

THE DILEMMAS OF DOMINANCE

NOAM CHOMSKY*

I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS my appreciation for the opportunity to take part in the conference and also to visit Cuba for the first time, much too long delayed, but I am very pleased to be here and pleased that you are all here as well.

A new doctrine

A year ago, in September 2002, several events took place of considerable significance, which cast a long shadow over world affairs. The first was the declaration of the national security strategy of the Bush administration. This announced in effect that the United States intends to dominate the world permanently by force if necessary—force is the one dimension in which the United States reigns completely supreme—and also announced the pretension to eliminate any potential challenge to its rule. This caused quite a reaction in the world. Not because it was new. In fact it is not new; there are many

* Professor of Linguistic, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, United States.

precedents as back as the early stages of World War II even before the United States entered the war. In those early days it was understood by US leaders that the war would end with the United States in a world dominant position and there were high-level meetings of State Department planners and experts on the Council on Foreign Relations, the main non-governmental foreign relations institution. And they issued some very important studies the basic theme of which was announced in 1941, concluding that the long term goal, I am quoting it now, was for the United States to hold unquestioned power in the post-war world and to act to ensure the limitation of sovereignty by any state that might interfere with the policy of achieving military and economic supremacy for the United States, and then followed elaborate plans so as to implement those ideas. And in subsequent years similar materials appeared in internal documents and sometimes even in public documents, but what was different last September was that the declaration was so brazen and so extreme and that it was so defiant of world opinion and was a warning to the world that you'd better watch out. And that is the difference. The predecessors were intended for elite discussion or general plans, nothing like this. That is the first of the major events that took place and should be taken into account.

The declaration was followed at once by a series of actions to implement the Bush doctrine. That included the announcement of quite remarkable military plans and immediate steps that were taken to undermine any international agreements that might impede the realization of the plans that were announced. I don't have enough time, but they are quite interesting, and also unknown –almost unknown– because although they were public they were not reported so the population doesn't know about them, except for people that pay special attention to these things. One of the steps that were taken to implement the national security doctrine, however, was very publicly announced, loud and clear; and that was the intention to invade Iraq. It was understood at once that the invasion of Iraq was to be what is sometimes called an exemplary action to demonstrate that the doctrine, the security doctrine, was intended very seriously, wasn't just words; it was going to be acted upon and it would be implemented at will, without any credible pretext and without the intervention of any international authority –that's crucial. The national security strategy itself barely mentions international law, or international institutions. Washington made it very clear to the Security Council right away that

it could be relevant –that’s the term that was used– it could be relevant if it gave its stamp of approval to actions that the US was going to carry out, whether it approved them or not; and if it refused to “be relevant” then it would be a “debating society”, merely an organ in which subjects are discussed without any influence on operational decisions. That’s what Colin Powell, the Bush administration’s “moderate,” explained. A few months later, at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, Powell said that the main issue at the World Economic Forum was Iraq, which generated a very grim and gloomy mood. Colin Powell was sent as the administration’s emissary and he informed at the World Economic Forum that, in his words, “the United States has the sovereign right to use military force and when we feel strongly about something we will lead and we will lead even if no one is following, as in this case”. That elicited very hostile reactions from the “masters of the universe” as the business press calls the people gathered in Davos, with only a slight touch of irony. These reactions are important facts to remember and think of when thinking of the evolving world system.

The electoral strategy and the art of “taming the beast”

Another crucial event of September 2002 was the opening of the mid-term election campaign, which is closely related. The Bush administration has a very fragile hold on political power; the population is generally opposed to its domestic policies, which is not very surprising –the policies are harmful to the general population and they also transfer enormous costs to future generations. The Republican campaign managers are well aware of this. The leading figure, maybe the most important person in Washington, is Karl Rove who heads the campaign committee, and he informed Republican Party activists that for the coming election, the November 2002 election, they would have to emphasize national security issues and suppress social and economic policies. And for the election it just barely worked. They manage to win the election by an extremely small margin of a few tens of thousands of votes; polls showed that voter preferences remained unchanged but their priorities shifted.

Enough people to win the election huddled under the umbrella of power in fear of the demonic enemy that was constructed by a

remarkable government media propaganda campaign that began in September and within a few weeks polls revealed that American opinion had been driven far off the international spectrum. Later studies and in greater depth showed the extraordinary misperceptions among the public, and the misperceptions are strongly coordinated with support for the invasion, which is not very surprising. I would've supported the invasion myself if I thought that Iraq was an imminent threat to the survival of the United States and that it was responsible for September 11's atrocities, that it was closely linked to Al-Qaeda which is surely planning new terrorists attacks. And that's why the invasion had considerable global support. All of these beliefs are really widely held in the United States and of course all are completely outlandish and held nowhere else.

