



DUBOIS WAS RIGHT

Malcom Lagauche
July 12, 2005

The great American historian/sociologist/activist W.E.B. DuBois was asked about the impending Soviet threat in 1958. He responded, "No country threatens us. We threaten the world." His assessment was as correct then as it is almost five decades later.

When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, the world hailed the end of the Cold War. The U.S. and the Soviet Union could once again spend their money on such unimportant items as education, health care, infrastructure upgrades, and employment. The term used in the U.S. was "the peace dividend."

While most of the world was celebrating a future of world peace, the U.S., almost stealthily began to write the last chapter of its book on taking over the world. Today, the results are evident to anyone except mainstream America. They are still in a state of denial and want to wreak vengeance upon the rest of the world. To them, the Cold War is still being enacted, but with different players. The decades-old battle of East vs. West has turned 90 degrees to a North vs. South battle. The North represents mainly the U.S., with Europe being a neutral observer, and the South is comprised of Third World nations, most of whom are populated by people of color.

The 1990s were a crucial time in the development of U.S. world hegemony. Little-by-little, the pieces began to fall for the rest of the world as America extended its tentacles to every corner of the Earth. At times, there was direct military intervention; at times military threats; and, when the military hardware did not have to be pulled out of the warehouses, economic intrusion did the job.

Today, the United States has a military presence in more than 160 countries. The United Nations consists of 192 national members, so there are few countries left without a U.S. military presence.

In 1997, an organization, The Project for the New American Century, was formed with little fanfare. The group's goal was for the military takeover of the world in the 21st century. Many of its charter members are now active in the Bush administration; people such as Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, and Donald Rumsfeld. Add to that list the names of Jeb Bush, Dan Quayle, Elliot Abrams, Gary Bauer, Eliot Cohen, William Bennett, and others, and you have a roster of some dangerous individuals: individuals who a decade ago would have been considered wackos by the

American public and political establishment. The Republican Party itself used to refer to these people as "the crazies."

The crazies are now in power. They surround Bush and pump their ideology to him and he, in turn, passes it on to the public. The problem is that the crazies now represent the thought process of tens of millions of Americans.

These people may be crazy, but they are not stupid. They have found and exploited the ethnocentric nerve that runs through many Americans. It's okay to mess around with the world because nobody is as good as an American. When the discussion comes up about military intervention or economic sanctions, most Americans praise the decision and allow the leaders to enact their vile policies.

A common term used by Americans is "Let's teach them a lesson." When I hear it, I ask who "them" are and rarely do I get an answer. Then I ask the key question, one of which I have never received an astute answer, "Why?" Most people go blank when queried about a reason.

How does the U.S. control many countries? Let's look at Egypt as an example. The Egyptian military is mainly supplied by the U.S. But, the U.S. has put limits on the independence of the Egyptian military by limiting stocks of spare parts as well as controlling the communications of the military. Hence, if the Egyptian army became a threat to Israel, it would be quickly halted by Washington.

The Egyptian military's main task is to protect Mubarak, Egypt's president. He is in the pockets of the U.S. and he must remain in power without opposition.

Let's look at control of the population of Egypt by the U.S. Egypt is a country that must rely on outside help to feed its quickly-expanding population. The U.S. supplies four million tons of wheat a year to Egypt through aid programs that must be approved by Congress. And, many of those who vote for this aid are pro-Israel. Mubarak knows this and does not rock the boat. If he did, his country would quickly suffer a devastating famine.

Many Democrats decry the Bush administration about its foreign policy and its hegemony, but they are just as much to blame as the current Republican junta. During the 1990s, Clinton spokespeople lied about Iraq and its weapons of mass destruction and kept the embargo in place that killed close to two million Iraqis. Actually, more Iraqis died during Clinton's stint than under the two Bush's. Madeleine Albright, Clinton's Secretary of State, when asked if the embargo was worth the lives of a million Iraqi children, unhesitatingly answered, "Yes."

Bush has merely escalated the xenophobia and ethnocentrism that grips much of the U.S. He has taken world domination up a notch. At least Clinton was more subtle about how world domination would occur and he never made the statement that Bush did when he promised "to export death and violence to the four corners of the earth in defense of this great country and rid the world of evil."

Omar Barghouti, an independent Palestinian political analyst, stated, "We are witnessing the ominous rise of the most powerful empire ever to exist. Judging from consistent media reports and opinion polls, the rest of the world seems to view it as a menacing rogue state that is arrogantly bullying other nations, east and west, north and south, into unqualified submission to its self-declared designs for world domination and incontestable economic supremacy."

He has aptly stated how the rest of the world looks at the U.S. — a view totally opposite to that shared by most Americans. Barghouti added, "A century and a half after officially abolishing slavery in the U.S., the new-old masters have a diabolic agenda to resurrect it, except this time on a worldwide scale."

