

PART II

THE LONGER-RANGE “TACTICAL” MOMENT IN WHICH OUR PRESENT SPECIFIC “LOGISTICAL”GEO-POLITICAL MOMENT ARISES: THE END OF THE COLD WAR

Since the morning of January 1st, 1992, the cold January morning immediately following the exhilarating night of the sudden and dramatic end of “The Cold War”, there has been a *secret* “Global Public Policy Debate” taking place, largely behind closed doors, among the elite “Leaders” of Western Civilization.” This “secret debate” concerns the structure and content of the specific new “Worldview” in accordance with the “Organizing Principle” of which the leaders of our Post Cold War Western World will agree to undertake to comport their conduct - now that The Cold War is over.

The details of this still-largely-secret global public policy debate must be brought to our public’s attention and then self-consciously examined by the American people – if we are to make certain, as informed American citizens, that *all* of the available public and private policy “options” that are *actually* available to us, here at the end of The Cold War, are “placed before us” for our collective public consideration in the face of the recent disturbingly-*restricted* national public policy debate which took place between The National Republican Party and The National Democratic Party during the Year 2004 Presidential Election.

The conduct of the Year 2004 Presidential Election makes it abundantly clear that, without some dramatic act of *active* and *aggressive* “Intervention” on the part of Adherents to other “Worldviews” (other than simply the classically “Reactionary”, “Conservative” and “Moderate” Worldviews), the present leaders of The National Republican Party *and* of the present leaders of The National Democratic Party in the United States are going to *consciously* refuse to present to the American people, for our choice, *most* of the alternative public policy “options” which actually exist (...**and which have any real chance of actually “solving” the public policy problems which presently confront us**) here at the end of The Cold War. Instead, the leaders of both major national American political parties will simply continue to simply “use” these public policy problems as the “public rational” which both of these two national collectives of elite national and international business leaders will cite to “justify” their mutual extraction of tax monies from our people to, in effect, “subsidize” their *shared* exploitation of the natural resources of our nation – and our world – for the purpose of generating

continued business income for their paying corporate business clients...allowing the “trickle down” benefits of their profit-taking endeavors that pass down to the Middle Class, Working Class and Underclass members of our country to continue to “purchase” the continued silence of our citizens.

CHAPTER I

THE INITIATION OF THE SECRET GLOBAL PUBLIC POLICY DEBATE

The present Global Public Policy Debate which we address in the work that follows began in June of 1989, a full two-and-a-half years before the end of The Cold War. This debate was “sparked” by then-University of Chicago Political Science Professor Dr. Francis Fukuyama, with his publication of his now-famous article in The National Interest Magazine. This article was entitled “THE END OF HISTORY”.¹

The specifics of this article will be addressed in much greater detail below. However, suffice it to say, here in this merely introductory comment, that this debate which was sparked by Professor Fukuyama in June of 1989, has now grown into a conflagration which drawn into its flames the major spokespersons of the numerous “Reactionary” and “Conservative” think tanks in America as well as the very few “Moderate” and “Liberal” effective think tanks that exist. These spokespersons have now become active participants in an intense, though still for-the-most-part “secret”, Global Public Policy Debate. This debate is “debating”, however, *only* the very narrow question of:

(A)

Whether it will be a “Liberal” Capitalist Worldview, a “Conservative” Capitalist Worldview, a “Moderate” Capitalist Worldview or, indeed, a “Reactionary” Capitalist Worldview that is going to be adopted as “the” dominant “Worldview” that will be adopted by **all major** American economic, political, academic and cultural leaders and then deployed, during the entire 21st Century, to guide all of the political, economic and military decisions of our nation...and of the other “Western” nations – and

¹ The National Interest 16 (Summer, 1989): pp.3-18.

(B)

Whether **the one** specific “Worldview” that is selected from among *these four* restricted “Worldview” choices should then be imposed upon the rest of the nations of our planet by either “The Sole Remaining Super Power” (i.e. the United States, as an individual nation state - now that the United States has “won” its protracted 80-year “Cold War” against “World Communism”) – or whether this **ONE** Capitalist “Worldview” chosen should be imposed upon the rest of the world by a brand new “Northern Industrial Alliance” (to be formed among the eight North Atlantic “industrial powers”: i.e. The United States, Canada & Mexico [The three “NAFTA” nations of the North American Free Trade Agreement] and The United Kingdom, Germany, France, Spain and Italy [The major “GATT” nations: signatories to the **General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade**] ...**and Russia** (now that Russia has “spun off” its so-called “Ethnic” Provinces [i.e. it’s “Asian” and “Islamic” Provinces of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.]

As stated above, this secret “discussion” began in June of 1989, some thirty months before the end of “The Cold War” between The Soviet Union and the United States and its Western Allies when Dr. Francis Fukuyama, then a Professor in the Political Science Department at the prestigious University of Chicago, published one of the most widely-discussed public policy articles of recent American history in the conservative magazine The National Interest. That article was entitled “THE END OF HISTORY.” Fukuyama, Francis, The National Interest, Vol. 16, Summer 1989, pp.3-18.

In this famous June 1989 article, Dr. Fukuyama predicted that “The Cold War” between The Soviet Union and The United States and its Western Allies was going to come to a much-more-rapid-than-expected conclusion than was at that time being predicted by most “global experts.” Indeed, Dr. Fukuyama predicted, in his article, that the sudden end of “The Cold War” was going to take place during the life-span of the very Administration of the United States Government that was in power at the time of the publication of his article (i.e. the 1988-to-1992 Administration of President George *Herbert* Walker Bush.) In his article, Dr. Fukuyama warned the leaders of The Western World that this up-coming unexpected event was going to confront the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of Western Civilization with a very serious dilemma at “THE END OF HISTORY.” This event, Professor Fukuyama argued, while it would be “hailed” by Western Leaders as their “triumph” over Global Communism, would, at the same time, confront Western leaders with the need to “face up to”, finally, the task of having “to deliver on” and to actually undertake to implement – **finally** unimpeded by any significantly-powerful nation state “outside” of Western Culture

– the “historical Ideals” of Western Civilization long-promised to the rest of the world..

Dr. Fukuyama argued in his article that, for seventy-two years (between The October Revolution of 1917 in Russia and the month of the publication of his article in June of 1989), the powerful nation states of Western Civilization, led by the United States, England, Germany and France, had been *continually* “postponing” *delivering on* their as-of-then over one-hundred and twenty-five-year-old “promise” (since 1789) to deliver “liberal democracy”, “individual rights” and “economic prosperity” to the vast majority of the remaining poor and oppressed billions of people who lived outside of this small handful of prosperous “Western” nation states. The leaders of our “Western” nations, Dr. Fukuyama warned, had been arguing... to their citizens *and* to the poor and the oppressed peoples of the world... for their entire lifetimes (i.e. for seventy-two years, as of that date) that the Western nations “could simply not ‘yet’ afford to “deliver on” their historical promises, because they had to “temporarily” *compromise* – both in their domestic and their foreign aid spending... and in their allowing of *full* democracy, *full* recognition of “human rights” and the *full* provision of “prosperity” to the poor and oppressed people of “The Third World” - because these Western nations were “faced with a ‘clear and present’ danger” of being *immanently* “overthrown” by “World Communism” – which they portrayed to the people of the world (and to their own citizens) as being a “monolithic”, “authoritarian”, “heartless” and “atheistic” threat to the entire “civilized world” of Western democratic capitalism.

The “staving off of Communism”, they argued, *required* their spending *hundreds of billions* of dollars, each and every calendar year, from their “public coffers” (i.e. from the pocketbooks and wallets of the workers and taxpayers of their nations), on both “high-tech” weaponry and traditional weaponry, on espionage activities, on “covert operations” and on supplying and fielding (all across the globe) tens of thousands of military troops and hundreds of military bases... which *billions of dollars* they would, *otherwise*, (of course) “wish” they could devote to providing the “gifts” of “Liberal democracy”, “individual rights” and “economic prosperity” to the citizens of their countries...and to the poor and oppressed peoples of the world.

Indeed, this “heavy burden” of protecting their respective nation states against the imminent threatened “overthrow by World Communism” even went so far as to *sometimes* require that these “Leaders of Western Civilization” actively take active steps to “curtail” “individual rights”, even *within* their own nations... but it *always* required their curtailing of the “ideal” individual human rights of the people “outside” of their nations (that is: in the geographic regions of the globe where “Communism” threatened to “deprive” these Western nations of their “privileged

access to” the “strategic raw materials” that were needed by these nation states... *for the most part* to produce more weapons...and to generate huge personal profits for that small percentage of their citizens who owned the stock of the private corporations which transformed these “strategic raw materials” into consumer products for their citizens.)

Indeed, the performance of this “heavy burden” (of defending their territory – and their “access to” these strategic raw materials from their “overthrow” by World Communism) also required the “Leaders” of these Western nation states sometime (though *always* with deep regret) to actively support (even *directly* against “domestic” *democratic* movements) thoroughly **totalitarian** and **dictatorial** regimes (in those *same* regions of the world which [coincidentally] contained the very “strategic raw materials” that were “needed” by the Western nations.) It was necessary, they argued...for seventy-two years...to sometimes actively support such **totalitarian** and **dictatorial** regimes in those foreign nations “in order to ‘keep out of power’, within those ‘strategic’ regions of the world, ‘Communist’ Governments (*even if* such ‘governments’ were desired *by a clear majority* of the citizens of those foreign nations.”²

Indeed, the successful performance of this “distasteful...but essential... task (of “staving off World Communism”) sometimes even required that the leaders of these Western nations actively participate in the direct military overthrow of entirely “Democratically-elected” governments (again [coincidentally], in those *very same* regions of the world where “Communism” threatened to take hold – and “deprive” the Western nation states of their “privileged access” to the “strategic raw materials” which they needed in that area of the world) in order to have in power in those foreign nations a “more stable” government in those regions than could be provided by less-“stable” *democratic* governments – and those new “authoritarian” governments *just happened* to be “more sympathetic to” The Free Market System...and to the contract interests of the foreign corporations which had the contracts to extract the “strategic raw materials” from that nation *for the benefit of* the Western nation state that was “sponsoring” that new “authoritarian” regime.

Dr. Fukuyama, in his June 1989 article, warned that, the moment the Soviet Union “fell”, this long-used “excuse” on the part of the leaders of the Western nations would suddenly disappear...confronting the leaders of the Western nations, for the *first* time since the rise of “Communism” in 1917, with an immediate “rising tide of expectations” on the part of a vast number of the poor and oppressed peoples of the world expecting that the Western nation states would now... finally... “deliver on” their long-postponed promise to deliver “liberal democracy”, “individual rights” and “economic prosperity”... to them (as well as to their own citizens.)

² Quote here “The Truman Doctrine” announced by American President Harry S. Truman in 1948 with reference to Greece.

This global situation, Dr. Fukuyama argued, in his June 1989 article, posed *both* a “problem” and an “opportunity” for the nation states of The West. Thus, their “dilemma.”

On the one hand, this up-coming situation *did* impose upon the nation states of The West an “imposition” of sorts, challenging them to take the steps that would be necessary to extend “liberal democracy”, “individual rights” and “economic prosperity” to literally billions of people across our planet who had never known these gifts.

