Stephen, "American Hegemony...", op. cit.

³⁷ See also Minkinen, Petri, "NAFTA and the Possibility of an Alternative Development Strategy in Mexico". *Yearbook of Finnish Society for Development Studies 1998-1999*. Helsinki, Kehitystutkimuksen Seura ry, 1999.

³⁸ In a similar manner the Mexican ruling party PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional) lost the consent component of its national hegemony after the violent repression of the student movement before the Olympic Games of Mexico City in 1968. See Minkinen, Petri, "La democratización de México en el contexto mundial". *Relaciones internacionales*, 72 (1996), 33-47.

³⁹ It is also evident that from the neo-realist and even political realist viewpoint hegemony cannot be sustained if the material base of domination is undermined.

⁴⁰ This wording makes an intentional division into a global war and an internal "national" civil war, purpose of which is to underline the fact that new imperialism is targeted also against the internal difference, non-white citizens and dissidents daring to think differently. Another way to put it would be to talk about the first global civil war. This option could, however, cause confusion because González Casanova, Pablo, ("Globalidad, neoliberalismo y democracia", in González Casanova, Pablo; Saxe-Fernández, John (coord.), *El mundo actual: Situación, y alternativas*. México, UNAM y Siglo XXI, 1996, 50) has used the term global civil war to imply a mode of economist or neo-colonial domination over the poor and poor countries, which is not the meaning I want to give in the context of different kind of war of the Bush administration.

⁴¹ Minkinen, Petri, "Chávez on yhä ongelma USA:lle (Chávez Still a Problem for the US)". *Helsingin Sanomat*, April 16 2002; Hallinan, Conn, "Virhe. Vain pääasiakirja (The Scent of Another Coup)". *The San Francisco Examiner*, December 29 2001.

⁴² See e.g. Chomsky, Noam; Herman, Edward S., *The Washington Connection and the Third World Fascism. The Political Economy of Human Rights: Volume I*. Boston, South End Press, 1979; Blum, William, *Rogue State. A Guide to the World's Only Superpower*. London, Zed Books, 2000.

⁴³ One should note the difference between the proto-fascist, ultranationalist and regressive paranoid policies of at least the "early" post-S-11-2001 Bush administration and the typical schizophrenic nature of "capitalism of post-modern flexible accumulation" analysed by David Harvey (*The Condition of Postmodernity*. Malden/Oxford, Blackwell, 1990), i.e. the typical mental state in the context of market-anarchy of the neo-liberal capitalism (cf. Rosenberg, Justin, *The Empire of Civil Society. A Critique of the Realist Theory of International Relations*. London, Verso, 1994).

⁴⁴ Safire, William, "You Are a Suspect". *New York Times*, November 14 2002.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Another serious problem, Bush administrations purposeful and illegal mixture of exemption both from the US legislation and international law was the creation of concentration camps to Guantánamo Base for the "enemy combatants" whom were denied the rights of prisoners of war guaranteed by the Geneva Convention.

⁴⁷ Orwell, George, 1984. Porvoo, WSOY, 1967; Agamben, Giorgio, *Mezzi senza fine: Nota sulla politica*. Torino, Bollati Boringhieri, 1996; Minkinen, Petri, "Terrorismin vastainen sota vie uuteen imperialismiin (War on Terror Leads to New Imperialism)". *Helsingin Sanomat*, December 2 2002.

⁴⁸ Step by step one is getting ever more convinced that there is no electoral way out of this cul-de-sac. However, given the cynical nature of the PNAC-ideologues behind the Bush administration, it is quite possible that a new war, a major "terrorist attack" or similar cataclysmic event will be staged in order to arouse new waves of nationalism and patriotism that is expected to improve George W. Bush's changes on the polls.

⁴⁹ If one wanted to be a bit nasty, one could paraphrase Brzezinski (*Nouvel Observateur Hebdo*, "Les revelations", op. cit., January 1 1998) and imagine an Iraqi opposition fighter and strategist saying to his leader: "We have now a chance to give the US their own Afghanistan War".

⁵⁰ As was the case with previous reports of the S-11 commission, they have no intention to make public their conclusions that are considered problematic from the point of view of national security. The Commission report of December 2002 (<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/serialset/creports/911.html>) did not reveal the crucial questions whether there were precarious internal or external links to the perpetrators: these questions had been dealt with but declared secret.

⁵¹ Rice, Condoleezza, *Opening Remarks...*, op. cit., 9.

⁵² Skinner, Quentin, "A Third Concept of Liberty". *London Review of Books*, April 4 2002, 18.

⁵³ Greenspan, Alan, *Testimony of Chairman Alan Greenspan, Economic Outlook and Current Fiscal Issues Before the Committee on the Budget*. US House of Representatives, February 25, 2004; IMF, *World Economic Outlook, Advancing Structural Reforms*. April 2004, especially Chapter II, "The Global Implications of the US Fiscal Deficit and of China's Growth"; *Global Economic Outlook 2004*, referred at in "Global Economy Expanding in 2004, UN and partner say", (<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=10400&Cr=global&Cr1=economy>); "10 Nobel Laureates Attack Bush Economic Plan". *AFP*, February 7 2003.

⁵⁴ Kennan, George F., "Sources of Soviet Conduct". *Foreign Affairs*, 25 (1947), 566-582; Hixson, Walter L., *George F. Kennan. Cold War Iconoclast*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1989, 23.

⁵⁵ I do not engage here in the discussion of the problematic role of the Security Council in the global decision making. With all its misgivings it is, however, better than the unilateral aggressive behaviour of the superpowers.

⁵⁶ See Minkinen, Petri, "NAFTA and the Possibility...", op. cit., 1999; Minkinen, Petri, "Critical Research of Open...", op. cit., 2004 (forthcoming).

⁵⁷ On the CTT see e.g. Patomäki, Heikki, *Democratizing Globalization. The Leverage of the Tobin Tax*. London / New York, Zed Books, 2001. The fact that the US has actively undermined these and many other reforms underlines the fact that the US is no more the progressive cradle of world civilization it used to be but instead the cradle of

global reaction. However, the US that renounces new imperialism can still play a progressive global role together with other global players.

⁵⁸ It is impossible to engage in deeper discussion here but I have shown elsewhere that the development of more equal, cooperative and democratic community in North America is not only possible but due to various historical, economic and political reasons a probable future development path. Here I underline the containing possibilities of a democratic regional community but there is also a legion of other more positive and meaningful possibilities that require, however, checks and balances against one-sided policies.

⁵⁹ Virhe. Vain pääasiakirja. Makhijani, Arjun, *A Looming Monetary Collision: Oil, the Dollar and the Euro. A Briefing Paper of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research on the Global Economy* (19 March 2003), [document on line]. Available from Internet at:

<[http://www.ieer.org/comments/econ/oil\\$euro.pdf](http://www.ieer.org/comments/econ/oil$euro.pdf)>

⁶⁰ Minkinen, Petri; Patomäki, Heikki, *Rahaunionin politiikkaa (The Politics of Monetary Union)*. Helsinki, Like, 1997.

⁶¹ Rice, Condoleezza, *Opening Remarks...*, op. cit., 2 & 9.