Well, all of this illustrates one of the dilemmas of dominance, how do you control the population, how do you tame the great beast, as Alexander Hamilton described the people –that's the problem, always. And it's particularly difficult when leaders are committed to policies that are harmful, that harm and endanger the beast. There is only one effective way that's known to carry this task ahead and that is to inspire fear, and it often works. That in fact is second nature to the people who are now running Washington; most of them are recycled from the Reagan and first Bush administration, from their most reactionary sectors, and that's the way they managed to hold power for 12 years.

The instructive nature of “exemplary actions”

Well, let's go back to another of the major events of September 2002. We have mentioned the national security strategy announcement and the invasion of Iraq. As I said, it was understood at once that the invasion was to be an “exemplary action”, that it was intended to instruct the world that they would have to put aside considerations of national interests and international law and they would have to act in support of America's goals. I happen to be quoting the noted Middle East historian Roger Owen of Harvard University but this was widely understood. Opposition to the war in the world –and in fact in the United States as well– was unprecedented, and a large part of the opposition I am sure was based on recognition that Iraq was, quoting *The New York Times*, was the first test case of the national security strategy, and certainly not the last. It was the Petri dish for an

experiment in pre-emptive policy –that’s the *Times*’ report after the war was over. It’s not quite accurate, the term pre-emptive which is commonly used is incorrect; pre-emptive action means something in international law, it’s applied to situations on the verge of illegality in accordance with the UN Charter, which does grant the right of self-defense against imminent, overwhelming attack when there’s no time for deliberation and diplomacy. Countries are permitted to react in self-defense until the Security Council has the chance to intervene. That’s pre-emptive war; this policy has absolutely nothing to do with pre-emptive war, and the term should not be used. Sometimes in more technical literature in international relations or international legal literature it is called preventive war or anticipatory self-defense, those terms are not so obviously false but they are also incorrect. Nothing was prevented by the invasion of Iraq and there was no self-defense anticipated. The presidential declaration permits the use of force against constructed threats, or invented threats, or imagined ones. In fact all of these terms are just euphemisms for what was called the Supreme Crime at Nuremberg, the crime of aggression. And that is also understood.

As the bombing of Iraq began the well-known historian and former Kennedy adviser Arthur Schlesinger wrote an article in which he recalled Franklin Roosevelt’s description of the bombing of Pearl Harbor as a date that will live in infamy; and “president Roosevelt was correct”, Schlesinger wrote, “but today it is we Americans who live in infamy as the government follows the policies of imperial Japan”. This kind of commentary is also unprecedented and right in the mainstream, in important parts of the mainstream. In fact the national security strategy and its implementation aroused much concern around the world including among the foreign policy elite at home as this quote illustrates, and these too are important facts, like the reaction of the World Economic Forum. In the major establishment journal, *Foreign Affairs*, the issue after the declaration of the security strategy featured an article by a well-known international relations specialist, John Ikenberry, in which he discussed what he called the “New Imperial Grand Strategy”, and he was quite critical of it and concluded that it poses a great danger to the world and to the United States, including the likelihood of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of terror as a deterrent to US aggression. Another leading specialist made the same point and it’s pretty obvious: “if you announce to someone you’re going to attack them, they don’t say please attack

me, they try to work out some way to defend themselves". The Iraq war also was accompanied by the same warnings. US and British intelligence agencies, others in the world and independent analysts warned that the likely consequences of the Iraq war were proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terror. And after the invasion the same sources reported that those predictions were apparently verified. Intelligence reported that the Iraq invasion was causing a huge setback for the war on terror; it led to a sharp peak in recruitment for terrorist groups and in fact Iraq became a terrorist haven for the first time as was pointed out by Harvard University's leading specialist Jessica Stern. With regard to proliferation, specialists on Iran and North Korea pointed out right away that the invasion probably stimulated their more active efforts to develop weapons of mass destruction, and if true that's not unprecedented either. In 1981 Israel bombed the Iraqi nuclear facilities, Iraq's reactors, under the pretext that they were developing nuclear weapons; in fact it turned out, according to inspection by US physicists, including the head of Harvard's physics department, that there were no facilities for developing nuclear weapons but the bombing did have the consequence of leading Iraq to institute and accelerate a program to try to develop nuclear weapons. Again the logic is pretty obvious, the consequences one expect.

