

## NEO-CON IMPERIALISM OR APOCALYPSE NOW?

by Darren Owen *Friday, Sep 8 2006, 4:30pm*

international / social/political / opinion/analysis

**Originally published in 2003, this article presents an extremely sobering read today!**

It appears that the greater majority of the American public have not kept pace with the rapidly developing neo-con "Bush Doctrine" of pre-emptive military strikes against sovereign states as laid out in last September's National Security Strategy. A strategy expressly forbidden and outlawed in the Geneva Convention and Nuremberg Treaty but long sought after by neo-cons seeking a global American empire predicated on military force. A doctrine that establishes the unquestioned sovereignty of the United States over any and all international laws while subjecting all other sovereign states to yield to the power of its military might. As James Kurth of Swarthmore College recently stated in an article in the National Interest, "Today there is only one empire, the global empire of the United States."

In this troubled post modern era, the United States has chosen to embrace a doctrine of force heading down a roadmap of unilateralism in international affairs that leads in only one direction, universalistic nationalism.

In the publication known as Foreign Policy an article written by Christopher Layne, a senior fellow in foreign policy studies at Cato Institute and Benjamin Schwartz, an analyst in the International Policy Department at the Rand Corporation entitled, "American Hegemony Without an Enemy," writes,

"After World War II Washington sought an international order based upon preponderant (American) power. That objective had very little to do with any existing or projected Soviet actions; in fact, American statesmen knew that their wide-ranging objective (of world domination) would increase Soviet insecurity and thereby the risk of war.

If fear of Soviet expansion had been the ... (real) reason to bring Western Europe and East Asia under the American security umbrella ... why does Washington continue to insist that an American-led NATO and the U.S. defense commitments to East Asia are still indispensable to America's security (after the demise of the Soviet Union)? The answer is that the basic aspiration of U.S. security policy since the Second World War has not been to contain the Soviets ... The Cold War (merely) provided the ... (excuse) for the strategy of (American) preponderance ... (The reality is that) American foreign policy ... springs from the ... outlook ... that (America must link the world to itself economically) ... and it is not an exaggeration to suggest that ... (this) has ... inexorably resulted in a globe-girdling empire." [Foreign Policy entitled, "American Hegemony - Without an Enemy" (Fall, 1993, No. 92, pg. 5) published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace]. ]

To truly appreciate this unbridled intolerance and aggressive reshaping of a "New World Order" of American imperialism, it is necessary that we go backward in time to gain a better perspective of the neo-cons and their Utopian goal of an unchallenged American superpower acting as the benevolent global hegemon.

SELF APPOINTED MESSIAHS

So let us begin by first answering the question, "just what exactly is a neo-con, what do they believe and where did they come from?" Regrettably, many Americans have no idea and equate the term with a "modern day" republican.

In short, neo-conservatism seeks U.S. military and economic domination of the world.

They envision a "New World Order", a new era of 'Enlightenment' by imposing what they term, "moral clarity and purpose" of "American exceptionalism" upon the world through forced military democratisation. A war is peace doctrine that flouts and dismantles international laws through open-ended warfare while maintaining both foreign and domestic rule. This messianic vision of an American global empire smacks of a totalitarian Orwellian super state with apocalyptic consequences for all humanity.

From the Foreign Policy Research Institute comes an article from Walter A. McDougall entitled, "Why Some Neo-Cons Are Wrong About U.S. Foreign Policy". In it, McDougall confronts the neocon agenda as laid out by the Cofounders of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) think tank, William Kristol and Robert Kagan in their article in Foreign Affairs "Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy," July-August 1996 that "benevolent hegemony" is a contradiction in terms. Such a self-conscious, self-righteous bid for global hegemony is bound to drive foreign rivals into open hostility to the U.S. and make our allies resentful and nervous. Secondly, the authors' argument again ignores the historical record, which demonstrates that U.S. diplomacy has been most successful when it weighs in against would-be hegemonies such as Germany and the Soviet Union for the purpose, as John F. Kennedy said, "to make the world safe for diversity." But Kristol and Kagan would have us arrogate to ourselves a hegemony for the purpose of making the world over in our image. Thirdly, there is a huge difference between promoting democracy for the purpose of undermining an aggressive dictatorial enemy, and turning some authoritarian country into an enemy because it is laggard in embracing American values.

A brief summary of the neo-conservative agenda can be found in the on the website of the American Enterprise Institute, a Washington think-tank that advises the Pentagon (Where Vice President Dick Cheney's wife, Lynn Cheney currently sits on AEI's Board of Directors): in an article entitled, "War Has Its Reasons,"

"Influential neo-conservatives, including Rumsfeld, Cheney, Wolfowitz, William Kristol, Douglas Feith, and Richard Perle, have been arguing for years in favour of an assertive U.S. strategy in the post-Cold War world. In 1997, they and other like-minded intellectuals organized the Project for the New American Century, which urged then-President Clinton to confront Iraq. "America was being too timid, too weak, and too unassertive in the post-Cold War world," Kristol argues. "American leadership was key to, not only world stability, but any hope for spreading democracy and freedom around the world."

Hartcher says,

"This [war] is about the neo-conservative view, the idealistic view, the Wilsonian view, that the world would be a better place if only America can make it that way." The neo-conservatives advocate a paradigm shift in which the United States spreads American values by asserting American power-by force, if necessary."

Neoconservatives have even given a name to their agenda of a Global American Empire, "Pax Americana" a term that has its predecessor in the British Empire, "Pax Britannia", from whose genesis is the "Pax Romana", the name for the Roman Empire. Both former Pax having ruled the

world through military might till over stretched and broken economically, with the fall of Rome ushering in the Dark Ages.

This neo-con strategic way of thinking is now guiding US foreign policy to establish their "American World Empire". But the neo-cons desire more than just World domination through their "Pax Americana", neo-cons envision the domination and control of space as well. Stating that much like the control of the high seas in the past, like "Pax Britannia, "sea Power" is to be replaced by "space power". This control even extends to cyberspace or the "infosphere" as tactical objectives to be realized. In *Rebuilding Americas Defenses* they state the necessity for the creation of a "new military service - U.S. Space Forces - with the mission of space control." (Page 5 "Key Findings"- see also 54-57) Just as recent as fall of 2002 the U.S. stood in the way of UN attempts to ban the militarisation of space.