On the other hand, Dr. Fukuyama argued, this “expectation” on the part of the billions of the poor and oppressed of our world would provide to the nation states of The West (especially to the United States, which would then stand as the one and only truly-uncontested “Super Power” on the entire planet at The End of The Cold War) a “brief window of opportunity” during which short period of time the United States and the other major nation states of The West would be able to offer to the world “a new set of ‘Principles, Policies and Programs’ which would extend the “values” of “Western Civilization” across the entire planet in a potentially totally peaceful and voluntary manner... a feat which had never before been accomplished in the entire history of mankind.

Dr. Fukuyama went on, in his June 1989 “End of History” article, to explain exactly why he personally believed that this task could be a comparatively easy undertaking for the United States and The Western Nations. This was because, he argued, the cultural values of “liberal democracy”, “individual rights” and “capitalist economic development” had successfully “vanquished” all other conceptual challengers (“monarchy”, “fascism” and, most recently “communism”), bringing our human family to “the endpoint of mankind’s ideological evolution” and to “the final form of human government”, i.e. “liberal”, “capitalist”, “parliamentarian”, “representative” “democracy.”

However, Dr. Fukuyama very importantly warned the leaders of the Western World that the “brief window of opportunity” that would open immediately at the end of The Cold War would not remain open for long. Indeed, he argued that this historic “window of opportunity” would remain “open” for only “a very brief period of time.” After this short period of time, he argued, this “window” would close. And, he argued, any effort on the part of the Western nations, especially on the part of the United States alone, to try to “impose” the unique “cultural values” of Western Civilization upon the people of “The Far East”, “The Middle East”, “Southeast Asia”, “Africa” or “The Southern Hemisphere” *after this door “closed”* would be **very strongly and very aggressively** resisted by the forces of “tribalism”, “provincialism”, “nationalism” and *especially* “religious ethnicity.”

Because of the potential “brevity” of the period of time during which this “window of opportunity” would remain “open” which Dr. Fukuyama predicted would open at the very end of The Cold War, Dr. Fukuyama, in his August 1989 article in The National Interest Magazine, issued a dramatic “clarion call” to the economic, political, academic, religious and cultural leaders of all of Western Civilization to begin, **at that very moment** (in the Summer of 1989) to begin to mobilize the convening of a series of international conferences among the economic, political, academic, religious and cultural leaders of Western Civilization at which to begin to *concretely* identify; (A) *exactly* what specific steps would need to be taken and (B) what *specific* institutions and agencies within which *specific* Western nations would need to take these steps in order to effectively “transfer” certain *specific* “western cultural values” that are *intrinsic to* “liberal democracy”, “individual rights” and “capitalist economic development” *to* the rest of the world within the very brief period of time that would be available to The West at the end of The Cold War... before this “window” closed.

However:

Virtually no one of any significant importance within the high levels of Western foreign policy circles believed that the Soviet Union was *actually* “on the brink” of collapsing in the Summer of 1989 as Dr. Fukuyama predicted. So, virtually no one within the leading ranks of the Western economic, political, academic, business, religious or cultural communities responded to Dr. Fukuyama’s public call during the entire thirty-month period between June of 1989 and December 31st of 1991.

Therefore, when the Soviet Union did actually “collapse”, at midnight on the night of December 31st, 1991, The West, just as Dr. Fukuyama had predicted, was “caught with its paradigms down.”

CHAPTER II

THE REACTIONARY RESPONSE TO DR. FUKUYAMA'S CHALLENGE

The first ideological group within Western Civilization to respond to Dr. Fukuyama's then-thirty-month-old challenge *immediately* following the fall of the Soviet Union was an enterprising group of extreme right-wing "Reactionary" ideologues who were at that time ensconced deep within the 1988-to-1992 United States Administration of George *Herbert* Walker Bush.

Secretly financed by the ardently right-wing Pennsylvania multi-billionaire heir to the Mellon Family fortune, Richard Mellon-Scaife (who had been a virulent secret supporter of the ultra-rightwing "Contra Cause" in Central America during the two Administrations of Ronald Reagan and George Bush Senior), a group of ardently "Reactionary" ideologues both inside and outside of George Bush Senior's Executive Branch Administration participated, during the very first week of January of 1992, in drafting a "White Paper" which was finally secretly circulated among the highest-ranking members of George Bush Senior's Administration on the morning of February 18th of 1992.

This secret document entitled "The 1992 Defense Department Planning Guidance Document" advocated that American political, economic, academic and cultural leaders – now that the Soviet Union had been soundly "defeated" *by the United States* - simply woodenly "return to" the Late 19th Century (*pre*-"Communist" Era) Western "Worldview" which had pre-dated the initial appearance of "International Communism" on the world stage.

This Late 19th Century "Worldview" was the worldview that was deeply-rooted in:

State-endorsed and State-subsidized domestic capitalism;

Caucasian Racial Superiority; and

Nation State-based international imperialism.

This specific Late 19th Century "Worldview" defined, indeed engined, the infamous "Gilded Age" of economic and territorial expansionism within the United States and "The Age of Global Imperialism" in Western Civilization. All three of the premises of this specific Late 19th Century "Worldview" had been indeed openly and unabashedly "championed", for example, by Mark Hanna, the principal "political advisor" to the Late 19th Century "Gilded Age" Administration of President William McKinley.

The *very* social, political and economic philosophy espoused by Mark Hanna is now unabashedly and openly extolled by Karl Rove, the closest personal political advisor of George “W” Bush.³

The virtually *immediate* “return” to *this specific* “Worldview” by the progeny of the Late 19th Century American advocates of the national “organizing principle” of Caucasian Nation State-based Capitalism and International Economic Imperialism in the form of “Manifest Destiny” and “The White Man’s *Christian Burden*” *should not have come as any great surprise*. For this was the very *operative organizing principle* of virtually every Western nation state *immediately prior to* the rise of its explicit “Anti-Thesis”: Atheistic, Worldwide, NON-Caucasian Communism in October of 1917.

So, this is exactly what happened *immediately*, in January of 1992, immediately following the “collapse” of the Soviet Union and the Worldwide Communist Movement.

However, when the existence of the secret “Reactionary” January 1992 United States Department of Defense Policy Planning Guidance Document that had been drafted by George H.W. Bush’s Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz with the participation of “Scooter” Libby, Dick Cheney, Elliot Abrams and William Krystol (with the secret financing of arch-Fascist Richard Mellon Scaife) was discovered by The Washington Post and The New York Times – and it was learned that this secret document was actually being secretly circulated and discussed within the Administration of George Bush Senior as the potential new “American organizing principle” which would replace simple “Anti-Communism” now that The Soviet Union had collapsed - The New York Times (on the morning of March 8th of 1992) and then The Washington Post (on the morning of March 11th of 1992) publicly exposed *the existence of* – but NOT the specific content of - this secret document.

This openly “Reactionary” Worldview was then quickly publicly “withdrawn” by George Bush Senior.

In its stead would be submitted an “alternative”, more merely “Conservative” proposed new global “organizing principle set forth in the *second* (“amended”) 1992 United States Defense Department Policy Planning Guidance Document authored by George Herbert Walker Bush, Colin Powel and Theodore G. Shackley (this last man being the 13-year protégé of Reinhardt Gehlen, the Anti-Soviet & Anti-Eastern Bloc Intelligence Chief of The Third Reich) entitled “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century...and Beyond.”

³ See The ???Brain & The ???? (re” Hanna)

CHAPTER III

THE SECRET “CONSERVATIVE” RESPONSE TO DR. FUKUYAMA’S CALL

George Bush Senior, his then-Military Chief of Staff, General Colin Powell and George Bush Senior’s *prior* Director of Covert Operations (when George Bush Senior had served as the Director of the American CIA in 1976), one Theodore G. Shackley, thereupon immediately prepared, in the stead of this “Reactionary” proposal for a “new global organizing principle”, their own merely “Conservative” Post-Cold War “Manifesto.”

This was a secret 1992 internal George Bush Senior Administration “White Paper” which was entitled: The Projection of United States Military Power Into the 21st Century...and Beyond. This became the new “substitute” *merely* “Conservative” “1992 Defense Planning Guidance Document” which *replaced* the original “Reactionary” draft of that document which had been prepared by then-Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and had been endorsed by then-Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney.

This *second* secret classified internal White House Memorandum of the Administration of George Bush Senior expressly *rejected* the “Reactionary”, “unilateralist”, single-nation-state-driven policy which had been proposed by the “Reactionary” authors of the *original* draft of the “Defense Department Planning Guidance Document” that had advocated that the United States alone, (as “The Sole Remaining Superpower”) undertake to exert – on its own - its unique, newly-won power as the dominant nation state on the face of the planet to *unilaterally* impose *its own* pro-Capitalist, pro-democratic, pro-“Human Rights” *interests* upon the rest of the world.

In the stead of this “Reactionary” proposal, George Bush Senior, General Colin Powell and former American CIA Covert Operations Chief Theodore G. Shackley proposed that the “Post Cold War” Government of the United States take the steps that would be necessary to establish a *new* eight-member international *economic, military and political* alliance (referred to within the pages of that secret internal White House Memorandum by the brand new name of: “The Northern Industrial Alliance.”) This new “Northern Industrial Alliance”, according to this second secret “Planning Document” was to be established among: The United States; Canada; Mexico; The United Kingdom; the new, re-unified Germany; France, Spain and Italy...**AND RUSSIA**.

In this secret “Conservative” “Defense Planning Guidance Document”, Republican President George Bush Senior, General Colin Powell and CIA Covert Operations Chief Theodore G. Shackley (whom George Bush Senior had *hoped* to place in *long-term control* over the CIA – in the same manner in which J. Edgar Hoover had been placed in long-term control over the Federal Bureau of Investigation) proposed that this new transatlantic “Northern Industrial Alliance”, operating, economically, through a new global *economic alliance*...operating, militarily, THROUGH THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO)...and operating “politically” through a new SUPER WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION (W.T.O.) “LEGISLATURE” (which, under this plan, would be delegated the legal authority to “over-ride” *any* “Legislative Act” of any member nation state of this “Alliance”⁴), join together their joint economic, military and political power in order to:

Maintain their continued *privileged access* to ‘the strategic raw materials’ that are needed by the members of The Northern Industrial Alliance.⁵

This secret *merely* “Conservative” Defense Planning Guidance Document - though never made *public* - became the source of George Bush Senior’s proposals for the establishment of “THE NEW WORLD ORDER” which was publicly supported by George Bush Senior’s closest Conservative political and military advisors...who included General Colin Powell (and, thereby, the United States Pentagon and The Military Joint Chiefs of Staff) and Theodore G. Shackley (and, therefore, the United States Intelligence Community...more specifically, the United States Central Intelligence Agency.)