The dispersal of the monopoly of violence

Well, that poses another one of the dilemmas of dominance. Violence may intimidate some but is likely to incite others either to revenge or to deterrence. And since no one can hope to compete with the United States in military force –the United States already spends about as much as the rest of the world combined in military expenditures and is far more advanced technologically in military terms, so that kind of reaction is impossible– potential victims will turn to the “weapons of the weak”, which are weapons of mass destruction and terror. Those are available to the less powerful, much less powerful. And sooner or later weapons of mass destruction and terror will become united, very few people doubt that and the prospects are quite horrendous, there are high-level US government-sponsored studies that go into in some detail as to the likely consequences, most of them not preventable. This was internally known long before September 11 through the 1990s. There're technical studies and others warning that the powerful have lost their monopoly of vio-

lence. They still have an enormous preponderance but no longer monopoly and that difference is significant, that's one of the reasons why September 11 was so shattering to the United States and Europe. And the reaction in much of the rest of the world was, "this is horrible but welcome to the club; this is what you've been doing to us for hundreds of years. We are sorry about the attacked on you, but it is not particularly novel". That's the meaning of the loss of a monopoly of violence to which the powerful have been accustomed. This was certainly known in, since 1993. In 1993, there was an attempt to blow up the World Trade Center with much more ambition and came very close to succeeding. With somewhat better planning it would have killed tens of thousands of people according to the building engineers. That was carried out by people who were apprehended and they were closely related to Al-Qaeda-type organizations, trained by the US and its associates in Afghanistan in the 1980s. And the leader of it was apparently brought to the United States by the CIA and was kept there under CIA protection. For sure, at the same time that they were trying to blow up the World Trade Center Clinton was sending Al-Qaeda activists and Hezbollah activists to the Balkans to fight on the US side of the Balkans war, which happened to be at the same time. But since 1993 it's been obvious to anyone who reads the newspaper that horrendous terrorist atrocities of these kinds are possible and it's just a matter of time before they happen.

Terrible as the September 11 attacks were they don't actually change the risk analysis; the risk analysis remains the same. It was already there, and the fact that it was realized basically doesn't change anything, except, you know, for the atrocities itself. Well all of this is perfectly well known to administration planners, it's not a secret to anybody. They know all of this just as well as the establishment's critics and they are now keeping their debates within the establishment, within very narrow circles. The administration understands surely that the actions that they are announcing and taking increase the threat to the security of the American people and the world, and they don't want that consequence, but it's just not a high priority, there are other priorities that are much higher, such as global dominance and the domestic programs of rolling back the progressive legislation of the past century and beating back what business leaders call the rising political power of the masses. Business literature happens often to be rather like "vulgar Marxism" in its terminology, as do internal documents; different values but the same ideas.

The current leadership is extremist in pursuing these goals but the spectrum of ideas is narrow, and that's important to understand.

The elite criticism is unprecedented in its intensity, but much of it is based on a recognition that the policies may prove very harmful to the interests of power and privilege. The people who own the world don't want to lose it and these policies may destroy it. The criticism is also based on the belief that there are safer and more effective means to achieve pretty much the same goals.

A good illustration of it was discussed last night¹ and you all know about it; it is Brazil. Forty years ago Brazil had a slightly populist president with some degree of popular support and that was enough of a danger for the Kennedy administration to instigate a military coup which established the first of the "national security states", the neo-Nazi states that then swept through the hemisphere. Well, today Brazil has a far more impressive and far more radical president who was elected with enormous support from mass organizations that have developed in the past 20 years, but there is no talk of a military coup. The reasons could be several, but one reason is that it's simply not needed.

Neoliberalism² and the corrosion of democracy

As regards the economic consequences of the neoliberal measures of the past 30 years, the economic effects are debatable, but it is clearly understood that these measures undermine democracy; they essentially make it impossible. That was understood 70 years ago by John Maynard Keynes, who pointed out that the experiment in democratic self-government is endangered by the global international financial markets. And therefore the post-war economic system, post Second World War economic system, which was designed by Keynes and the US representative Harry Dexter White, was based on the principle that if you have free flow of capitals and free speculation against currencies

¹ See Francisco de Oliveira's article in this book.