The U.S. has copied the former imperialist actions of Great Britain in forcing countries to relinquish their raw materials. Today's treasures, instead of gold, cotton and spices, can be explained in one word — oil. This commodity is not just a raw material for fueling the economies of the world, but it has become the number one item for power and bragging rights. Hence, Iraq had to be invaded by the U.S. for a show of power. According to Robert E. Ebel, director of the energy program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, "Oil fuels military power, national treasuries, and international politics. It is no longer a commodity to be bought and sold within the confines of traditional energy supply and demand balances. Rather, it has been transformed onto a determinant of well-being, of national security, and of international power."

Michael Klare, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, added, "Controlling Iraq is about oil as power, rather than oil as fuel. Control over the Persian Gulf translates into control over Europe, Japan, and China. It's like having our hand on the spigot."

Now, it becomes even more clear why the U.S. had to invade Iraq. It was for total domination, not for the ouster of a regime or the destruction of invisible weapons. The Portuguese writer and Nobel laureate, Jose Saramago said, "We are marching against the law of the jungle that the United States and its acolytes old and new want to impose on the world."

Even former U.N. Secretary General Boutros Ghali, who more than once was conned by the U.S. in U.N. affairs, sees the entire picture. He said, "Multilateralism and unilateralism are just methods for the United States: they use them a la carte, as it suits them. The United Nations is just an instrument at the service of American policy."

There are millions of Americans who hold the U.N. in contempt, saying that the New York-based agency is attempting to take away U.S. sovereignty. They speak of a "one-world government" in which the U.N. rules every country. I look at this with an opposite view. I maintain that the U.S. uses the U.N. when it can for legitimacy, and, when the members oppose the U.S., the Americans tell them to go perform sexual acts on themselves.

The acquiescence of the American people toward their government's policies (both Democratic and Republican parties) has led us to a point in history that is very dangerous for the rest of the world. Eventually, that danger will rebound in America. I never thought I would be the citizen of a country that, in its own words, tells its citizens not to visit over 100 countries on the Earth because their lives may be in danger. The Department of State website lists all the countries. They consist of democracies, dictatorships, leftist governments, rightist governments, etc. In other words, there is no common political persuasion to the opposition of U.S. policy worldwide. And, I take offense that my own government has taken away my freedom of travel and turned what was once an enjoyable vacation into a harrowing life-threatening experience.

Now, the rest of the world knows of the U.S. version of the Earth and it does not agree. There is a backlash that is growing, both on the political and military levels.

A German journalist recently stated, "Every day conservative U.S. ideologues deepen the rift by accusing Europeans alternatively of being arrogant, incompetent or simply stupid. In this situation, there remains nothing for the Europeans to do than to free themselves once and for all from the U.S. Politically and morally, it will not be a problem — but militarily, things are much more difficult."

He hit the nail right on the head. U.S. military might is overwhelming. While the rest of the world was talking of the "peace dividend" following the Cold War, the U.S. just kept on increasing its war machine. However, there are a few things happening now that could alter the balance.

First, France, Belgium and Germany are behind an effort to create a strong European military, aloof of NATO. The U.S. has told them that it is not necessary, but forward-thinking Europeans think otherwise. They can see their countries being future Iraqs within decades.

Now, let's look at another event that will slow down the U.S. power grab. In Iraq, the people are fighting back. For decades, the U.S. has been able to conduct "wars" against various Third World countries with little loss of life on the U.S. side, but with massive numbers of deaths and damage to the opponents. In Panama and Grenada, the U.S. death toll was a couple of dozen. In Somalia, again a few dozen. In the campaign against Serbia, the U.S. did not lose one service person. The irony of the Serbian campaign is that the former president of Serbia is on trial in The Hague for killing al-Qaida-trained Muslim insurgents in Serbia, while U.S. soldiers today receive medals of merit for executing the same actions against Afghans.

Current Iraq is a different story. The U.S. lost about 100 soldiers before Bush declared victory on May 1, 2003. That was a small price to pay. But, the Iraqis are offended by the U.S. presence and an all-out resistance is currently making things difficult for the Americans. Almost 1,800 have died since the victory statement and over 13,000 have been wounded, most with severe injuries such as lost limbs, blindness, brain damage, etc.

The momentum is beginning to change, however, the U.S. has not picked up on this. Bush is still threatening every country that does not kiss his backside, and Kerry says he will maintain the status quo if elected. Kerry says he will send even more troops to Iraq and he has criticized Bush for being soft on Cuba. He does not get it either.

I am not a firm believer in the adage that history repeats itself. However, I have heard discussions about the rise and fall of the Roman Empire in comparison with today's U.S.-dominated world and I must admit that there is compelling logic in the argument.