It is extremely important that we focus our attention on this proposed global “organizing plan” – because *it* represents the “ideal” proposal that was set forth *originally* by Adolph Hitler (and was actively supported by George Herbert Walker; Prescott Bush; Fritz Thyssen; J.P. Morgan as well as by Joseph P. Kennedy (supplement this list of men with the names from Trading With The Enemy and Mae Brussel’s names) in the critical period between 1917 and 1940 – when exponents of the *pure* Late 19th Century “organizing principle” of Caucasian Nation State-based Capitalism and International Imperialism were being solicited (by Adolph Hitler and the men identified above) to *expand* their too-narrow view of **Nation State-based** Caucasian Capitalism & International Imperialism to embrace a NEW WORLD ORDER that was driven NOT by an attachment to the old 1628 Worldview of “Nation Statism” set forth in the Treaty of Westphalia but was, instead, driven by a vision of a Trans-European AND TRANS-ATLANTIC

⁴ The precursors to this Super-Legislature can be seen in the World Trade Organization (W.T.O.) and in the new European Parliament which governs the new European Union.

⁵ Cite to “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into the 21st Century...and Beyond.”

ALLIANCE among ALL of the “Caucasian” nations of the world *over and against* all of the “Aboriginal Peoples” of the world.

It was, indeed, (according to these men) only because of the failure of some of the more “narrow-minded” leaders of various nation states within Western culture (such as Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, Charles DeGaulle and others) to embrace this “Greater Vision” proposed by Adolph Hitler and the “supporters” of his transnational vision of this New World Order that Adolph Hitler was “compelled” to pursue the much more “narrow” (and “primitive”) German Nation State-based effort to establish the supremacy of The Caucasian Race and The Industrial Capitalist “Uber Mensch”...thereby drawing him and his effort into “conflict” with other competing nation states...such as England, France and, ultimately, the United States (which, one must remember, did not fully mobilize to attempt to stop Hitler’s efforts in Europe until *its* territory (actually the western-most piece of “territory” that the U.S. was trying to “annex” in its westward march toward establishing a land base in Asia itself in *its* engagement in “Manifest Destiny” *beyond the boundaries of North America to the West*) – which soon after World War II were *continued* in Korea (in 1950) and in Vietnam (in 1954.)

Thus, what was, *in fact* occurring, *immediately* following the collapse of the “Anti-Thesis” of The World Communist Movement on December 31st of 1991, in the January-February 1992 presentation to the Cabinet and Pentagon Officials of the Administration of George Herbert Walker Bush was the *renewal* of the old pre-World War II “debate” between the two “schools” of thought that were *both* espousing an automatic *return to* the pre-1917 Late 19th Century “organizing principle” of Caucasian-controlled Domestic Capitalism and International Imperialism as the *renewed* domestic and international “organizing principle” of United States post-Cold War domestic and international policy ...but *one* merely espousing the more “primitive” Nation State-based model of this Late 19th Century (pre-Communist “Anti-Thesis”) “organizing principle” (The Project for a New American Century) and the *other* espousing merely the “more sophisticated” model of this same Late 19th Century “organizing principle” (The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century and Beyond through the establishment of a new Trans-Atlantic “Northern Industrial Alliance” between the United States and ALL of the other “Caucasian” nations of the Northern Hemisphere including RUSSIA...but conspicuously EXCLUDING China and ALL of the former Soviet Union’s “Ethnic” [i.e. NON-Caucasian] Provinces.)

However, this “debate” between the advocates of the adoption of the “Reactionary” secret global plan authored by Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Cheney, Scooter Libby, Elliot Abrams, William Krystol (and, indirectly, by Richard Mellon Scaife), the founders of “The Project for a New American Century”, *and* the advocates of the adoption of the *second* secret merely “Conservative” global plan

for a “New World Order” authored by George Herbert Walker Bush, General Colin Powell and George Bush Senior’s CIA Covert Operations Chief, Theodore G. Shackley entitled “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century...and Beyond” was kept totally secret from the American people during the entire American Presidential Campaign of 1992 (which was the first American national political election to be held following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the sudden end of The Cold War on December 31st of 1991.)

Thus, when we, as an American people, were asked by The National Republican Party and by The National Democratic Party, in November of 1992, to choose our first “Post Cold War” President and United States Congress following the collapse of The Soviet Union – and the end of a seventy-two-year struggle with The Soviet Union (which had exposed us to two full Generations of the threat of total thermonuclear annihilation), *neither* of these two thoroughly “Strategic” global plans for The Post Cold War World that were being actively debated within the National Republican Party was *ever* publicly presented to the American people for our discussion or for our “choice” between them – by *either* The National Republican Party *or* The National Democratic Party.

Nor were we, as the American people, presented by *either* of the two major national political parties with *any other* “alternative” “Strategic” Worldview by means of which we might choose to “adjust” or “amend” our previous “Cold War Worldview”... now that “The Cold War” was over.

William Jefferson Clinton was, in fact, the “official offering” made to us by the new, Post Cold War “Moderate” Democratic Leadership Conference, which was the source of yet a *third* distinct, “Strategic” global “Worldview” and plan for the Post Cold War World. However, this *third* new global “Worldview” *too* was explicitly withheld from the American people at the end of The Cold War as a potentially new “alternative” “Strategic” vision for The Post Cold War World to replace the “Cold War” Worldview which we had been forced to adopt and adhere to for an almost 80-year period.

Instead, we were presented with a mere “Personality Contest” between:

George *Herbert* Walker Bush – who was presented to us as a mere “Middle-Aged, Patrician, Yale College Graduate, Former CIA Director and the ‘Youngest Fighter Pilot of The World War II Generation’ from Connecticut (by way of Texas)” and

William Jefferson Clinton – who was presented to us as “The *first* Post World War II Generation, Up-From-The-Working-Class, Small Town Arkansas, Handsome, Persuasive, Brilliant Georgetown University and Yale Law School Graduate... and Rhodes Scholar... from ‘Hope’, Arkansas.”

Had we, as the American People, been provided with a simple One-on-One “choice” *between* Vice President George Herbert Walker Bush’s secretly-proposed “Conservative” New World Order *and* the completely new “Moderate” Worldview of The Democratic Leadership Council and their Presidential Candidate, William Jefferson “Bill” Clinton - completely un-“tutored” - as we were - as to the full policy implications of their respective “Worldviews”, the American people *might well have* “stuck with” George Herbert Walker Bush (and his *merely* “Conservative” Worldview) – despite the fact that George Bush Senior had been deeply implicated in “The Iran/Contra Scandal” and was under *significant* public scrutiny, and criticism, at that time, for his growingly-revealed central role in that public scandal.

However, because of his *deeply personal* displeasure with George Herbert Walker Bush (due to George Bush Senior’s direct *personal* criminal involvement in the crimes of the Iran/Contra Scandal during his service as the CIA Director, as Ronald Reagan’s Vice President [as the Chairman of the secret 5412 Committee of the National Security Council which oversees and authorizes “covert operations” of the CIA and the U.S. Military]) and then during *his own* Presidency – **and because George Bush Senior had *personally* directly lied to H. Ross Perot** (when Perot, as a member of President Ronald Reagan’s National Security Advisory Committee between 1981 and 1989 had *asked* George Bush Senior about the public claims being made against the Administration concerning the so-called “Off-The-Shelf Enterprise” of Colonel Oliver North) – Ross Perot chose to announce *his* candidacy for the Presidency of the United States in 1992 as an “Independent” Presidential Candidate.⁶

Because of the candidacy of H. Ross Perot, Bill Clinton (an ardent advocate of – if not a truly consistent Adherent to – the “Moderate” Worldview) won the votes of only 43% of the votes of the merely 52% of the Americans who actually chose to cast ballots for the American Presidency in November of 1992.

However, George Herbert Walker Bush won only 38% of votes actually cast for the American Presidency in November of 1992.⁷

⁶ Details of this never-before-publicly-revealed “confrontation” between billionaire Texas businessman H. Ross Perot and George Bush Senior are set forth in an up-coming book revealing the entire “behind-the-scenes” story of The Iran/Contra Scandal to be published as The Fall of The Phoenix following the publication of the present work.

⁷ Once again, however, it is important to remember that only a fraction of voters over 51% of the *legally-eligible*

This was *because* H. Ross Perot (portrayed by the national media as a “Maverick”, though he was *actually* a rather ardent Adherent to the “Reactionary” Worldview) **won 19% of the votes that were actually cast** for the American Presidency in November of 1992 as the Candidate of the new “Third Party”, Reform Party.

It is the uniform political judgment of all of the most respected political experts in America that, IF H. Ross Perot (the “Reactionary”) had NOT run against George Bush Senior for the American Presidency in 1992, an adequate majority of the 19% of the total votes which were cast for Ross Perot in the 1992 Presidential Election would have gone to George Bush Senior. This would have resulted in George Herbert Walker Bush’s having won a second term as the President of the United States in November of 1992...and this would have enabled George Bush Senior to have been the *first* American President elected following the official end of The Cold War.

However, Bill Clinton (the “Moderate” candidate of The Democratic Leadership Council) won the first Post “Cold War” National American Presidential Election, while winning only 43% of the votes of the only 52% of the legally-eligible American voters who actually cast ballots...to George Bush Senior’s only 38% of the votes cast.

Thus, the first American President to be elected after the end of The Cold War was elected with the votes of only 22% of the *legally-eligible* voters in our country.

The re-election of George Bush Senior (an ardent advocate of and a consistent adherent to the “Conservative” Worldview) to a second full term in the American Presidency in November of 1992 *would have* provided George Bush Senior with the opportunity to have devoted the first four full years following the end of The Cold War to the implementing of his Post Cold War “Conservative” grand global strategy, the “particulars” of which had been set forth in his March 1992 “Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century and Beyond.”

However, *because of* the insistence of an ardent Adherent to the “Reactionary” Worldview on running as an “Independent” candidate for the American Presidency in November of 1992, the attempt to implement the Global Strategic Organizing Plan for the “Conservative” Worldview entitled “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century and Beyond” was stopped – at least until the Year 2000... following the completion of a full eight years of a Clinton/Gore “Moderate” American Administration.

voters in all of the United States in 1992 actually *voted* in the 1992 American Presidential Election. This means that the “Conservative” George *Herbert Walker* Bush obtained the votes of only **19%** of the *legally-eligible* voters in America in 1992.

This peculiar turn of historical events in American history is important⁸ because it provided to William Jefferson Clinton and Al Gore (both Adherents to the democratic Leadership Council's decidedly "Moderate" Worldview) the opportunity to attempt to implement the "Moderate" global "Worldview" of The Democratic Leadership Conference during the crucial decade which immediately followed the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of The Cold War.

This was "the brief window" following the end of The Cold War.

However, it is *crucial* to remember (for the purposes of determining exactly how much support *each* of the alternative "Worldviews" enjoys among our American population) that Bill Clinton and Al Gore (both rather indifferent and inconsistent Adherents to the "Moderate" Worldview) received the votes of only 22% of the then-*legally-eligible* voters in all of America⁹ - and George Herbert Walker Bush (a *very* consistent Adherent to the "Conservative" Worldview), received the votes of only 19.76% of the then-*legally-eligible* American voters.

Ross Perot (a true "Reactionary", but who "marketed" himself as a "Maverick"...and, therefore, won votes from a wide range of "constituencies") in 1992, won the votes of only 10% of the then-*legally-eligible* voters in America.