² Since the word *neoliberalism* does not appear in many conventional English language dictionaries a little explanatory note is in order. Throughout this book *neoliberalism* refers to this new term introduced in the public discourse in the last ten or fifteen years. It refers to a unique blend of "neoclassical" economics -with its exaltation of unfettered free-markets and its reciprocal condemnation of any form of state intervention aimed at reducing the damages produced by social Darwinism- and neoconservative politics, with its emphasis on strong authority, religion, traditional values, and political restraint. The economic policies of *neoliberalism* are properly condensed in the Decalogue of the Washington Consensus and the "official line" of the IMF, the WB and the WTO. Despite some minor differences, its politics are exemplarily synthesized in the whole array of domestic and international initiatives of governments such as Bush Jr.'s in the US, Aznar's in Spain, and Blair's in the United Kingdom. Therefore, the term should not be confused with the word "liberal" in its American meaning.

states can't do anything because the economy can be destroyed, and also the principle that currencies must be pretty closely regulated; they stay within narrow bands so there won't be speculation against currencies. The first of the major steps that dismantled this system 30 years ago freed financial capital flows, and thus comes the predicted danger than may have destroyed the experiment in democratic self government. As these measures intensified and increased, they narrowed the possibilities for governments to undertake policies because policies are really determined by what is sometimes call the virtual parliament of investors and lenders who decide what policies they accept and if they don't like them they destroy the currency, undermine the economy and so on. Now, that's all been well understood for years and other elements of the neoliberal program also have this consequence; take privatization, which is a mantra of neoliberalism. There was no economic justification for privatization, but here's a very good political motivation: privatization reduces the public arena by definition, it transfers decisions from the public arena into the hands of unaccountable private tyrannies, which is what corporations are. And that by definition again undermines democracy. The privatization of services is now under negotiation; that, essentially, if carried out, reduces the public arena to virtually nothing. It reduces it so drastically that formal democracy can be tolerated, in fact introduced without undue concern that it might have any effects. Well, it's been widely observed that the extension of formal democracy in Latin America in recent years has been accompanied by a steady lack of faith in democracy. The reasons for that were pointed out by Atilio Boron. Years ago, namely, the extension of formal democracy coincided with the extension of neoliberal policies which undermined functioning democracy; and indeed were designed for that purpose. I mean, nobody says it, but it cannot be that people who apply them don't understand these simple points which were obvious to Keynes and otherwise true virtually by definition.

Well, many of the establishment critics of the Bush administration's extremism much prefer the softer measures for taming the beast, less dangerous ones. At home as well; there is a domestic analogue. It is also worth keeping very much in mind that the grim forecasts that are expressed here are largely shared by government planners across the spectrum. Samir Amin³ spoke yesterday of what he called "the trend toward apartheid on a global scale". And the US intelligence and

³ See Samir Amin's article in this book.

US military planners have similar expectations; they use a different terminology and they apply the policies that they expect to have these consequences instead of opposing them, but the analysis is approximately the same, so US intelligence and military planners –I am quoting– predict that globalization, meaning the neo-liberal style of globalization, will lead to a widening economic divide between the haves and the have-nots and that deepening economic stagnation, political instability and cultural alienation will lead to unrest and violence among the have-nots, much of it directed against the United States, perceived as the source of what they are suffering. This analysis happened to be from the Clinton administration, not the Bush administration; which again illustrates that the conceptions are widely shared. And military planning is in fact geared to this eventuality, quite explicitly. There is a domestic analogue; probably this view lies at the heart of the sharp increase in criminalization. In fact, throughout the neoliberal period the increase in jailings centered on the people who in Latin America are sometimes called disposable, the targets of “social cleansing”. The United States is more civilized; instead of murdering them you put them in jail, and this goes on right along with the neoliberal period. Clinton increased the numbers by about 50%. Well, all of this leads us back to the first dilemma: how do you control the population, the ones who are bearing the costs and the risks?

How to win the presidential elections of 2004?

A specific problem right now is how to win the coming election, the 2004 election. Well, if you want to know that’s done, go back to May 1st., 2003: recall the carefully staged performance in which President Bush landed on an aircraft carrier, placed in such a way that you get the right television pictures, wearing combat gear, helmet and so on; he was an object of ridicule and fear around the world but it was taken quite seriously in the United States. On its front page –I don’t know if it was meant seriously– the front page report in the *New York Times* described his victory speech as a powerful Reagan-like finale. Coming back to the meaning of this, the more astute observers described the event as the opening of the 2004 presidential campaign which will be built on national security themes. That was the *Wall Street Journal* report.