In no uncertain terms, this new foreign policy is nothing less than a messianic crusade. A crusade of global military redemption in pursuit of 'moral clarity' through "American principals of governance abroad," As spelled out by William Kristol and Donald Kagan, co-founders of the Project for the New American Century.

The ideology of the neo-cons who have hijacked our government and are using their influence to direct foreign affairs is all together frightening in its consequences for humanity. Consequences on an apocalyptic order that if left un-checked, will lay waste to the security of the world in the name of peace.

If the thought of a unipolar world run by neo-conservatives driven by messianic ideals in charge of the most powerful military machine the world has ever known is not scary enough, read on, it only gets more bizarre.

The tension in the world is on the rise, and the neo-con crusade is fast leading to a clash of civilizations between the Western and the Moslem world. As Bush said, "you are either with us or with them," this is a "crusade," against the dreaded "axis-of-evil" nations in pre-emptive strikes, with or without the UN. As a messianic and "enlightened" leader with "moral clarity" such a leader is freed from any and all international laws to do as he pleases based on the "Infinite Justice" and "Enduring Freedom" of the cause. Such a leader might even conclude that God speaks to him!

"God told me to strike at Al Qaeda and I struck them." "And then he instructed me to strike at Saddam, which I did."

"And now I am determined to solve the problem in the Middle East. If you help me I will act, and if not, the elections will come and I will have to focus on them."

As General Boykin has repeatedly told Christian groups around the country that President George W. Bush was chosen by God to lead the global fight against Satan.

He told one gathering: "Why is this man in the White House? The majority of Americans did not vote for him. He's in the White House because God put him there for a time such as this."

A time such as this is a time of deeply troubling consequence for all humanity.

With a President who states boldly, "Bring them on", World War III is looking more plausible than ever. So it is in all our best interests if we take some time away from the television and the propaganda media machine and find out a little more about these neo-conservatives who want to

rule the world as self appointed elite benevolent dictators by hijacking America.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PHILOSOPHER KINGS

There are those who say Neo-cons first arrived on the scene in the early 70's with, as some would call him, "the godfather of neo-cons," Leo Strauss, a Jewish German born fascist. As Jeffrey Steinberg writes in an article entitled "Profile: Leo Strauss, Fascist Godfather of the Neo-Cons".

"The hallmark of Strauss' approach to philosophy was his hatred of the modern world, his belief in a totalitarian system, run by "philosophers," who rejected all universal principles of natural law, but saw their mission as absolute rulers, who lied and deceived a foolish "populist" mass, and used both religion and politics as a means of disseminating myths that kept the general population in clueless servitude. For Strauss and all of his protégés (Strauss personally had 100 Ph.D. Students, and the "Straussians" now dominate most university political science and philosophy departments), the greatest object of hatred was the United States itself, which they viewed as nothing better than a weak, pathetic replay of "liberal democratic" Weimar Germany.

It was this perceived weakness of America's excesses and lack of military projection that drove this early band of Jewish liberals to add the prefix "neo" to conservative to reflect their arrogant ideological thinking that called for the use of American military superiority to democratise the world though lies and deceit of the masses for their political objective.

This philosophy of deception is one of the critical elements of neo-conservative thought. William Pfaff of the International Herald Tribune writes in "The long reach of Leo Strauss' neo-conservatives"

"He (Leo Strauss) also argued that Platonic truth is too hard for people to bear, and that the classical appeal to "virtue" as the object of human endeavour is unattainable. Hence it has been necessary to tell lies to people about the nature of political reality. An elite recognizes the truth, however, and keeps it to itself. This gives it insight, and implicitly power that others do not possess. This obviously is an important element in Strauss's appeal to America's neo-conservatives."

His real appeal to the neo-conservatives, in my view, is that his elitism presents a principled rationalization for policy expediency, and for "necessary lies" told to those whom the truth would demoralize." (Emphasis added)

Pfaff stresses that it is important to understand the philosophy of Strauss, "because his followers are in charge of U.S. foreign policy."

And who are these new philosopher kings ruling our government though lies and deception?

One well known Straussian is William Kristol, co-founder of the Project for the New American Century who when interviewed for the book, "Gang of Five" by Nina J., Easton held nothing back when he said,

"One of the main teachings [of Strauss] is that all politics are limited and none of them is really based on the truth. So there's a certain philosophic disposition where you have some distance from these political fights.... You don't take yourself or your causes as seriously as you would if you thought this was 100% 'truth.' Political movements are always full of partisans fighting for their opinion. But that's very different from 'the truth.'"

Other Straussians include:

Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz; Abram Shulsky of the Pentagon's Office of Special Plans, Richard Perle of the Pentagon advisory board, Elliott Abrams of the National Security Council, John Podhoretz, editorial page editor of Murdoch's yellow tabloid, the New York Post, former editor of The Weekly Standard, Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas; Attorney General John Ashcroft; I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, chief of staff and chief national security advisor to Vice President Cheney, who was introduced to the world of Leo Strauss by his own Yale University professor and mentor, Paul Wolfowitz; Pentagon disinformation officer Abram Shulsky; Gary Schmitt, executive director of the Kristol-led Project for the New American Century (PNAC); David Brook, another editor of The Weekly Standard; Werner Dannhauser, a protégé of Strauss, who left academia to assume the editorship of the flagship neo-con magazine Commentary following the retirement of Norman Podhoretz; and Robert Kagan, also of The Weekly Standard, and the son of leading Yale University Straussian Donald Kagan and William Kristol, the co-founder with Robert Kagan of the the Project for the New American Century established in 1997.