For purposes of clarity then, let us call this: **22%** of all eligible American voters voting for the "**Moderate**" Worldview; **20%** of all eligible American voters voting for the "**Conservative**" Worldview and **10%** of all eligible American voters voting for the "**Reactionary**" Worldview.

Appropriately enough, each of these votes represents roughly the *exact percentage* of Americans who view themselves as being "Moderates" (23%), "Conservatives" (20%) and "Neo-Conservatives" (though they do NOT refer to *themselves* as "Reactionaries") (10%).¹⁰

However - because of the maintenance of complete "secrecy" concerning:

the specific content of the "Reactionary" Post Cold War Strategic Global Plan (which we can accurately identify, again for purposes of clarity, as "The Project for a New American Century");

⁸ The role in which was played by The Christic Institute, as the primary consultant to H. Ross Perot about the criminal activities of George Bush Senior, will be set forth in the up-coming book entitled The Fall of The Phoenix.

⁹ This, again, was due to the fact that just slightly over 51% of the *legally-eligible* voters in the United States in 1992 actually went to the polls and voted for the President.

¹⁰ See, e.g. _____

the specific content of the “Conservative” Post Cold War Strategic Global Plan (which we can equally accurately identify, again for purposes of clarity, as “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century and Beyond”)

and because Bill Clinton, Al Gore and the Democratic Leadership Council never presented any *consistent* or *coherent* systematic “Moderate” Post Cold War Strategic Global Plan to the American people¹¹ -

one can NOT accurately determine to any specific degree of absolute certainty exactly *which* of these three “Worldviews” (if *any*) the actual majority of *legally-eligible* American voters *would have* chosen to adopt as our new “Post Cold War” Strategic Global “organizing principle” to replace “Anti-Communism” – **IF we had known what ALL of our “options” were.**

We were simply never offered a clear choice among the alternative available “Worldviews.”

A “clear choice” as to which *consistent* and *coherent* Post Cold War Strategic Global “Worldview” we wished to adopt – now that The Cold War was over – was *further* denied to us because Bill Clinton and Al Gore, in actual practice, adopted and undertook to implement an entirely “*eclectic*” public policy agenda... rather than the “Moderate Agenda” which had been only *unofficially* “cobbled together”¹² by the new Democratic Leadership Council when it had been hastily organized in the immediate aftermath of The Cold War by Congressman Richard Gephardt of Missouri.

Bill Clinton’s and Al Gore’s 1992-to-2000 public policy agenda did NOT, therefore, constitute anything like a *coherent* or *consistent* “Moderate” Worldview agenda. It was, instead, merely an “eclectic” admixture of:

(A) *some* of the principles of the “Liberal” military and foreign policy agenda which had been advocated by the former National Security Advisor to the 1976-to-1980 “Liberal” Democratic Party Administration of Jimmy Carter, National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski – the details of which *were* **publicly**-advocated by Dr. Brzezinski in his June 1992 “White Paper” entitled OUT OF CONTROL: The Threat of Global Chaos on The Eve of The 21st Century

¹¹ Which, as of 1992, had *not* been as thoroughly thought-out, or as well-articulated as had been the “Reactionary” Worldview (in “The Project For a New American Century”) and the “Conservative” Worldview (which had been set forth, by George Bush Senior, Colin Powell and Theodore G. Shackley, in “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century and Beyond.”)

¹² (Here describe the merely *eclectic* manner in which the DLC undertook its process of putting out simple *ad hoc* proposals...predominately determined by Richard Gephardt, the Democratic House Majority Leader and Founder of the Democratic Leadership Council.

his response to Dr. Francis Fukuyama's June 1989 public challenge;

(B) *some* of the principles the "Conservative" international economic program calling for the creation and establishment of N.A.F.T.A. (the North American Free Trade Agreement) and *some* other of the economic and social program reforms called for by the "Conservatives" (such as the "modification" – in a "conservative" direction - of our American "Medicare" Program, our American Welfare Program and the de-constructing of major features of other classically "Liberal" "New Deal" Programs from the "F.D.R." Era of the National Democratic Party¹³;

and

(C) a number of explicitly "Moderate" programs on both the international and domestic fronts which had been advocated by the *classically* "Moderate" Democratic Leadership Conference.¹⁴

Thus, during the critical First Decade immediately following the "collapse" of the Soviet Union and the end of The Cold War –

the very "brief period" during which Dr. Francis Fukuyama predicted, in his June 1989 article, that a "very brief window of opportunity" would open – but would then soon close" following the end of The Cold War during which the United States and "The West" might *successfully* "offer" to the world - with any **real** chance of having it accepted by a "critical mass" of world leaders - the long-promised Ideal Principles of "The Western Worldview" consisting of the "highest Western ideals" of "liberal democracy", "individual rights" and "Capitalist economic development")

the leadership of the National Democratic Party in the United States failed to offer to the world *any* truly internally-consistent vision or "Worldview" *at all*.

¹³ Such as -----

¹⁴ Such as -----

Equally importantly however, the leadership of the National Republican Party utterly *mis*-construed the November 1992 loss of “Conservative” Worldview Adherent George Bush Senior to the “Moderate” Bill Clinton and allowed this misperception to throw into question the traditionally-consistent “Conservative” Worldview of the National Republican Party... so as to allow the “Reactionary” opponents within George Bush Senior’s own 1988-to-1992 Administration who had opposed George Bush Senior’s proposed “Conservative” Post Cold War Strategic Global Organizing Plan to *publicly* “pony up” *their* alternative “Reactionary” February 18th, 1992 proposal in the form of “***The Project for A New American Century***” and Knute Gingrich’s “Reactionary” ***Contract With America***”¹⁵ and to offer this entirely “Reactionary” Worldview to Republican voters as an “*alternative*” to the National Republican Party’s traditional “Conservative” Worldview as its new *potential winning* “Post Cold War” Worldview.

What were the Worldview “offerings” that were, in fact, truly available to us, then, at the very end of The Cold War ?

Has the “brief window of opportunity” that we were notified about by Dr. Francis Fukuyama in his famous 1989 essay now “closed”?

And, if it has not, what is it that we can do – IF ANYTHING - here in the *Second* Decade following the end of The Cold War - to successfully “make available to” the voters of the United States – and to the world – a “New Paradigm” Worldview, in a completely *peaceful* manner, which will make our “offer” adequately appealing to the other cultures of our world, as our offer to the world to fulfill the long-promised “ideals” of our Western Civilization?

Should we attempt to do this?

And, if we believe that we *should* try to do this – exactly *what are* these “basic ideals” that we *should* “offer to” the world... as our “highest ideals”?

Do these ideals *mandate* that all nations and cultures adopt “Capitalism”, or “The Free Market” as their *sole* Mode of Economic Development within this “New Paradigm”?

¹⁵ It would be left, by the leadership of the National Republican Party, to Professor Samuel P. Huntington and The Council on Foreign Relations of David Rockefeller’s Tri-Lateral Commission in New York to set forth the *public* presentation of George Bush Senior’s “Conservative” Strategic Global Organizing Plan in his June 1993 article published in Foreign Affairs Magazine entitled *The Clash of Civilizations and The Remaking of World Order*.

Do these ideals *mandate* that all nations and cultures adopt “Parliamentary”, *Representative* Democracy as the *sole* “mechanism” by means of which “Democracy” might be implemented ?

And *precisely* which “Individual Rights” do we deem to be truly *intrinsic* to a “System of Ordered Liberty” and, therefore, “Universal” in their requirement and which *other* “Individual Rights” *might we* be willing to concede to be more merely “cultural” to “The West”?

To answer this important set of global public policy questions, let us examine the *specific content* of the full “SET” of “alternative” Worldviews that are known to our “Western Civilization” which are the “Worldviews” which are truly available to us as “Candidates” for such an “offering” to the world, here at the end of The Cold War.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARTIFICIALLY “RESTRICTED” NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVE “WORLDVIEWS” PRESENTED TO AMERICANS AT THE END OF THE COLD WAR

OPTION “A”

THE “REACTIONARY” WORLDVIEW

As was stated above, the first thoroughly-internally-consistent “Worldview” that was offered to the American Government immediately following the collapse of the Soviet Union on the night of December 31st, 1991 as the “new” *organizing principle* to replace simple “Anti-Communism” as the *new organizing principle* for Western Civilization was the “Reactionary” Worldview. This “Worldview” was set forth to the members of George Bush Senior’s American Administration by the authors of the January, 1992 internal White House 1992 “Defense Planning Guidance Document” that was subtitled “A Geo-political Framework for Assessing Force Level & Budgetary Needs.”¹⁶

Assisted by a group of “outside consultants” (which included William Krystol, the reactionary Editor of *The Weekly Standard*) who were funded by arch-reactionary Pennsylvania billionaire Richard Mellon-Scaife,¹⁷ a group of several “Reactionary” advisors inside the 1992 Administration of George Bush Senior (which included: Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Cheney and ...Frish?) prepared a 46-page internal White House “White Paper” inside the George Bush Senior Administration in the very first week of January of the year 1992 and secretly circulated this White Paper within the White House on the morning of February 18th, 1992.

¹⁶ This document was to be amended on April 16, 1992 and then go on to become the basis of later documents which became the source of the principles and policies of an organization entitled “The Project For A New American Century.” Some of the documents of this organization were not made public until after 1992, during the Clinton Administration. Such documents include a lengthy document entitled: “Rebuilding America’s Defenses.” However, because this February 18, 1992 internal Bush White House Memorandum constitutes the “foundational document” of this group, we refer to this document not be its “technical” title (“The 1992 Defense Planning Guidance Document”) but as “The Project For A New American Century.”

¹⁷ (against whom U.S. Customs Official Joseph Price had developed substantial evidence directly implicating him in criminally supporting illegal arms sales to the criminal Central American “Contras” during the infamous “Iran/Contra Scandal” during the Reagan and Bush Administrations
The details of this evidence will also be set forth in the forth-coming work entitled The Fall of The Phoenix.

This document was begun on the Monday morning of the very first week of January of 1992 by then-Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and then-Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, immediately following the collapse of The Soviet Union.

The first draft of this new policy plan was signed and circulated by Under Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz on the morning of February 18, 1992 to: the United States Military Chiefs of Staff,; all of George Bush Senior's Cabinet Secretaries, all U.S. Military Commanders of Worldwide Military Theaters and to other "selected" top Pentagon Officials.

The three "key features" of this new proposed policy were:

- A.) It proposed a totally new Foreign Policy and Military Policy for the United States that would be designed to *stop* the emergence of *any* other nation state in the world as even a *potential* future military "rival" to the United States as the predominant world military and economic power. This new policy was to achieve this objective by undertaking all steps that would be necessary to assure that the United States would establish its unchallenged military and political supremacy over every single "region" of the world "whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to become a general global power." Thus, the new military policy of the United States would be one that endorsed the waging of "preemptive" and "pro-active" war to secure and retain its position as "the preeminent military and economic power" on the planet.
- B.) It proposed a new foreign and military policy "to establish and protect a new order" that would secure and protect *only* the "interests and values" of The United States, and NOT those of any broader international alliance. Therefore, this new foreign and military policy was unabashedly self-interested. And
- C.) It proposed a new foreign and military policy that was to be "unilateralist" – not only in those instances in which "unilateral" action on the part of the United States was absolutely necessary...but, rather, in all instances in which the "unilateral" application of military force by the United States was *possible*.