And Karl Rove, the campaign manager, made that clear; he said the theme of the coming election will be the battle of Iraq, emphasizing

ing “battle”, and not the war. The war will go on, the war is the war on terror, and that must continue because there is no other way to frighten the population into obedience, and if it happens to have negative consequences like the destruction of the country, that’s one of the costs you have to face. President Bush and his victory speech declared victory in a war on terror by removing an ally of Al-Qaeda; it’s immaterial that no competent observer including the CIA believes a single word of this. It’s a higher truth and therefore facts are irrelevant, including the fact that the only known connection between Iraq and terror is that the invasion apparently increased the threat of terror exactly as had been predicted, but it makes no difference and it continues. So a few weeks ago and in his regular weekly radio address the president announced that the world is safer today because their coalition ended the regime that cultivated ties to terror while it built weapons of mass destruction. That was a few weeks ago. Bush’s speechwriters and minders know very well that all of these are complete fabrications but they also know that if you repeat them often and often loudly enough they just become truth. They didn’t invent that but they know it, and it works. It works at least temporarily; it worked last September, September 2002. Within a few weeks about 60% of the population believed that Iraq was a threat to the security of the United States. No one in the world believed that, including Kuwait which had every reason to fear Saddam Hussein. He invaded them; they would’ve liked to tear him to shreds, but they didn’t regard Iraq as a threat –they knew that Iraq was the weakest country in the region, that it had been devastated by criminal sanctions. It was essentially disarmed, otherwise the United States would not have been willing to attack it. There was a horrible monster running it but not a threat to anyone, and in fact Kuwait had joined other countries in the region in trying to integrate Iraq back into their own regional system over strong US objections. But in the United States it was believed. Congress a few weeks later passed a resolution authorizing the president to use force because of the threat to the security of the United States posed by the government of Iraq. The press and intellectuals were kind enough not to remind us that Congress was repeating a script that is familiar. In 1985, President Reagan already declared the national emergency in the United States –pretty serious– because of what he called the unusual and extraordinary threat to the security of the United States posed by the government of Nicaragua, which was only two days’ driving time from Texas, so Americans had to tremble and fear before the Nicaraguan hordes who posed an unusual

and extraordinary threat, much worse than Saddam Hussein. And in fact all of this helps explain Karl Rove's confidence that they can carry it off in the coming election. Let's go back now to the powerful Reagan-like triumphalism reflected in Bush's victory speech.

Well, that's referring to Ronald Reagan's victory speech when he informed the country that "we are again standing tall" having conquered Grenada, overcoming the resistance of a few dozen construction workers with six thousand special forces who got eight thousand medals of gold during the invasion. So we were standing tall and the powerful Reaganian finale on the first of May, on the aircraft carrier, was a recollection of that grand moment of modern history.

Well, that went on right through the 1980s. Every year there was some new scare. Libyan hitmen were wandering the streets of Washington to assassinate our leader, part of Libya's campaign to expel America from the world. Reagan said Grenadan and Nicaraguan crime in the streets were a threat to our existence. The first president Bush won the 1988 election basically by playing the race card, by appealing to the threat of the black criminal, who's going to rape your sister unless you elect me. The drug scare works about the same; drugs and crime in the United States are about the same as in other industrial societies, but fear of crime and drugs, which is manipulated, is much higher, and it has its effects. The method worked for about 12 years, exactly 12 years that the administration was able to stay in office, even though the population was quite strongly opposed to its policies which again did harm most people. In fact, by 1992 Reagan was considered the most unpopular living ex president, right next to Nixon, and far more so than Carter and Ford. Well, so they want to replay the same script, not surprisingly –it worked well before, let's try it again.

The stake on world domination

All the above is fundamental for the dominant group in the United States. And a lot is at stake in the current situation. Internationally one stake is world domination, which is not a small minor goal. And also control over Middle East oil. The expectation I presume is that the United States will end up with military bases in Iraq, stable bases right at the heart of the oil producing region for the first time, in a client state, a state which will be called free and independent and even democratic, but in secret will be described the way the British in secret