## TROTSKY AND THE "PERMANENT REVOLUTION"

While there can be no doubt that Leo Strauss is the Godfather of the Neo-cons, it can also be said that Leon Trotsky is their Grandfather in an article titled "Trotsky's ghost wandering the White House -- Influence on Bush aides:

Bolshevik's writings supported the idea of pre-emptive war" Jeet Heer writes for the National Post,

"To this day, Schwartz speaks of Trotsky affectionately as "the old man" and "L.D." (initials from Trotsky's birth name, Lev Davidovich Bronstein).

"To a great extent, I still consider myself to be [one of the] disciples of L.D," he admits, and he observes that in certain Washington circles, the ghost of Trotsky still hovers around. At a party in February celebrating a new book about Iraq, Schwartz exchanged banter with Wolfowitz about Trotsky, the Moscow Trials and Max Shachtman

Leon Trotsky, a Marxist revolutionary continued with the Marxist philosophy of the materialist conception of history, economic and political theory of the laws of capitalist society and its socialist transformation. A brief summation of what Trotsky believed will shed considerable light on to why the neo-cons are so beloved of "the old man" and their totalitarian world empire ideology.

From an article entitled "Trotsky, one of the great leaders of Marxism first published August 21, 1941 we read,

"The investigation of Trotsky's work as a theoretician is a timely task of particular importance."

"Trotsky is the theoretician of the 'permanent revolution' in the 20th century. As such he developed and proclaimed laws of Marxist theory which govern a) the relationship between the bourgeois and proletarian revolution, b) the passing of the revolution from the national to the international plane, c) the transformation of the international revolution to a world revolution (noteworthy here is the further development of the theory of the motive forces of and the course of the revolutions in the backward colonial or semi-colonial countries - Russia 1917, Chinese revolution 1925-27: law of "combined development "as a logical development of the law of "uneven development", d) the strategy and tactics of modern civil war,[1] e) the economic and sociological preconditions in the development of the socialist plan, f) the conditions and the course of bureaucratic degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship in an isolated national state."

Trotsky's theory is called "Permanent Revolution" which he first published in 1930.

This was the central idea in the difference between Stalin and Trotsky in the early stages of the Soviet Union. Whereas Stalin wanted to focus the attention of the people in the re-building of Russia, Trotsky looked to keep the revolution alive taking the fight to the capitalists in the west.

Trotsky's proposed "permanent revolution" was a revolution that must never cease. Trotsky rationalized that the revolution driven by its own inertia would spread and prevail over all its enemies, from the capitalism of the west or what he called, "enemies of the people" to all global enemies.

If the revolution failed to be kept alive, it would simply perish.

This is neo-con philosophy at its core, a core mission to "transform" U.S. foreign policy to exert a "permanent" global hegemony even if it brings "revolutionary change" just like dear old grand dad, Leon Trotsky.

You can read this for yourself in a report called "Rebuilding Americas Defenses" from the Neo-con think tank, Project for the New American Century where we find these words,

"A transformation strategy that solely pursued capabilities for projecting force from the United States, for example, and sacrificed forward basing and presence, would be at odds with larger American policy goals and would trouble American allies.

"Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalysing event - like a new Pearl Harbour."

Transformation is a revolution and is interchangeable with words like treason, subversion, sedition, cataclysmic, radical change, or simply read, overthrow. Go ahead, look up the words. Because that is exactly what the neo-con Trotskyites have done by hijacking our national security having begun a new American revolution for global dominance, or their Pax Americana. Again, in their own words from the same report,

"None of the defense reviews of the past decade has weighed fully the range of missions demanded by U.S. global leadership, nor adequately quantified the forces and resources necessary to execute these missions successfully. Page 5

What missions need to be executed successfully? The missions of enforcing U.S. global leadership of their "Pax Americana", the revived Roman Empire of the neo-cons!

To strong a connection? The report goes on to say,

"The fourth element in American Force posture - and certainly one that holds the key to any longer term hopes to extend the current Pax Americana - is the mission to transform military forces to meet new geopolitical and technological challenges." Page 11 (Read global conquest)

"The failure to prepare for tomorrow's challenges will ensure that the current Pax Americana comes to an early end. Page 13

This Trotskyist view of the world is the neo-cons new "war against terrorism", a war without end, unable to be stopped by any means or cost. But neo-cons vow to fight this new revolutionary war to

carry democracy to the far corners of the globe whether the world wants it or not.

In a recent interview on CNBC, neo-con Michael Ledeen spoke on the justification of a US attack on Iraq. "We are the one truly revolutionary country on Earth," he declared, and that would be "the reason we will successfully transform the lives...of millions in the Middle East."

Words cannot be more clear, neo-cons, like Trotsky, seek, a permanent revolution. Terrorism is now the 'new global enemy', the manifestation of evil, manufactured or real, the Bush cabal confirms almost daily their tireless commitment to "finish the Job," of rooting out the evil among us. We are De Facto in permanent and perpetual state of war against terrorism whose definition can be equated with Bush's statement, of an "axis of evil" people who seek to destroy our freedoms, eerily similar to Trotsky's "enemies of the peoples." In short, Trotsky's theory called "Permanent Revolution"!

As Vice President and neo-con, Dick Cheney has told us "we can no longer operate under 20th century standards" given that the war against terrorism "may never end. At least, not in our lifetime."

## THE BIG LIE - PROPAGANDISING THE MASSES FOR WAR

The most effectual engines for [pacifying a nation] are the public papers... [A despotic] government always [keeps] a kind of standing army of news writers who, without any regard to truth or to what should be like truth, [invent] and put into the papers whatever might serve the ministers. Thomas Jefferson to G. K. van Hagedorn - Oct. 13, 1785. (\*) ME 5:181, Papers 8:632 8:632.

9/11 was the catalyst the neo-cons needed to begin their revolution, and securing public opinion for such a war has been known for some time. Hermann Goering, General of the third Reich said in his prison cell in Nuremberg in 1946:

"Why would some poor slob on a farm want to risk his life in a war when the best that he can get out of it is to come back to his farm in one piece? But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy or a fascist dictatorship or a communist dictatorship ... That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country."