Within this group of “Reactionary” ideologues who directly participated in the authoring and “pushing” of this entirely new American foreign and military policy to the United States Government in January of 1992 (some of whom held high-level policy positions within the 1992 Administration of George Bush Senior and others who did not) were: Paul Wolfowitz; Richard Perle; Richard Cheney; Donald Rumsfeld; Dan Quayle; Elliot Abrams; Lewis Libby; Jeb Bush; William J. Bennett; William Krystol and Richard Mellon-Scaife.

Most simply and directly put, what this tiny group of Richard Mellon-Scaife-funded “Reactionaries” was advocating in this secret internal White House policy document was that:

Now that **the United States** had “defeated” the Soviet Union in the long 75-year “dialectical struggle” which had been waged by the United States as “the House Champion” of the traditional Late 19th Century Western Civilization “Thesis” of Nation State-Based Caucasian State Capitalism and International Imperialism – (which “Thesis” was, historically, implemented through the means of **unilateral** *nationalistic* and *capitalistic* economic expansionism and the *nation state-based* expropriation and exploitation of the natural resources that were to be found within and under “aboriginal”-occupied lands throughout the world...as well as [when necessary] through the means of cultural and military aggression openly waged against the regimes that governed those “aboriginal” nations that contained these natural resources)

against

the Soviet “champions” of the non-“Western” “**Anti**-Thesis” of *non*-Caucasian Inter-National World Communism –

The United States - as **The One Sole Remaining “Super-Power” nation state in the world** - should aggressively move unilaterally to seize “the spoils” of this 75-year-long “dialectical struggle” by openly announcing that “We have won” and “We are going to simply *return to* the adoption and implementation of the exact same “organizing principle” that had been “the **Thesis**” that had been the operative “organizing principle” of Western Civilization between 1826 (following the adoption, by The West, in 1826, of George Wilhelm Freidrich Hegel’s *dialectical* “Alternative Theory of Right” as its dominant “Mode of Ethical Reasoning” – and social organizing) and 1917 (the point in history when this open and unquestioned “organizing principle” of Western Civilization had been “challenged” and “confronted” by its *dialectical* opposite “Anti-Thesis” of *non*-Caucasian, *Inter-National* World Communism.

Thus, completely-“reasonably” (it would seem on the face of it), the long-time advocates of the nearly-century-old Late 19th Century “Western” “organizing principle” of **Caucasian State Capitalism** and International Imperialism simply re-asserted themselves in the very week following the “collapse” of their 75-year-long *nemesis*.¹⁸

However, because of the historical “embarrassment” which had been generated by the “excesses” which had been perpetrated in the name of this specific “Strategic Global Organizing Plan” by The Nation State of Germany between 1929 and 1945¹⁹, (and because of the central role which this “Worldview” had played in the world-wide collapse of the Western economic system in 1929 which led directly to World War II) when the circulation and active discussion of this specific “Strategic Global Organizing Plan” within the Administration of George Bush Senior was *made public*, on Sunday, March 8th, 1992 in The Sunday New York Times and again on Wednesday, March 11th of 1992 by The Washington Post, support for this specific newly-proposed “Global Organizing Plan” was promptly disclaimed by the Administration of George Bush Senior – and was immediately *replaced by* the proposal for a “more *merely* Conservative” Worldview as the new proposed “global organizing principle” to be implemented following the end of The Cold War...not only for the United States, but for all other “Western” countries as well.

This was the “Conservative” Worldview.

¹⁸ One will note that this proposed “organizing principle” was the same “organizing principle” which had been proposed earlier in Western Culture, by Adolph Hitler and his adherents to the German Nazi Party, when they attempted to rally the forces of Western Civilization, when confronted by “Communism”, to recommit themselves, consciously, to the cause of the Caucasian “Übermensch”, through the “Thesis” of State-supported Capitalism and International Imperialism to claim the resources which were to be found in lands controlled by inferior “aboriginal” races.

¹⁹ Which “Cause” had been *originally actively supported by* the father of George Herbert Walker Bush and the grandfather of George Walker Bush (Prescott Bush, the United States Senator from the State of Connecticut), by “the namesake” of *both* George Bushes (George Herbert Walker, the Maternal Grandfather of George Herbert Walker Bush, the Maternal Great-Grandfather of George Walker Bush and the C.E.O. of Brown Brothers-Harriman, the major financier of significant imperialist ventures in Latin America and the owners of The United Fruit Corporation), **by** the father of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Ted Kennedy (Joseph P. Kennedy, the former United States Ambassador to Britain) and **by** the father of David Rockefeller, the founder of the Council on Foreign Relations (John D. Rockefeller) and other major American Bankers such as J.P. Morgan and -----

OPTION “B”

THE “CONSERVATIVE” WORLDVIEW

This second “Worldview offering” took the form of a “new draft” of Paul Wolfowitz’s and Richard Cheney’s original “February 18th 1992 Defense Planning Guidance Document”. This “new draft” was prepared and then circulated within the Bush White House beginning on the morning of April 16, 1992.

This “new draft” proposed a new Post Cold War American foreign and military policy that was far less “unilateralist” and was, therefore, far less “threatening” to America’s European allies than was Wolfowitz’s and Cheney’s February proposed new policy. This “new policy” proposed a much heavier reliance by the United States on “regional alliances” to deter hostile, non-democratic powers from seeking to dominate strategic regions of the globe.

This April 16th Draft also emphasized the need and intent of the United States to preserve a key role for NATO in areas of the world in which American military power had been pre-eminent throughout the period of The Cold War.

This “new document” also placed a much greater emphasis on international military cooperation – with a special emphasis on cooperation with Russia, the Ukraine and the other former Republics of the former Soviet Union.

This April 16th, 1992 document became known as “The Defense Planning Guidance Document for 1994-to-99” (as distinct from “The 1992 Defense Planning Guidance Document” that was drafted by Paul Wolfowitz.)

This document, too, however, expressly reserved the right of the United States “to act independently, as necessary, to protect the vital interests of the United States.”

As discussed above, this April 16th, 1992 “new draft” of the Defense Planning Guidance Document was written almost exclusively by George Bush Senior, General Colin Powell and George Bush Senior’s former CIA Covert Operations Director, Theodore G. Shackley. It was entitled: “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century...And Beyond.”

This document was a “paradigmatic” statement of the “Conservative” Worldview. In this document George Bush Senior, General Colin Powell and former CIA Covert Operations Director Theodore G. Shackley stated, in effect, that:

While it is true that it was the United States that played the central role in “defeating” the threat of Global Communism (first by financing the reconstruction of Europe and Japan after World War II through The Marshall Plan, then by developing and maintaining nuclear weapons superiority over the Soviet Union, by then “confronting”, through *covert operations*, the potential spread of Soviet Communism in Europe, Africa and Latin America and then, finally, by threatening to commence a *new* “round” of nuclear weapons development in the form of the proposed “Star Wars” Project that threatened to “bankrupt” the Soviet Union) it is, however, important for the United States, here at the end of The Cold War, to “reach out” to its “Western” Allies **and to bring “The Western Industrial Nations” into a crucial new ECONOMIC, MILITARY and POLITICAL “Alliance” WITH RUSSIA** in order to prepare “Western Civilization” to protect itself...and its values... against the potential “rise of a New Asian Empire” under the potential global leadership of China.

So, *rather than* the United States embarking on a “*unilateralist*” strategy of pursuing primarily its *own* narrow *self*-interests as an independent nation state, the United States should:

- A.) **NOT** “reduce” its Cold War-period level of total annual military spending substantially below that of its 1991-1992 “Cold War” level;
- B.) Re-direct *from* its future annual U.S. military expenditures on any further development of *its own* “independent” *strategic* military defense...by cutting its future military expenditures on such “Strategic” war-fighting military technologies as: *any new* “Strategic Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile System” and our U.S. “Inter-Continental ‘Strategic’ Manned-Bomber Program – *to* other military areas ; and
- C.) Re-direct the bulk of the funds saved *from* those no-longer-needed “U.S.” “Strategic” War Fighting Programs *into* the **Re-Structuring** of our U.S. “Conventional” (i.e. NON-“nuclear”) military forces so as to be prepared to “project **U.S.** military power” into and to WIN TWO DISTINCT “Theater-Level” Wars in two entirely different regions of the world AT THE SAME TIME;
- D.) Develop an entirely new “Generation” of Conventional, Theater-Level War-fighting technologies (in the form of a new “Tactical” Jet Fighter, a new highly-mobile and multi-terrain

armored tank with increased “fire power”, new highly-mobile “tactical” Troop Transport Vehicles, a new “tactical” military helicopter and new “high-tech” night-time war-fighting equipment [such as a new Generation of “night-vision” equipment, new human-body-heat-seeking weaponry, new encrypted battlefield communications equipment, etc.] and a new infantry rifle – **ALL OF WHICH NEW MILITARY EQUIPMENT WAS TO BE DEVELOPED, MANUFACTURED AND SOLD BY UNITED STATES PRIVATE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL CORPORATIONS**

AND

which was to be “standardized” for all N.A.T.O. nations;

- E.) Develop a new, “highly-mobile”, “Rapid-Deployment” “Tactical” Military Fighting Force capable of being “air-lifted”, on “short-notice”, into “tactical” situations which will require the application of merely “tactical” fighting forces to engage in “police actions” *with military forces provided by other N.A.T.O. nations*; and
- F.) Direct the remainder of the money redirected away from the future construction of new Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile Systems and Inter-Continental Manned-Bomber Programs into the development and deployment of a **highly-intensified** and **dramatically-increased** program of **LOW INTENSITY WARFARE** (i.e. “COVERT” OPERATIONS) to be by the United States to pre-emptively disrupt and “neutralize” any even “potential” resistance to the policies of a new “Northern Industrial Alliance.”
- G.) Finally, the United States should take the lead in organizing a new “Northern Industrial Alliance” between the “Western” nation states which were signatories to the North American Free Trade Agreement (N.A.F.T.A) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (G.A.T.T.) *with* **RUSSIA** which would be an *economic* Alliance, a *military* Alliance and a *political* Alliance.

However, because the internal discussion of this George Bush Senior/Colin Powell/Theodore Shackley “Option B” Strategic Global Organizing Plan that began, in March of 1992, within the highest ranks of the Executive Administration of George Bush Senior was never *publicly* discussed until after the “Liberal” Community “went public” with *its* proposal for a new, Post Cold War global organizing principle, let us turn our attention, next, to this “liberal” proposal (“Option C”) that was publicly made, in June of 1992, by Dr. Zbigniew Brezezinski, the former National Security Advisor in the “Liberal” 1976-to-1980 Democratic Party Administration of Jimmy Carter.