described their colonial domains. It will be run by what the British called an Arab façade, behind which Britain effectively ruled. That's pretty much the way the United States has run its own backyard, Central America and Caribbean, for a hundred years, and it's familiar in the history of imperialism. It's particularly important in the Middle East. Back in 1945 the State Department recognized that particularly the oil of the Gulf region is a stupendous source of strategic power and one of the greatest "material" prizes in world history. That's not a small thing and the US must of course control it; that has been a leading theme of post-war history. The same intelligence predictions that I have mentioned before had anticipated that the Gulf region will provide about two thirds of the energy resources of the world in the next generation. And therefore the US must control them. Notice that control doesn't mean access—it doesn't matter whether the US uses the oil, in fact if the US shifted to solar energy it will still have to control the oil. In fact they predict and anticipate that the US itself will rely on more stable Atlantic basin resources, West Africa and the Western hemisphere, fundamentally Canada, Mexico, Venezuela and Colombia—and that is part of the reason for the great concern about the conflicts in the Andean region. But even though the US won't particularly access Middle East oil itself, it wants to control it. This stupendous source of strategic power remains and as US planners pointed out 50 years ago, controlling it gives what they call veto power over what other governments may do. So there's a very powerful international interest at stake and there are also powerful domestic interests.

The Bush administration people are not conservatives, they are radical statist reactionaries, which is something quite different. Their policies right away included a huge increase in federal spending, in fact the biggest increase since the Reagan administration came in, that is since they came in the first time, combined with a massive tax cut for the rich, and the consequences of that are perfectly obvious. It leads to what economists call a fiscal derailment. In fact, the government own economists now estimate unpayable bills of approximately 45 trillion dollars, which is about six times the total gross domestic product. The presidential spokesman was asked about that in a press conference and he responded that yes, it is correct, and therefore Congress will have to be responsible in dealing with Medicare, the health programs (limited but that do exist), Social Security and other programs for the population, and when he said they have to be responsible he didn't mean fund them with progressive taxation, he

meant destroy them. And that's the point. The point is this phrase, which comes from the budget director of the first Reagan administration: we have to starve the beast, we have to starve those parts of the government that serve the general public. You can't run for office by saying I want to eliminate health care, security, schools, roads and so on, but you can run for office saying, well, I'm sorry but we have a huge unpayable debt of 45 trillion dollars so we just can't fund any of those things but of course we can still continue to fund and in fact expand those parts of the government that serve the powerful and the privileged. That's essentially the program and it's not very secret. The heart of that is military spending but you have to remember about military spending that its purpose and its function, to a substantial extent, is domestic: it provides a cover for the development of the technology of the future. If you use a computer and the internet and telecommunications and so on you are enjoying the results of decades of transfer of cost and risk to the public under the pretext of national defense, so that then the results can be turned over to private corporations for profit and that has been true –that's true for almost the entire so-called "new economy" and it's also planned for the economy of the future. That's also one of the many respects in which the rich and powerful wouldn't dream of participating in market systems. "Markets are for the poor and defenseless, not for the rich". That's essentially the script followed, in its most extreme form, in the past but familiar now too. And there is only one method to get the public to pay the costs, take the risks, suffer the consequences; and that is to press the panic bottom.

The Old and the New Europe

Well, there are other dilemmas of dominance. One of them, a crucial one, is controlling other major power centers. The most spectacular achievement of the propaganda campaign of the past year has not, in my opinion, been in creating fantastic images of Iraq, not that that wasn't spectacular enough, but there was something more dramatic, namely the admiration for the president' inspiring vision of bringing democracy to the Middle East, tribute to a "yearning for democracy" as some press commentators described it. This noble presidential vision proceeded right alongside the most remarkable display of hatred and contempt for democracy that I have ever seen. I can't recall

any counterpart. And the two went side by side with, as far as I can see, no comment. An illustration of what I mean is for example the distinction between the Old and the New Europe that was the main theme of the early part of the year. Old Europe: Germany and France are the bad guys, the ones we hate and rival. New Europe: Berlusconi and Aznar and the former Russian satellites so we admire for their marvelous achievements. What's the criterion that distinguishes New Europe from Old Europe? Well, it's absolutely clear and definitive. Old Europe, the bad Europe, were the countries where the governments took the same position as the overwhelming majority of their population. New Europe were the countries where the governments overruled an even larger proportion of their population. The criterion was absolutely explicit –you couldn't say more dramatically "I hate and despise democracy". Maybe the most extreme, most dramatic example was Turkey. Everyone was surprised the Turkish government took the same position as 95% of the population, and they were bitterly condemned for lacking democratic credentials –this is actually the word it was used. Paul Wolfowitz, who was supposed to be the great visionary, even condemned the Turkish military because they didn't intervene to prevent the government from taking the same position as 95% of the population and he urged them, meaning ordered them, to apologize to the United States for this departure from democratic credentials, and to agree to help the United States. All of this went on almost without comment. Although some of the commentaries were absolutely amazing. Such prominent intellectuals as Robert Kagan condemned what he called the paranoid conspiratorial anti-Americanism of Old Europe and its feverish intensity –meaning how can Europeans fail to comprehend that we are noble and that their task is to serve us. Fortunately there were enlightened figures like Berlusconi and Aznar who understood that and the same was true in the former Russian satellites, where they have experience in the matter.