Corporate media giant Clear Channel Communications, owners of over 1200 radio stations and with close ties to the Bush administration organized a series of pro war rallies across the country to promote a definite political propaganda agenda celebrating the neo-cons Iraq strategy.

Noam Chomsky, MIT professor of Linguistics and Foreign policy analyst in his most recent book, "Hegemony Or Survival" writes,

"Controlling the general population has always been a dominant concern of power and privilege... "Wilson's (President Woodrow) own view was that an elite gentlemen with "elevated ideals" must be empowered to preserve "stability and righteousness" Leading intellectuals agreed. "The public must be put in its place," Walter Lippmann declared in his progressive essays on democracy. That goal could be achieved in part through "the manufacture of consent," a "self-conscious art and regular organ of popular government." This "revolution" in the "practice of democracy" should enable a "specialized class" to manage the "common interests" that "very largely elude public opinion entirely." In essence, the Leninist ideal. Lippmann had observed the revolution in the practice of

democracy first hand as a member of Wilson's Committee on Public Information, which was established to coordinate wartime propaganda and achieved great success in whipping the population into war fever." (page 6)

And an Excerpt from Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf:

"The function of propaganda does not lie in the scientific training of the individual, but in calling the masses' attention to certain facts, processes, necessities, etc., whose significance is thus for the first time placed within their field of vision. The whole art consists in doing this so skilfully that everyone will be convinced that the fact is real, the process necessary, the necessity correct, etc. But since propaganda is not and cannot be the necessity in itself, since its function, like the poster, consists in attracting the attention of the crowd, and not in educating those who are already educated or who are striving after education and knowledge, its effect for the most part must be aimed at the emotions and only to a very limited degree at the so-called intellect...The more modest its intellectual ballast, the more exclusively it takes into consideration the emotions of the masses, the more effective it will be..."The art of propaganda lies in understanding the emotional ideas of the great masses and finding, through a psychologically correct form, the way to the attention and thence to the heart of the broad masses. The receptivity of the great masses is very limited, their intelligence is small, but their power of forgetting is enormous. In consequence of these facts, all effective propaganda must be limited to a very few points and must harp on these slogans until the last member of the public understands what you want him to understand (or believe)."

#### A GUIDE TO THE NEW GRAND PLAN REVEALED

Nowhere is Neo-conservatism more firmly grounded then in Paul Wolfowitz, deputy Secretary of Defense and student of Strauss at the University of Chicago, earning his Doctorate under him in 1972.

After the collapse of the Berlin wall and the end of the cold war, neocons saw this opportunity as the time and destiny of the United States to reshape the world into their new American world led order. It was Wolfowitz, while serving as Under Secretary Defence for Policy from 1989 to 1993, who had the responsibility for reshaping military policy at the end of the cold war.

Wolfowitz then supervised the drafting of a policy statement called Defense Planning Guidance, which was submitted to then Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney. It was Cheney who would later submit this new strategy to President Bush Sr. for his major foreign policy address on August 2, 1990, the day that Iraq invaded Kuwait. The media had more pressing news with the invasion and the new policy went unnoticed.

It wasn't until 1992 when a version of the new policy was published by the Times, which ran a front page article disclosing that the Pentagon sought unilateral dominance through pre-emptive strikes against failed states. This new view was considered so radical that the policy had to be toned down and was subsequently denied by Cheney and his team who leaked a more restrained version.

One of the key points of the plan states,

The number one objective of U.S. post-Cold War political and military strategy should be preventing the emergence of a rival superpower.

"Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavour to prevent any hostile



power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia.

"There are three additional aspects to this objective: First the U.S. must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new order that holds the promise of convincing potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role or pursue a more aggressive posture to protect their legitimate interests. Second, in the non-defense areas, we must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order. Finally, we must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role."

In short, essential ideas of the neo-cons of "reshaping," rather than reacting to the rest of the world, and of preventing the rise of another superpower in favour of a global American empire through military supremacy. The politics of containment would no longer be on the table. Diplomacy, negotiation and international law be damned, militarism was the new post modern American way. Multilateralism was to be replaced by the hammer of strategic American unilateralism. Pre-emptive ambitions of a new imperial world thug.

But this dream was to be short lived as the democratic presidential candidate Bill Clinton defeated Bush ending the neo-con rule in office, and temporarily halting their apocalyptic agenda. But the neo-con team submitted one last report entitled "Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy" which outlined again the idea anticipatory self-defense.

## PROJECT FOR A NEW AMERICAN CENTURY

The neo-cons however, did not sit idle, instead establishing several think tanks to secure their influence upon national security and military policy makers through ideological coloured glasses of world peace through American domination.

The most notable and ultimately most influential of these think tanks is the Project for the New American Century or PNAC co-founded by William Kristol and Robert Kagan, which on June 3, 1997 issued its founding Statement of Principles, declaring: "We need to accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles."

The signatories are notable in that they include:

Jeb Bush, governor of Florida, key to handing the presidency to his brother George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Vice President of the United States, former Secretary of Defense, former Halliburton CEO, Dan Quayle, former Vice President of the United States, Donald Rumsfeld, current and past Secretary of Defense and our friend Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense, former Undersecretary of Defense for Policy.

PNAC sets forth the ideas embodied in neo-con thinking creating a blueprint for an American empire by first taking American principals to Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and Iran. The vaunted axis of evil as declared by president Bush in his state of the union address.

Just a few years earlier on May 29, 1998, PNAC sent a letter to the leadership of the U.S. House of Representatives advocating regime change in Iraq. As a result, Congress passed the Iraq Liberation

Act. Section 3 of the Act reads: "It should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime." Signatories of the letter included Kristol, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, member and former chairman of Defense Policy Board; managing partner in Trireme Partners, a venture-capital company heavily invested in manufacturers of technology for the military and homeland security and James Woolsey, former Director of Central Intelligence.

In September of 2000 PNAC released one of its most notable reports entitled "Rebuilding Americas Defenses" and this is where it gets interesting. On page 50 through 51 of the report we find,

"A transformation strategy that solely pursued capabilities for projecting force from the United States, for example, and sacrificed forward basing and presence, would be at odds with larger American policy goals and would trouble American allies.

"Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalysing event - like a new Pearl Harbour."

I hope you caught that. Neo-cons admit that the process of "revolutionary change through military force will be a long arduous haul up the steep hill of public opinion in light of a "catastrophic and catalysing event", like a 911 event perhaps? Ah, now you're starting to get the broader brush strokes of a surreal painting of a theoretically conceived and planned attack to further the neo-cons agenda of world domination and the reshaping of the middle east through lies and deception. (More on 911 later.)

PNAC's call for a democratisation of the world with particular interest in the Middle East cannot go unnoticed on several counts. Each of which will be briefly touched upon here in part one of this series, but will be more thoroughly examined in upcoming series of articles.

For more information see PNAC.info - Exposing the Project for the New American Century - An effort to investigate, analyse, and expose the Project for the New American Century, and its plan for a "unipolar" world.

See also The Four Reasons why "We The People" must remove the current administration of The United States of America. And PNAC Revealed. All excellent sources.

## CORPORATE GREED

First, a global military force will necessitate an increased defense budget for the build-up of the American military machine, which is called for in the Rebuilding Americas Defenses. The report called for 3.8 percent of gross domestic product for Defense spending. The very next year the Bush administration requested a defense budget of \$379 billion up from \$300 billion, almost exactly 3.8 percent of GDP.

As Richard Pearl has been quoted as saying,

"The President of the United States, on issue after issue, has reflected the thinking of neo-conservatives."

The Pentagon budget for defense spending is greater than the next 15 countries combined! But this is the cost of running, ruling and maintaining a Global empire thru force of arms. To anyone who

doubts that the US is currently a not a Global empire, let this sobering fact sink in. The United States currently maintains an overseas presence of over 750 military bases located in over 130 countries with more to be added with the addition of the occupation of Iraq as a strong hold for the Middle East. The costs are enormous in running an Empire, a fact Rome found out all to well. But it would appear that the one thing man never learns form history, is that man never learns from history.

Consider also that these bases are the home of the most technologically advanced military machines the world has ever known, with ever advancing technology to come.

Nor is it intended that this military machine stand idle, when in the September 2002 "National Security Strategy" was released by President Bush, it stated that the goal of US foreign policy is, "to extend the benefits of freedom...to every corner of the world."

A tall order indeed, but the neo-cons have their reasons as we shall see.

Increased defense spending has many benefits for the neo-cons. Outside of the obvious build up of the greatest war machine the planet has ever seen to wield as their planetary policeman. There are also defense contractors to think about. You see, neo-cons also happen to be well placed and heavily invested in what has been called the "military Industrial Complex" in companies such as Halliburton, Vice President Dick Cheney being it's former CEO. The Carlyle group, known as the ex-Presidents club, which invests heavily in defense contractors such as Virginia based United Defense, a weapons manufacture. Brown and Root, America's foremost base building contactor. There are more but you get the idea.

One cannot help but be ominously reminded of Eisenhower's last speech in warning Americans of this danger when he said,

"In the counsels of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the Military Industrial Complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes." -- President Dwight Eisenhower, January 1961.

It would appear that the rise of misplaced power currently exists in the hands of the neo-cons who call themselves the "cabal". A cabal bent on marching young American soldiers to war for greed and the crusade of global American imperialism.

How absolutely genius of the neo-con "Bush cabal". Not only have they positioned themselves to direct foreign policy matters controlling both the Pentagon and White House in the pursuit of their ideological dream, but reap to themselves huge profits at the same time! Bush and associates have successfully taken a \$300 billion surplus and warp and woofed that to an astounding \$500 billion federal deficit and growing eclipsing the old record \$290.4 billion held by his father in 1992. Current federal debt is \$6.8 trillion and growing! (federal debt is the total amount from IOUs accumulated by the federal government over time. The deficit is the annual gap between spending and revenues. Source CBSNEWS.com) Consider also the Inspector General has notified Congress that the Pentagon cannot properly account for \$1.2 trillion in transactions!

We will take a closer look into this corporate neo-con windfall in future article in this series entitled, "Imperialism or the Apocalypse - The Multinational Corporate Connection"

## 2. PEAK OIL

The second reason for PNAC's call for the democratisation of the Middle East is quite simple. No other region on earth has such vital raw materials, primarily oil, in a time when world oil production is peaking. A key point in the 1992 "Defense Planning Guidance" of Wolfowitz mentioned earlier.

In an analysis from the editors of Nightline of ABC News entitled "Spoils Of War In Iraq War, To The Victor Goes The Oil" it states,

"The fundamental issue is, the day after Saddam is removed, the Iraqi oil industry is open for grabs, and it will depend upon the government of Iraq to decide how it will dispense that resource," says oil consultant Rob Sobhani, a professor at Georgetown University in Washington. "Certainly, American companies would be in a very, very strong position to compete for the right."

"Once the fighting starts, you have to be involved or you are irrelevant," says Emerson. "And it's not just because of the Iraqi oil. It's because of the oil in the entire region. You want to be part of the post-war world in the Persian Gulf."

The significance of the vast oil reserves of the Middle East cannot be understated. Besides the trillions of dollars to be had by multinational oil companies drooling over the prospect of taking over these vast oil reserves, there is also the impending economic disaster of peak oil to think about. Our economy is industrial oil based, and without a reliable source, would soon collapse as a result oil depletion. At current levels of US production, our oil reserves would last approximately ten years without an outside source. Iraq on the other hand has oil reserves that will last 526 years!

Peak oil is a real concern as many scientists predict world oil will peak as soon as 2006. Besides, you can't very well drive your newly purchased war machine without the oil needed to sustain it. The facts are that the United States military is the largest consumer of oil in the world with one quarter of the world's jet fuel being used by the military alone.

Matthew Simmons who has been a key advisor to the Bush Administration and Vice President Cheney's 2001 Energy Task Force and the Council on Foreign Relations stated on May 27th, 2003 addressing the second international conference of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil (ASPO).