OPTION “C”

THE “LIBERAL” WORLDVIEW

Within six months of the official dissolution of The Soviet Union on the night of December 31st of 1991, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, the former National Security Advisor of The United States Government under the “Liberal” Democratic Party Administration of President Jimmy Carter, in June of 1992, published what has come to be widely-recognized as the "Opening *Public* Salvo" in the critical Post Cold War public policy debate among the leaders of Western Civilization to determine and define the *specific* contours of the task that presently lays before the people of Western Civilization - now that “The Cold War” is over: the task of identifying, explicating and carrying into effect the long-espoused (but equally long-postponed) “Ideals” of Western Civilization.

In June 1992, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski published a public White Paper entitled: Out of Control: Global Turmoil On The Eve of The 21st Century.

In this White Paper, Dr. Brzezinski declared that our Post Cold War World was now faced with a “Clear and Present Danger” of “imminent global chaos" that, he predicted, would begin virtually immediately, beginning in 1993, within a specific 32-nation geographical region of our planet that he identified as “The Eurasian Oblong.” This was a several-hundred-thousand square mile area of our planet measured, from west to east, from the Balkans on the Adriatic Sea eastward to the western-most border of China's Sinkiang Province [i.e. “Southeastern Europe”] and measured, north to south, from the Russian-Kazakhstan frontier along the Russian-Ukrainian Border southward to the Persian Gulf. This “Eurasian Oblong” includes all of Iraq, Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan and the entire “Middle East.”

This state of “global chaos" that Dr. Brzezinski predicted in his 1992 White Paper, he argued would be generated as a direct result of the creation of a sudden "geopolitical power vacuum" that was created by the sudden unanticipated “collapse” of the Russian Empire as a world power. As a result of this “power vacuum”, Dr. Brzezinski asserted, that there had “evaporated” any perceived chance of there ever developing, within the foreseeable future, a stable “Russian-Chinese-Iranian-Middle Eastern Alliance” that would have been culturally capable of peacefully governing this region of the world in accordance with “some clearly-defined set of political, economic, social and cultural principles” that could be commonly agreed-upon among these four “cultural powers” in that region of the world.

Dr. Brzezinski warned, in his 1992 article, that the United States (as the sole remaining "Super Power" on our planet) would be sorely tempted to intervene, unilaterally, in this part of the world to attempt to "police" this region - in order to undertake the facially-appealing task of attempting to put a stop to what many would perceive to be a very dangerous - indeed unacceptably dangerous - threat to world stability: a situation that would threaten general military and political "chaos" throughout this entire region of the world manifesting itself in the form of regional civil wars, massive "ethnic cleansing" and racially-driven pogroms.

Indeed, Dr. Brzezinski predicted, in his June 1992 White Paper, that many nation states of the world would aggressively implore the United States to *unilaterally* intervene into this part of the world in the face of potentially soul-shattering examples of human torture and racial genocide that would be immediately forthcoming in this part of the world following the end of The Cold War.

However, Dr. Brzezinski sternly warned the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of the United States, in his 1992 article, to resist yielding to the strong temptation to unilaterally intervene that would be generated in response to these strong exhortations.

Dr. Brzezinski advocated that the leaders of the United States, instead, consciously "endure" this temporary horror while our political leaders engaged in the task of "re-configuring" the nations of the Post Cold War World into a "New Global Confederal Structure" – other than The United Nations – *that would be led into being by The United States* - which "New Global Confederal Structure" could then undertake to insert its *collective* power into this dangerously-unstable region of the world, in the form of a new *multi-lateral* Alliance.²⁰

HOWEVER, in order to "lead" into creation such a new and unprecedented "New Global Confederal Structure", Dr. Brzezinski asserted categorically, in his 1992 White Paper, that it would be absolutely indispensable that the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of the United States (assisted by other Western World leaders) BECOME, IN ACTUAL DAY-TO-DAY PRACTICE, "The Moral Leader" of such a New World Order.

²⁰ Any truly objective analysis of the actual policy which was followed by the Democratic Administration of President Bill Clinton concerning the Balkin Crisis which followed the collapse of The Soviet Union reveals that Dr. Brzezinski's specific advise was followed, to the letter, by The Clinton Democratic Administration.

In order to earn this unique status, in actual practice, Dr. Brzezinski argued that the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of the United States (assisted by world leaders from other nations of The West) must **SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY AND COMMIT THEMSELVES TO VOLUNTARILY COMPORT THEIR CONDUCT - BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND COLLECTIVELY – IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH A SPECIFIC SET OF CONCRETE "ETHICAL PRINCIPLES", *ULTIMATELY MORAL IN THEIR NATURE.***

Dr. Brzezinski argued that such a “voluntary” comportment of their conduct in accordance with such a commonly-agreed-upon set of “Ethical Principles” would, in practice, lead the nations of The West... and our citizenry... **away from** the pursuit of what Dr. Brzezinski identified as “The ACTUAL ‘Ideal’ of Western Civilization” (which Dr. Brzezinski identified as “The Pursuit of ‘Permissive Cornucopia.’”) This “Pursuit of ‘Permissive Cornucopia’” identified by Dr. Brzezinski was the pursuit of personal greed and material wealth on the part of our individual private citizens and our private business corporations, and the conscious pursuit of the accumulation of national political, military and economic power and control over the natural resources of the rest of the world on the part of our government leaders (in *both* the Republican Party *and* the Democratic Party.)

This “voluntary” comportment of their conduct in accordance with such a commonly-agreed-upon set of “Ethical Principles” would, in practice, **NOT ONLY** lead the nations of The West... and our citizenry... **away from** the *exclusive* pursuit of “Permissive Cornucopia” but this conduct would also lead us **toward** the *more* successful “accommodation” of what Dr. Brzezinski identified as the “general social needs” of the people of the world (that is, toward the pursuit of the *more* effective alleviation of global poverty; toward the *more* successful preservation of “nature's patrimony” [i.e. our natural environment] and toward the *more* effective protection of the “authenticity” of each individual human identity in the face of the growing threat posed by the increasingly mindless development of technology in the fields of human genetic engineering and cloning and in the field of the development of more and more deadly weaponry.

Dr. Brzezinski argued in his 1992 article that **ONLY** by undertaking the two specific actions of:

- **THE PUBLIC IDENTIFICATION OF** and
- **THE ACTUAL VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL AND COLECTIVE CONDUCT WITH** such a " specific set of concrete “ethical principles”, ultimately *moral in their nature*”

would The United States be able to substantively “earn”, rather than simply unilaterally attempt to “lay claim to”, the title of “The Moral Leader of A New Global Confederation” (guided by democratic principles and free-market values voluntarily SELF- restrained from the pursuit of the *actual* Western ideal of “Permissive Cornucopia.”)

The self-conscious *identification* of such a set of concrete “Ethical Principles” - and the *collective mustering of the national political, economic, intellectual and cultural will necessary to persuade our national political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders – and our private institutions and citizenry - to voluntarily comport our individual and collective national conduct in The West with these ultimately “moral” values* - was, then, “the ultimate historic challenge” that Dr. Brzezinski identified as “The Challenge” that presently confronts the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of the United States (and of the Western Nations as a whole) here at “The End of History” following the conclusion of The Cold War.

When scrutinized completely objectively, Zbigniew Brzezinski's 1992 “moral challenge” to the “Leaders of Western Civilization” can be seen to be nothing more than (though nothing less than) a simple re-articulation, in only slightly-modified wording more appropriate to the 1990’s, of the advice that the Chair of Harvard University's Department of Philosophy, Dr. John Rawls, gave to Western Leaders in his famous 1972 work entitled A Theory of Justice.

In that historic 1972 treatise on Moral Ethics, Dr. John Rawls advocated that Western policy makers seeking a truly effective, and morally-defensible, “Standard of Justice” should seek to self-consciously “caveat” any standard public policy choice that they might be otherwise motivated to make based strictly upon the “wooden” application of the classical “Utilitarian” Mode of Ethical Reasoning (that is: a Mode of Ethical Reasoning that is motivated solely by the seeking of their “self-interest” on the part of the majority of a given community’s citizens causing them to select those public policy choices which, more or less arithmetically, generate merely “the greatest good for the greatest number”) by, instead, “*modifying*” any such purely “wooden” application of the “Utilitarian” Mode of Ethical Reasoning by adopting an *amended* Mode of Ethical Reasoning that would cause them to select, instead, that public policy choice that would “generate the greatest good for the greatest number” but, which would, AT THE EXACT SAME TIME, provide AT LEAST ‘SOME THING’ for the least well-off.” The choice of such a self-conscious “modified” or “alternative” Mode of Ethical Reasoning on the part of Western Policy-Makers, Dr. Rawls argued in his 1972 work, would constitute an ethical “compromise” *between*:

- the employment and the “wooden” application of a strictly classical "Utilitarian" Mode of Ethical Reasoning in the field of public policy (which, for example, he argued, might “mechanically” result in a public policy choice of allowing the 90% of a population of the United States which is Caucasian to continue to retain as slaves the 10% of the population which is Black) and
- the employment of the Mode of Ethical Reasoning advocated by adherents of what Dr. Rawls identified as "The ‘*Intuitionist*’ School of Justice" (members of which “School” were given to uttering such seemingly impenetrable declarations as: "All men are created equal and are endowed, by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights, among which are Life, Liberty and The Pursuit of Happiness" etc.)

This “compromise” Mode of Ethical Reasoning was, of course, the classic “Liberal” Ethic.

Dr. Brzezinski's 1992 re-articulation of Dr. Rawls' 1972 “Liberal” Principle of Justice and his advocacy that this specific “Mode of Ethical Reasoning” be utilized by Western leaders to arrive at their Post Cold War public policy positions, here on “the eve of the 21st Century”, resulted in Dr. Brzezinski's advocacy of a foreign policy by means of which Western Leaders would allow the public policy choices of our “New World Order” to be *primarily* dictated by the operation of the unregulated play of pure Capitalist “market forces” (i.e. “free market” forces) *but then* to consciously “temper” these decisions by undertaking the self-conscious act of “supplementing” such otherwise “raw” market force -determined choices in the field of public policy by (“arbitrarily”, as it were) providing AT THE SAME TIME “at least some minimum guarantee of individual well-being” to those who would not otherwise be adequately provided for simply by the simple “wooden” putting into direct effect, as national American public policy, the unvarnished result of the simple “free play” of raw “free-market” forces. See, e.g., Out of Control, at p.216.

Thus, both Dr. Rawls' and Dr. Brzezinski's proposals can be seen to be a simple re-articulation of the classical “Liberal Ethic” that was publicly advocated, for example, by Professor Louis Hartz of Harvard University, in the mid-1950’s, in his famous work entitled The Liberal Ethic.

OPTION “B-(2)”

THE PUBLIC “CONSERVATIVE” WORLDVIEW

This “Conservative Cause” within this Post-Cold War Global Public Policy Debate has been *publicly* “championed”, during the decade following the end of The Cold War, by the President of the American Academy of Political Science, Professor Samuel P. Huntington, from his position as the most prominent academic spokesperson in the field of International Policy for the “conservative” New York City-based Council on Foreign Relations of David Rockefeller’s Trilateral Commission.