The highest achiever among them is Latvia. The former foreign minister was asked why the Latvian government supported the United States even though the population was overwhelmingly opposed, and he gave the right answer. He said: "We have to salute and shout, 'Yes, sir!,' we have to please America, that will demonstrate our democratic credentials". All of this went on without comment by the press that witnessed this vision of democracy. That's quite an achievement. I don't think many totalitarian states could achieve that kind of propaganda effect. Well, the hatred and fear of Old Europe, France and

Germany particularly, that had much deeper reasons than the visceral fear and contempt for democracy. Ever since World War II there has been a considerable concern that Europe might go on an independent course. During the Cold War this was called the “fear of a third force”. There’s no time to talk about it but there’s quite an interesting history that is coming out of the US and Russian archive records, about this interplay through the 50s and the 60s. The appearance of a third force has been a major concern all along.

The year 1973, 30 years ago, was the year of what should be called and in Latin America is often called the other 9/11. That’s the September 11 coup that overthrew Allende, killing several thousand people, the equivalent of maybe 60 thousand in the United States by conservative estimate. That 9/11 as you know was strongly supported and partly instigated by the United States and Kissinger expressed its reasons. The reasons were that Allende’s victory could be a virus that would spread contagion, not just through Latin America but through Southern Europe –it would send the message that there can be a peaceful road to some form of social democracy and independence and that is unacceptable. In fact at the very same time in Southern Europe the United States was carrying out extensive subversion similar to Chile’s particularly in Italy. Major CIA operations had been going on; in fact they’d been going out since 1947, and they were going on in the early 70s, to prevent Italian democracy from functioning. They even included supporting fascist elements, as in fact happened in Greece right next door. It was happening at the same time. United States is a global power; what’s happening in one place is usually happening somewhere else. And the fear there too was the spreading of contagion.

Incidentally, the Kremlin agreed on this; they too hated and feared the rise of what was called Eurocommunism, and a little later any form of social democracy. In Europe they feared it just as much as Kissinger did; they had the same perception. Well, this fear of successful independent development is, I think, the primary theme of the Cold War, masked under security pretexts by both sides.

Cuba is a very striking case, the declassified records are extremely illuminating about this, but I am sure you know about it –this is not new, nothing new about it. The Tsar and Metternich warned of the contagion of republican principles from the liberated American colonies which they said might undermined the marvelous order of Europe and Kissinger was probably just quoting the tsar and

Metternich when he warned of the contagion of Allende in Chile and of social democracy in Italy. Let us not forget that he is an expert on that period of history.

The same year, 1973, was designated “the year of Europe” –that was the year of celebration of Europe’s definitive recovery from the war, and Kissinger gave an important address called “The Year of Europe Address” in which he warned Europe to keep to its regional interests, within the overall framework of order that would be managed by the United States– “don’t go on an independent course”. And of course France and Germany are the industrial and commercial and financial heartland of Europe so if they go on an independent course it’s very frightening. The moves to expand NATO and the European Union and the deep concern right now about an independent European military force all fall within this framework of very long standing concerns.

There’s another concern: Northeast Asia. Northeast Asia is the most dynamic economic area in the world, the fastest growing. Its joint gross domestic product is much higher than that of the United States, it has about half of the foreign exchange in the world, it’s greatly involved in world trade and growing beyond the US and Europe and it is a region that is potentially integrated and self sufficient. It has plenty of energy resources in Eastern Siberia; there is now big conflict over pipeline construction –you now, who’s going to get the advantages from them. It has some of the leading industrial powers in the world, Japan and South Korea, China coming along. The US is quite concerned that it too might achieve some form of independence including energy independence, which means freeing itself from the veto power that comes from the control of the sources of energy and the transit routes. That lies at the background of US military interests in the Middle East and central Asia. The big question is about which way the pipelines will go from central Asia and also concerns about North Korea and many other issues. Again there’s too much to talk about at this time as I would like to.