"And serious energy planners need to assume non-OPEC supply is at a plateau. But thank heavens for the Middle East. The big non-Middle East OPEC producers are also past the peak. Algeria and Libya could probably still grow but they're too small to offset everyone else. And only the Middle East can logically be explained to replace declines elsewhere.

Middle East energy is the Promised Land. All roads lead to Rome and to the future of oil and gas. Rome is the Middle East." (For more information on Peak Oil.)

From The Observer (UK): "Paul Wolfowitz, Assistant Defence Secretary, and Richard Perle, a key Pentagon adviser, see military action as part of a grand plan to reshape the Middle East. To this end, control of Iraqi oil needs to bypass the twin tyrannies of UN control and regional fragmentation into Sunni, Shia and Kurdish supplies. The neo-conservatives plan a market structure based on bypassing the state-owned Iraqi National Oil Company and backing new free-market Iraqi companies. But, in the run-up to war, the US oil majors will this week report a big leap in profits. ChevronTexaco is to report a 300 per cent rise. Chevron used to employ the hawkish Condoleezza Rice, Bush's National Security Adviser, as a member of its board. Five years ago the then Chevron chief executive Kenneth Derr, a colleague of Rice, said: 'Iraq possesses huge reserves of oil and gas - reserves I'd love Chevron to have access to.' "

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/nol/shared/spl/hi/middle\\_east/02/iraq\\_key\\_maps/img/maps/iraq\\_oil\\_map485.gif](http://news.bbc.co.uk/nol/shared/spl/hi/middle_east/02/iraq_key_maps/img/maps/iraq_oil_map485.gif)

Now to any casual observer it cannot go unnoticed that in our war on terrorism since 9/11, we have gone after Oil producing states or swing producing states. Afghanistan being the first, which is now interestingly , but not surprisingly headed by Hamid Karzai, Chairman of the Interim Administration for Afghanistan. Hamed Karzai was the main intermediary between the Mujahedin and the CIA who later became a top advisor to Unocal. It was Unocal who sought the development of an oil pipeline across Afghanistan to tap into the Caspian reserves. Is the picture getting any clearer?

Next on the list we have Iraq, Iran, now Saudi Arabia, developments in West Africa, also in Venezuela, and Colombia. All areas where terrorism appears, exactly where the oil is or in the swing producing nations. Coincidental? Maybe, maybe not, though highly suspect for even the most sceptical.

More on the oil connection will be brought to light in a future article of this series entitled, "Imperialism or Apocalypse Now - The Bush -- Cheney Oil Connection.

## ISRAEL AND THE ZIONIST CONNECTION

It is well known that the neo-cons are intensely pro Israel and pro Zionists to the core. It is unfortunate that the moment one mentions Zionism the immediate thought is that of anti Semitism and white supremacy. This is just more spin and propaganda in an attempt to deceive and misdirect attention from their ideological beliefs that Zionism is a movement to attain the Jewish Messianic ideal of world domination.

The history of Zionism finds its beginnings in 1896 with a Austrian journalist Theodor Herzl who wrote the book, "Der Judenstaat," (The Jewish State) which was published and quickly spread all over Europe. In the book, Herzl called for a large tract of land to be provided for the Jews.

In 1897, Herzl organized the first Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland. At this Congress, the WZO or World Zionist Organization was established.

In the media and print, Zionism is presented as the ideal of all Jews to return to their beloved promised land, Palestine, and the rebuilding of a Jewish State. That such an explanation has been believed is just more proof of the world's ignorance of Jewish national (Zionism) and ideological beliefs.

Zionism has grown into a messianic idea of a Jewish super state with its goal to make Palestine the seat of a super-Government over all the nations of the world.

In his Book, "Open Secrets: Israel Nuclear and Foreign Policies" Israel Shahak argues that Israel can only be understood from within and shows how American media is misleading in its coverage concerning Israel. Shahak continues his arguments claiming Israel aims at establishing hegemony over the entire Middle East and in order to do this has considered among other tactics the extremes of pre-emptive strikes against Syria and Iran. Does that sound familiar?

Well for those on the outside, this would be news, but Jews around the world are fighting against Zionism and for all that it stands for. A good place to start might be Jews Against Zionism where they unequivocally state,

**ZIONISTS DO NOT REPRESENT JEWS**

Here are some quotes from their site,

"We implore and beseech our Jewish brethren to realize that the Zionists are not the saviours of the Jewish People and guarantors of their safety, but rather the instigators and original cause of Jewish suffering in the Holy Land and worldwide. The idea that Zionism and the State of "Israel" is the protector of Jews is probably the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the Jewish People."

"The Holy Land was given to the Jewish people on the condition that they observe the Torah and its commandments. When they failed to do this, their sovereignty over the land was taken from them, and they went into exile. From that time, we prohibited by the Torah with a very grave prohibition to establish a Jewish independent sovereignty in the Holy Land or anywhere throughout the world. Rather, we are obligated to be loyal to the nations under whose protection we dwell."

One of the goals of Zionism then is to reverse the iron yoke that God had imposed upon the adherents of Judaism. The main problem was that it assumed that Jews had a divine right to reverse that captivity without addressing the original reasons that God had imposed the iron yoke upon them in the first place. The law spells out how that yoke may be removed. Simply compare what the law says with Zionism and you get a clearer understanding of what Zionism is trying to accomplish.

To reverse the captivity the law specified that He would release them from their captivity only under certain conditions. The primary condition was that they repent of their hostility against God who gave them the law to be followed from their beginning as a nation. Lev. 26:40-42 (KJV) says,

40. If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary unto me;

41: And that I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity:

42: Then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land.

Zionism is simply trying to bypass the very Law that was given to the Jews and establish their own kingdom in the Promised Land with messianic illusions of a super state ruling the world. A millennial kingdom without God, His laws, or His blessing. In others words, Zionism attempts to usurp authority from God in regards to the "Promised" land that was given them based upon the "condition" set forth in the divine Law which the Jews failed to keep. Thus the exile from the land in the first century till the promised Messiah comes to replant them in the land and establish His Kingdom. But Zionism is trying to circumvent God and the yoke of the law.