Because this *public* explication, by Samuel P. Huntington, of this “Conservative” Strategic Global Organizing Plan was not *publicly* released to the American public until *after* former Carter Administration National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski published his “Liberal” “Threat of Global Chaos” White Paper in June of 1992 – even though Professor Huntington’s June 1993 Foreign Affairs Magazine article explicated basically the same “Conservative” Worldview that had, *earlier* been laid out *only in secret* by George Bush Senior, General Colin Powell and Theodore G. Shackley in March of 1992 in their internal White House Memorandum entitled “The Projection of U.S. Military Power Into The 21st Century and Beyond” – this “Conservative” “Option B (2)” is placed here, following the explication of Zbigniew Brzezinski’s “Liberal” proffer that we have identified as “Option C”, because Zbigniew Brzezinski’s “Liberal” offer appeared first, and Professor Huntington is so obviously *responding to* Dr. Brzezinski’s proposed Post Cold War Global Organizing Principle in his 1993 Foreign Affairs Magazine article.

Professor Huntington’s “Conservative” Worldview in this Global Public Policy Debate was been set forth *publicly* clearly and straightforwardly in Professor Huntington’s 1996 book entitled The Clash of Civilizations: The Remaking of World Order, that is an expanded version of his famous article of the same title which was published in Foreign Affairs Magazine in June of 1993.

Professor Samuel P. Huntington, the former Director of Security Planning for The United States National Security Council; the former President of the American Political Science Association and the most influential member of the all-powerful Council on Foreign Relations of David Rockefeller's conservative Trilateral Commission, responded almost immediately to Dr. Brzezinski's “Opening Salvo”, when he, in June of 1993, publicly recommended a starkly different “Organizing Principle” to Western political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders from the “Organizing Principle” proffered by Dr. Brzezinski.

Professor Huntington undertook this “proffer” in his public article published in the prestigious magazine Foreign Affairs. This article was entitled “THE CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS AND THE REMAKING OF WORLD ORDER”.

This June 1993 article quickly became the **most** widely-read, and the **most** widely-discussed, American public policy paper presented in United States history ...other than George Kennan's famous "X Article" that was published in 1946 (also in Foreign Affairs Magazine). In that earlier Foreign Affairs Magazine article, George Kennan, writing under the pen-name of “X”, had advocated to the Leaders of The Western World the adoption of the Western “Organizing Principle” of “Containment” toward The Soviet Union, China and World Communism – through the implementation of “The Marshall Plan.”

Professor Huntington's 1996 expansion on his 1993 article is *still* a national best-selling book listed weekly, in *The New York Times Review of Books* as one of the top-selling non-fiction books in recent American history. Professor Huntington therefore presently unquestionably “occupies the field” as the proponent of the most widely-accepted “alternative” Post Cold War “Strategic Global Organizing Principle” to Dr. Brzezinski's 1992 proposed adoption of “The Liberal Ethic.”

In his 1993 article, and again in his 1996 book of the same title, Professor Huntington *expressly* condemned Dr. Brzezinski's call for the ascertainment of, and the voluntary comportment of our national leaders’ individual and collective conduct with, what Professor Huntington characterized as alleged “Universal Ethical Principles” to be *artificially* imposed upon otherwise clear choices dictated by “pure free market forces”.

In his book, Professor Huntington states:

The concept of a “Universal Civilization” is a distinctive product of Western Culture. In the 19th Century, this idea of “The White Man's Burden” helped justify the extension of Western political and economic domination over non-western societies. Here, at the end of the 20th Century, this concept of a “universal civilization” is now being used again to justify western cultural dominance over other non-western societies and the need of those societies to ape western practices and institutions. “Universal civilization” is, in short, simply the ideology the West uses to confront non-western cultures.

This accusation by Professor Huntington is of the utmost importance to the point that we are making in this work - because his specific criticism of Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski's proposal has indisputable merit. Moreover, this criticism is grounded squarely in the specific statements and principles that are articulated by Dr. Brzezinski himself in his own 1992 writing.

For example: in his 1992 White Paper, Dr. Brzezinski asserts such principles as the following:

Today, the United States stands as the only truly global power. The question arises whether a global power that is not guided by a globally-relevant set of values can for long exercise that predominance. Unless there is some deliberate effort to reestablish the centrality of some moral criteria for the exercise of self-control over gratification as an end in itself, this phase of American preponderance may not last long, despite the absence of any self-evident replacement Although an increasingly interdependent global political process is emerging, America's difficulty in exercising global authority could produce a situation of intensifying global instability - because of inner weaknesses derived more from cultural causes than from economic causes....This crisis in the post-communist world, in the meantime, could deepen, undermining the wider global appeal of democracy [and free-market Capitalist economies] and a new coalition of poorer nations - perhaps led by China - might then emerge...This is the critical historical challenge that America now faces. Only by creating a society that is guided by some shared criteria of self-restraint can America shape a world *in-which we are in control of its destiny*. Only with such recognition, can we *insure that we will be the Masters* - not the victims - *of history in the 21st Century* . See, Introduction, Out of Control , pp. xiii-xv (emphasis supplied).

This troublesome tone appears over and over again in Dr. Brzezinski's 1992 writing. For example, Dr. Brzezinski states, at pp. 87-89 of his 1992 work:

“In the final decade of the 20th Century, the United States stands perched on top of the world. It faces no rival capable of matching its comprehensive global power - a power that has four dimensions: (1) global military reach; (2) global economic impact; (3) global cultural and ideological appeal and (4) global political muscle. However, the value content of the American message threatens to undermine *America's role as the Global Leader*. Can America sustain its ‘special position’ over the long haul ? ... History teaches that a super power cannot long *remain dominant* unless it projects - with a measure of self-righteous confidence - a message of world-wide relevance. *That was the experience of Rome, of France and of Great Britain....*

This is the necessary point of departure for an assessment of *America's staying power as the globe's predominant State* and the prospects of any possible rival to America's pre-eminence." (Emphasis added).

Again, at pp. 216-217, Dr. Brzezinski states:

There is today no shared global understanding of the real meaning of democracy ... Even more confusion is evident in the case of the concept of the 'free market'. Today, it is triumphant - with 'Thatcherism' held in higher repute than 'Marxism'. However, unless democratic practice, especially the economic performance of the free market system, leads to a demonstrable improvement in social conditions, it is only a question of time before a negative reaction to these concepts sets in.

And, most starkly, he states:

Without some instinctive, organic national aspiration, nations do not emerge - or remain - great powers. *Only those which in some manner produce a culturally spontaneous outburst of assertive, competitive and driving desire to explore and to conquer, transform themselves into an entity that becomes demonstrably more dominant than others. That desire reflects a sense of mission expressed through wholehearted dedication of countless individuals who partake of a shared commitment to glory and destiny of national greatness.* Id., at p.116 (Emphasis added.)

However, lest one misjudge the "perspective" (or "direction") *from* which Professor Huntington's criticism is being directed against Dr. Brzezinski's "challenge" that Dr. Brzezinski poses to the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of the United States, one must recognize that Professor Huntington's "challenge" to Dr. Brzezinski is being issued from the "Right"- and NOT from the "left" - by a professional advisor to The Council on Foreign relations of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission who is NOT genuinely sympathetic to "the cause" of protecting the poor potential victims of "universal values"... as one might mistakenly surmise from the specific content and tone of Professor Huntington's initial criticism voiced against Dr. Brzezinski's proposal.

Professor Huntington is clearly no opponent of "Imperialism", especially not on any "ethical" grounds.

While, at pp. 26-27 of his 1996 book-length explication of his 1993 article published in Foreign Affairs, Professor Huntington *seems to* “recognize” nine separate and distinct “civilization identities”, that he states will be “shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration and conflict in the Post Cold War World of the 21st Century”, in actual practice Professor Huntington, at p. 42 of his 1996 book, flatly states that:

Of all the objective elements that define civilizations, the most important is religion ... To a very large degree the Major Civilizations [are] closely identified with the world's Great Religions."

Professor Huntington therefore goes on to state, at p. 47 of his 1996 book, that:

“Religion is the central defining characteristic of civilization” and “the great religions are the foundation on which the great civilizations rest."

Because, Professor Huntington argues, the Catholic Christian religion “predominates” in both Latin America and in Sub-Sahara Africa, he argues, at p.136 of his 1996 book, that it is appropriate to simply “merge” all of the cultures in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa into “The West”, as what he designates as simple “sub-variants” of *Christian* ‘Western Christian Civilization’.

Professor Huntington, at pp-174 et seq. of his 1996 book, does the same for all of the North African potentially “separate” “civilizations” (including Islam and Judaism) all of which he merely “subsumes” under the identity of one over-arching “Islamic Civilization."

Such an analysis starkly negates any purported claim that Samuel Huntington might wish to stake out as an opponent of “Cultural Imperialism.”

At pp. 100-109 of his 1996 work, Professor Huntington then goes on to present to his American readers a potential military and economic dialectical “Adversary” in the form of “The New Asian Empire” to be led by China - as the “source” of the stimulus of his new “Organizing Principle” for “The West.” There Professor Huntington sets forth the principle premise of his proposed “Worldview: that the Leaders and people of Western Civilization must self- consciously RETURN TO the embracing and practicing a “Core Set of Uniquely ‘**Western**’ Beliefs and Ideas”, as “common members” of a uniquely “distinct” **Western** Civilization, in order to re-claim the source of the unique “power” and identity that belongs to “Western Civilization” – “beliefs” and “ideas” that are inescapably *expressly separate and distinct from* the essentially “*different*” Cultures of Asia, Islamic Northern Africa (and, perhaps, the “Orthodox” region of Russia [depending upon Russia’s Post Cold War willingness to become part of “Western Civilization”]).

See, pp-1 63-168). This must be done, Professor Huntington exhorts Western World Leaders, in order to “stave off” what Professor Huntington plainly presents to the world as the *actual* “Clear and Present Danger” that faces the world, here at “The End of History” represented by the end of “The Cold War.” This is: the immanent economic, and then the eventual (but inevitable) military threat posed to “The West” by an economically and militarily superior “New Asian Empire” adversary (pp. 103-209) that Professor Huntington predicts will PROBABLY wage a thermonuclear war against “The West” at the end of The Second Decade of the 21st Century in order to “overwhelm” The West ... UNLESS The West takes specific steps to rapidly “strengthen itself” by our self-conscious return to a firm and devoted practice of its “unique” and “distinctive” “WESTERN” cultural values.

Professor Huntington, thereupon, straightforwardly calls upon the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of The West to “RENEW” their individual and collective commitment to a “Core Set” of cultural values that are “uniquely” and “distinctively” Western which include:

- the embracing of The Classical Legacy of Greek Philosophy and Rationalism;
- adherence to The Roman Concept of The Rule of Law;
- the use of the Latin Languages;
- the re-centralization within our culture of The Catholic and Protestant Christian Religion;
- the imposition of Representative Democracy;
- respect for Private Property;
- the installment of the “Free-Market” Economic System throughout The West; and
- the enshrining of “Individualism.” (See, pp-69-72)

Only a strict and rigid adherence to these specific *uniquely* “Western” values, Professor Huntington argues in his 1993 article, will provide “the means” by which we can adequately strengthen our Western Culture to successfully prepare ourselves to “stave off” being *first* intentionally culturally “overwhelmed” by

“The New Asian Empire”, *then* economically subjugated by “The New Asian Empire” and *finally* inevitably militarily “overwhelmed”, in a thermonuclear war, by this vastly larger and potentially more powerful culture in the 21st Century (pp. 312-316.)