The new faces of the arms race

Let us again take up the initial idea: the bellicose strategy of National Security is dangerous, even, and especially, for the United States. Current technological resources make it possible to attack anywhere,

without prior notice, and with such detailed monitoring that it makes it possible to see cars crossing the streets in some city located in the antipodes. This reduces the need for military bases abroad and for allies and –in principle and perhaps in practice– offers an incredible way of controlling the world through violence. It also, in all likelihood, offers a method to destroy the world because it is known that these systems are extremely dangerous. And of course, in the face of this, other international actors don't remain indifferent, and react.

Russia, for example, has already responded with a marked increase in its military capability. Military expenditure has been increasing by around a third in the last year, reacting to the United States' plans exactly as it was expected to. Nowadays it is concentrating on the manufacture of missiles of greater sophistication and variety, including more advanced submarines that are equipped with improved intercontinental missiles. After the United States dismantled the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, Russia apparently repositioned itself by setting up its missiles in what is called "Launch and Warning" mode, or, what amounts to the same thing, automatic response, and this is virtually a recipe for destroying the world. Its deteriorated command and control system potentially guarantees an accident, and the likelihood of this happening will increase as these military systems are expanded. All of this is well known, and it can all be read about in the technical magazines. Only two weeks ago, the Russian defense minister, Sergei Ivanov, informed NATO that Russia is adopting the Bush doctrine of first attack, which includes nuclear attack against a perceived threat. Well, that is Bush's National Security strategy. Now the world is a more insecure place, Russia having decided to follow the United States' initiative in the strategic field. One cannot expect to reserve this right exclusively for oneself; the Russians are following the example and presumably others will react in a similar way. This is the well-known logic of escalation.

The same is true in relation to the so-called Missile Defense. This has been perfectly well understood by military specialists in China and the United States. In fact, both employ the same terms and know equally well that Missile Defense is an offensive weapon. What these analysts say is that defense with missiles is not only a shield but also a source that supplies the necessary means for a first nuclear strike in the hope of surviving a retaliation, with the expectable consequences. China is responding exactly as expected through an increase in its offensive nuclear military capacity, which forces India

to respond in the same manner, which in turn forces Pakistan to respond, and afterwards all this has its effects on the Middle East and in a large part of the rest of the world.

Again, all this is known, only that these threats, including threats of mass destruction, aren't paid sufficient and due attention. More evidence on the ranking of the threats was generated in September and October 2002. On September 19, two days after the announcement of the new National Security strategy, the Bush administration destroyed international efforts to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) which envisioned the supply of monitoring and control mechanisms that would prevent their development. Soon after, on October 23, the United States blocked the efforts made at the United Nations to prevent the militarization of outer space—which the UN correctly described as a serious danger to international peace and security—and also blocked efforts aimed at reaffirming a protocol of 1925 forbidding bacteriological warfare, a very serious threat for the United States, probably impossible to forestall. A good example are the anthrax attacks: even although the tracking of this element led to a federal laboratory, where these actions came from still hasn't been discovered, which illustrates the difficulties that exist to prevent such attempts. The efforts to forbid it were blocked by the Bush administration last October. Since 1999, the United States has blocked efforts to reaffirm and strengthen the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 that forbids the militarization of space. This too has been blocked since the year 2000, and Washington also blocked negotiations at the United Nations Conference on Disarmament and Militarization of Outer Space.

Recently, the Bush administration announced that it is no longer limited by Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. This article is the only one that establishes obligations on the nuclear powers, since it imposes a commitment to make efforts in good faith to eliminate nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, all powers have violated it. In fact, the Bush administration is, openly and brazenly, developing new nuclear weapons that will naturally lead others to respond in the same manner.

All these initiatives increase the risks to survival. The same is true with regard to the protection of the environment: the refusal to accept the Kyoto Protocols and other, similar measures is well known, and there is absolutely nothing new in this. Anyone who knows something of history, including the most recent events, knows that the his-

torical record is replete with examples of leaders willing to run the risks of destruction in order to promote their interests with regard to power, dominance and enrichment. The difference now is above all a difference of scale. Now the stakes are much higher. In fact the stakes are really the survival of mankind.

The overall conclusion, I think –and part of this is the reason why there is a sector of the elite that is opposed to the particular forms of dominance promoted by the Bush administration– is that violence is indeed a powerful instrument of control. History demonstrates it, but the dilemmas of violence are not insignificant and we should understand them in all their complexity.