For further information and a more complete list of sites on the subject click [here](#). Jews against Zionism.

What is disturbing is that the pro Zionist neo-cons of the Bush cabal, hold some of the highest offices of our government. With their desire to establish hegemony over the entire Middle East, it becomes quite clear in the face of the foreign policy strategies coming out of PNAC that Zionists are using the military might of the US to accomplish their purpose. An American crusade against Islam in the name of terrorism for the purpose of establishing a Jewish super state perpetuated through force in the name of freedom and democracy.

To accomplish this grand strategy, the adherents of this insanely mad push will present the pre-emptive doctrine in the name of freedom in the absurd call for regime change. Democratisation by military force to bring about global peace and security, thus establishing a new world order. Death to thousands of innocents in the name of peace.

The insanity of peace through war is exasperating enough without the even more psychotic Bush campaign adds recently aired which actually promote the idea of pre-emptive war for peace. AND EVEN MORE ABSURD THAN ALL OF THAT IS THAT THE AMERICAN PUBLIC IS ACTUALLY BUYING IT!

PNAC asserts, Iraq must be the first dealt with in the Rebuilding Americas Defenses report stating,

"The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein."

William Kristol, Chairman of the Project for the New American Century testifying to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 7, 2002 states,

"Thank you, Chairman Biden, Senator Helms, and members of the committee, for inviting me to testify before you today. You have asked me to address the question, "What's next in the war on terrorism?"

The short answer is that Iraq is next. I am not simply saying that Iraq should be next - although I think it should be. I am rather drawing a straightforward conclusion from President Bush's State of the Union speech, and from the logic of the war itself."

In the Rebuilding Americas Defenses report it goes on to say that North Korea, Libya, Syria and Iran are dangerous regimes and it appears that Syria and Iran are indeed next to be slated for regime change in reshaping the Middle East. CIA covert revolutionary operations are already underway, and a campaign on the threat of nuclear WMD is seen daily in the media.

When one takes a good hard look at who is in charge of policy making at the pentagon, this reality becomes a clear and present danger of apocalyptic proportions. Just recently, congress passed a measure called the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Act that will be used to justify future military action against Damascus. Remember the Iraq Liberation Act?

Senator Robert Byrd, the West Virginia Democrat stated,

"I have not seen any evidence that would lead me to believe that the government of Syria is responsible for the attacks against our troops in Iraq... Such insinuations can only build the case for military action against Syria which unfortunately is a very real possibility because of the dangerous doctrine of pre-emption created by the administration," Sounds all to familiar, does it not?

And if all this has yet to raise the hair on the back of your neck, the report Rebuilding Americas Defenses spotlights China for 'regime change' saying 'it is time to increase the presence of American forces in southeast Asia'. In other words, it's time to democratise China.

China would not be like the Iraqi war, which can be likened to the Empire of the Star Wars movie attacking the Flintstones after being obliterated in the Gulf War and decade long sanctions.

Sanctions which killed between 345,000 to 530,000 children under Age 2 in Iraq between 1990 and 2003: 345,000 to 530,000 (Village Voice, 5/2/03)

During President Bush's recent trip while speaking to London's Banqueting House, Bush said,

"In some cases, the measured use of force is all that protects us from a chaotic world ruled by force."

"Because European countries now resolve differences through negotiation and consensus there is sometimes an assumption that the entire world functions in the same way. But let us never forget how Europe's unity was achieved -- by Allied armies of liberation and NATO armies of defense."

"Beyond Europe, where oppression and violence are very real, liberation is still a moral goal."

These words might as well been written by Robert Kagan, one time white house speech writer and co-founder of PNAC with William Kristol. Kagan authored a PNAC blueprint of postmodern international relations entitled "Of Paradise And Power -- America And Europe In The New World " based on an earlier essay entitled "Power And Weakness" which appeared in Policy Review June/July 2002. Dr. Henry Kissinger writes of the book saying,

"Though in the past we have often disagreed, I consider this essay one of those seminal treatises without which any discussion of European-American relations would be incomplete and which will shape that discussion for years to come."

In "Of Paradise And Power" Kagan argues that Europe which possesses no military presence in the post modern world finds itself in a state of weakness, using diplomacy, international laws and seduction in all matters of international affairs while depending on US military strength for security. Whereas America is the undisputed leader in Power Politics and is willing to act unilaterally if necessary to achieve its means. A far cry from the European global mission of compromise and reconciliation in establishing multilateral governance through subjecting all states to the international rule of Law.

This goes to the very heart of Bush's speech in London cited above. The U.S. through the neo-con influence has pushed US foreign policy to unilateralism in international affairs that leads to a one-way only road of universalistic nationalism.

Kagan writes,

"American policy makers have found it hard to believe, but leading officials and politicians in Europe really have worried more about how the United States might handle or mishandle the problem of Iraq - by undertaking unilateral and extralegal military action - they have ever worried about Iraq itself and Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction. And while it is true that they have feared such action might destabilize the Middle East and lead to unnecessary loss of life, there has always been a deeper concern."

Kagan continues,

"If international problems cannot, in fact be settled the European way, wouldn't that suggest that Europe itself may eventually fall short of a solution, with all the horrors this implies? That is one reason Europeans were so adamant about preserving the universal applicability of the International Criminal Court. For the United States to demand immunity, a double standard for the powerful, is to undermine the very principal Europeans are trying to establish - that all nations, strong and weak, are equal under the law and all must abide by the law." Page 61-63

Note the word "extralegal" and "immunity" from international law. Read, "The US can do what it



wants, where it wants, all laws be damned!"  
Bush further stated in London,

"The failure of democracy in Iraq would throw its people back into misery and turn that country over to terrorists who wish to destroy us. "Yet democracy will succeed in Iraq. Because our will is firm, our word is good and the Iraqi people will not surrender their freedom."