This is decidedly a *very different* “challenge” for Western Leaders than the “challenge” that was identified by Zbigniew Brzezinski.

However, it is important to note that both Professor Huntington’s and Dr. Brzezinski’s seemingly *different* prescriptions for a new Post Cold War planetary culture share a disturbingly similar endorsement of a strict adherence to “the free market” economic system as the sole mode of economic development on our entire planet and the wirings of both authors contain a strikingly similar endorsement of The United States remaining the overwhelmingly “strongest” and “most dominant” nation state on the planet – while becoming a “partner” in a new self-conscious “Confederation of States” to be formed *by the United States* among the industrialized nations of “Western Civilization.”

IF a common agreement were to be struck between Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski and the members of his “Liberal” Community and Professor Samuel P. Huntington and the members of his “Conservative” Community pursuant to which Dr. Brzezinski’s “Common Set of Ethical Principles” were to be identified as virtually the same “values” that Professor Huntington would identify as the “values” that are “unique” and “distinctive” to “Western Culture” and the *membership* in Dr. Brzezinski’s “New Confederal Structure” of nation states were to be determined to be the same “Western” nations that Professor Huntington recommends “band together” to re-commit themselves to “strengthening” their adherence to this *same* “core set” of *uniquely* “Western” values – then a profoundly strong and intense “alliance” would be in the offing between the leading adherents to the “Conservative” Worldview and the leading adherents to the “Liberal” Worldview here at the end of The Cold War.²¹

²¹ This potential Post Cold War “Alliance” between the “Conservative” supporters of George *Herbert* Walker Bush and the “Liberal” supporters of Massachusetts Senator John Kerry will be the subject of an important discussion later in this work.

OPTION “D”

THE “MODERATE” WORLDVIEW

During the course of the 75-year-long “Cold War” between The Soviet Union and The West, the National Democratic Party gradually assumed the role of the potential “Mediator” or “Ameliorator” between the two “extreme” positions advocated by World Communism (advocated by The International Communist Party) and Caucasian State Capitalism (that has been traditionally advocated by The National Republican Party in the United States.)

Democratic President Franklin Delano Roosevelt became the preeminent “Mediator” in this undertaking.

When the system of “Caucasian State Capitalism” was given its “full reign” between 1845 and 1917 in the United States during “The Gilded Era” by the leadership of the National Republican Party, this caused the Western Capitalist system to virtually collapse in upon itself under the weight of its own natural excesses in 1929.²² It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a son of America’s most elite economic aristocracy, who “stepped in” to “salvage” Western Civilization’s social organizing principle of Caucasian State Capitalism *from itself* ...but also from the very real threat of being “vanquished” by the forces of World Communism²³ in 1932. This dual proposition has been the subject of extensive research and writing by economic and political scholars over the years since 1932.²⁴

My point, however, is not to re-explore, or to reargue, this well-researched and already well-argued dual proposition here. It is, rather, simply to move *from* this point to *my* point - which is my contention that *this* unique “role” (as the “Mediator” or “Ameliorator” between the “excessive” activities of the proponents of “raw”, unbridled Caucasian State Capitalism and the potential appeal, in The West, of certain aspects of “World Communism”) became the “institutional” role

²² For an objective explication of the inherent tendency of the Western Capitalist system to gravitate toward these “excesses”,
See e.g. the Original Draft of The United States Catholic Bishops’ Economic Pastoral Letter: Economic justice For All, 1986

²³ The principles of which had come to be supported, by 1932, by literally hundreds of thousands of perfectly patriotic American workers within the United States who had become convinced by their personal victimization by the “excesses” of State Capitalism and its attendant International Imperialism

²⁴ See, e.g. -----

of the National Democratic Party within the American Political Order following The World Depression of 1929 throughout the remainder of The Cold War period. The raw “Reactionaries” - who remained inside the National Republican Party throughout the period between 1932 and 1964 - repeatedly, attempted to “purge” the National Democratic Party of anyone whom they perceived to be what they called a “fellow traveler” of advocates of the “socialized” view of The World Order. However, despite this repeated endeavor, until December 31st of 1991, steadfast advocates of “Moderating” between the “extreme” views of “The Reactionaries” within the National Republican Party and the “extreme” views of adherents to the World Communist Party maintained effective ideological control over the National Democratic Party throughout the period of The Cold War, bringing to the United States: the Anti-Child Labor Laws; Federal Anti-Trust Laws; the Five-Day Workweek Legislation; The Federal Minimum Wage Law; The Social Security Act; Federal MediCare Legislation; The Federal Graduated Income Tax Amendment; Federal Air Quality Control Legislation; Federal Environmental Legislation and numerous other federal legislative programs *all* of which had the effect of *legislating against* the strictly pro-Capitalist “bent” of the American entrepreneurial class **on behalf of** average American citizens *as workers and consumers* (who were, otherwise, considered to be mere “objects” by the “Captains of Industry” who controlled the ideology of the National Republican Party.)

However, while these endeavors on the part of the National Democratic Party, between 1932 and December 31st of 1991, were consistently attacked and condemned as “socialistic” and even as “Communistic” by strict adherents to the “Reactionary” Worldview inside the Capitalist Class leadership of the National Republican Party, it is essential to recognize that these “ameliorative” Democratic Party-inspired legislative enactments consistently – indeed *uniformly* – fell vastly short of fulfilling *any* of the truly “socialist” demands of The World Communist Movement.

These “ameliorative” Democratic Party legislative enactments, directly to the contrary, were *self-consciously* “calculated” by the leaders of the National Democratic Party to simply “stave off” the “more radical” demands of The World Communist Movement by providing some simple “modicum” of “compromise” between the raw “Capitalistic” objectives of the leaders of the National Republican Party and the genuinely “socialistic” objectives of adherents to The World Communist Movement.

That is all that need be said about this fact - lest this work be *mis*-perceived as somehow “advocating” the secular Communist *economic* “cause” simply because one deigns to use the term “Capitalist” to identify the principles, policies and proposals that have historically been “driven” by simple “Capitalist” principles

and to recognize that the American Democratic Party has NOT provided a meaningful “solution” to the social and economic problems identified by the worldwide socialist movement of the 20th Century.

The point that we are making here is simply this: When the preeminent nation state on our planet that supported and actively espoused the adoption and implementation of the purely “Communist” Worldview collapsed on the night of December 31st, 1991, the leadership of the National Democratic Party in the United States immediately lost their by-then **75-year** *raison d’etre*. Stated specifically, the National Democratic Party, on the night of December 31st, 1991 lost its 75-year-old reason for continuing, any longer, to exercise their simple “*moderating*” activity within the American Political Order between the advocates of the supremacy of pure “raw” capitalistic market forces and the advocates of the “administered” social welfare State.

Their 75-year exercise and application of this merely *moderating* “Mode of Ethical Reasoning” of the “Liberal” Democratic Party philosophy had brought the National Democratic Party, as of December 31st of 1991, to the position, within the American Political Order, of being the predominantly “Liberal” political party within the American Political Order, articulating the “compromise” legislative and social positions “located” somewhere “mid-way” between the 150-year-old “Reactionary” Worldview “Thesis” of “Caucasian State Capitalism” (that was still openly advocated by the “Reactionaries” within the National Republican Party) and the 75-year-old “communist” Worldview “Anti-Thesis” of Secular World Communism (that was openly advocated by the membership of The World Communist Party.)

Because of the surprisingly sudden “loss” of its virtually “mechanically-identified” 75-year task of being “the moral rudder” within the American Political Order at midnight of December 31st of 1991, on the morning of January 1st of 1992, the historically-“Liberal” National Democratic Party in the United States found itself without its traditional 75-year-old “moral compass.”

Without the continuing historical “pull” of the “Communist” “Anti-Thesis” pulling the National Democratic Party “*toward*” a position of “socialist” compromise with the “Reactionary” advocates of raw Caucasian State Capitalism, beginning on the morning of January 1st, 1992, the leadership of the National Democratic Party in the United States began to suddenly “drift” slowly...but steadily...in the direction of the Caucasian State Capitalist public policy positions that were being aggressively advocated by the leadership of the National Republican Party, spelling the effective “end” of the potential world-wide “Socialist Revolution.”

In light of this fact, an overtly *self-conscious* effort was immediately mounted, from *within* the National Democratic Party, to discern – and to publicly-articulate - a “new, ‘*more moderate*’ ” Worldview to be advocated by the National Democratic Party within the American Political Order.

This task was undertaken immediately by the new Democratic Leadership Council that was founded and led by a member of the National Democratic Party who has historically publicly-identified *himself* as “A Terminal Centrist”, Missouri Congressman Richard Gephardt.

(HERE INSERT A SHORT HISTORY OF THE DLC)

OPTION “E”

THE “PROGRESSIVE” RESPONSE

There was virtually no response whatsoever to Professor Fukuyama’s 1989 challenge from the “Progressive” community within Western Civilization. In the same manner there was no meaningful response to his challenge on the part of the adherents to any other generic “Worldview” either. This was due to the fact that no one took seriously Professor Fukuyama’s prediction predicting the imminent up-coming demise of the Soviet Union. However, unlike the adherents to the other systemic “worldviews” discussed above, members of the “Progressive” community in the United States, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, became functionally intellectually and philosophically “paralyzed.”

The *only* measurable response on the part of the “Progressive” community within the United States to the demise of the Soviet Union was the organization of “The Progressive Caucus” within the United States House of Representatives by progressive Ohio Congressman Dennis Kucinich of Cleveland, Ohio.

However, even this group (made up of some 54 members of The United States House of Representatives consisting almost exclusively of Congresspersons elected from very “liberal”-to-“progressive” University-town-dominated Congressional Districts, several predominantly minority-populated, poverty-stricken inner-city Congressional Districts and a handful of Congressional Districts inhabited by highly-educated professionals such as Marin County, California, San Francisco, the Upper-East Side of Manhattan and Beverly Hills) organized no effective joint staff and undertook no significant steps whatsoever to try to develop any truly coherent set of “progressive” “Principles”, “Policies” or “Programs.”

The remainder of the “Progressive” community throughout Western Civilization, however, (with the sole exception of Cuba) stood “frozen” like the proverbial “deer in the headlights of an on-rushing car”, simply “stunned” by the sudden and unexpected collapse of the global leader of the world-wide secular socialist movement for the full century of their lives.²⁵

²⁵ This is not to dismiss entirely the handful of efforts that were made to try to sustain an intellectual and philosophical rationale for “the socialist cause”, despite the demise of its historical leader. These efforts included ----- . However, because of the failure of any of these immediate post Cold War efforts to undertake to try to significantly “re-think” the fundamental philosophical and metaphysical assumptions of the Marxist ideology which underlay the 20th century rationale for the world-wide socialist movement, none of these immediate post Cold War intellectual or philosophical efforts generated any meaningful advance in the other-wise “lost” socialist cause.