Democracy as we know it is a government based on the popular vote of the people to choose who will govern them in free elections. You can bet dollars to donuts that Bush and his fellow neo-cons idea of democracy is to choose an interim provisional government based on their idea of who should rule. Further, you can bet that this hand picked and unelected provisional group will, with the help of the neo-cons, write a new constitution "FOR" and not "BY" the people. Is that democracy or elitism controlling the future for the sake of multinational corporate interests and a Pro Israel policy?

So who are these mad Zionist Israel first neo-cons we are referring to that help write such abhorrently absurd reports for Americas foreign policies strategies and carry such weight an influence in our government?

1). Richard Perle----One of Bush's foreign policy advisors, he is the chairman of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board. A very likely Israeli government agent, Perle was expelled from Senator Henry Jackson's office in the 1970's after the National Security Agency (NSA) caught him passing Highly Classified (National Security) documents to the Israeli Embassy. He later worked for the Israeli weapons firm, Soltam. Perle came from one the pro-Israel think tanks, the AEI. Perle is one of the leading pro-Israeli fanatics leading this Iraq war mongering within the administration and now in the media. (Recently resigned as chairman of the Defense Policy Board, but still remains as member.)

2). Paul Wolfowitz----Deputy Defense Secretary, and member of Perle's Defense Policy Board, in the Pentagon. Wolfowitz is a close associate of Perle, and reportedly has close ties to the Israeli military. His sister lives in Israel. Wolfowitz came from the above mentioned Jewish think-tank, JINSA. Wolfowitz is the number two leader within the administration behind this Iraq war mongering.

3). Douglas Feith----Under Secretary of Defense and Policy Advisor at the Pentagon. He is a close associate of Perle and served as his Special Counsel. Like Perle and the others, Feith is a pro-Israel extremist, who has advocated anti-Arab policies in the past. He is closely associated with the extremist group, the Zionist Organization of America, which even attacks Jews that don't agree with its extremist views. Feith frequently speaks at ZOA conferences. Feith runs a small law firm, Feith and Zell, which only has one International office, in Israel. The majority of the firm's work is representing Israeli interests. His firm's own website stated, prior to his appointment, that Feith "represents Israeli Armaments Manufacturer." Feith basically represents the Israeli War Machine. Feith also came from the Jewish thinktank JINSA. Feith, like Perle and Wolfowitz, are campaigned hard for the Israeli proxy war against Iraq.

4). Edward Luttwak----Member of the National Security Study Group of the Department of Defence at the Pentagon. Luttwak is reportedly an Israeli citizen and has taught in Israel. He frequently writes for Israeli and pro-Israeli newspapers and journals. Luttwak is an Israeli extremist whose main theme in many of his articles is the necessity of the U.S. waging war on Iraq.

5). Henry Kissinger-----One of many Pentagon Advisors, Kissinger sits on the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board under Perle. For detailed information about Kissinger's evil past, (read Seymour Hersch's book "Price of Power: Kissinger in the Nixon White House"). Kissinger obviously played a

part Southeast Asia mass murders (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos), installing Chilean dictator Pinochet, Operation Condor's mass killings in South America, and more recently served as Slobodan Milosevic's advisor. He consistently advocates going to war against Iraq. President Bush nominated Kissinger as chairman of the September 11 investigating commission (a position that Kissinger turned down for fear of having to disclose the names of the clients of his consultancy firm). It's like picking a bank robber to investigate a fraud scandal.

6). Dov Zakheim----Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for the Department of Defense. He is an ordained rabbi and reportedly holds Israeli citizenship. Zakheim attended attended Jew's College in London and became an ordained Orthodox Jewish Rabbi in 1973. He was adjunct professor at New York's Jewish Yeshiva University. Zakheim is close to the Israeli lobby.

7). Kenneth Adelman-----One of many Pentagon Advisors, Adelman also sits on the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board under Perle, and is another extremist pro-Israel advisor, who supports going to war against Iraq. Adelman frequently is a guest on Fox News, and often expresses extremist and often ridiculous anti-Arab and anti-Muslim views. He once called the Arabs "anti-Semitic" on Fox News (11/28/2001)

8). I. Lewis Libby -----Vice President Dick Cheney's Chief of Staff. The chief pro-Israel Jewish advisor to Cheney, it helps explains why Cheney is so gung-ho on invading Iraq. Libby is longtime associate of Wolfowitz. Libby was also a lawyer for convicted felon and Israeli spy Mark Rich, whom Clinton pardoned, during the last days of his presidency.

9). Robert Satloff----U.S. National Security Council Advisor, Satloff was the executive director of the Israeli lobby's "think tank," Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Many of the Israeli lobby's "experts" come from this front group, like Martin Indyk.

10). Elliott Abrams-----National Security Council Advisor. He previously worked at Washington-based "Think Tank" Ethics and Public Policy Center. During the Reagan Administration, Abrams was the Assistant Secretary of State, handling, for the most part, Latin American affairs. He played an important role in the Iran-Contra scandal, which involved illegally selling U.S. weapons to Iran to fight Iraq, and illegally funding the contra rebels to overthrow Nicaragua's Sandinista government. He also deceived three congressional committees about his involvement and hence faced felony charges. He pled guilty in 1991 to two misdemeanors and was sentenced to a year's probation and 100 hours of community service. A year later, former President Bush (Senior) granted Abrams a full pardon. He was one of the more hawkish pro-Israel Jews in the Reagan Administration's State Department.

11). Marc Grossman-----Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. He was Director General of the Foreign Service and Director of Human Resources at the Department of State. Grossman is one of many of the pro-Israel Jewish officials from the Clinton Administration that Bush has promoted to higher posts.

12). Richard Haass-----Director of Policy Planning at the State Department and Ambassador at large. He is also Director of National Security Programs and Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). He was one of the more hawkish pro-Israelis in the first Bush (Sr) Administration who sat on the National Security Council, and who consistently advocated going to war against Iraq. Haass is also a member of the Defense Department's National Security Study Group, at the Pentagon.

13). Robert Zoellick-----U.S. Trade Representative, a cabinet-level position. He is al

---

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-303.html>