

COPS OR CAESARS?



WILFRED JONES

Robert Nassikas is an ardent believer in American suzerainty. He argues on this page that only the United States can keep peace in the world and should use its enormous political and military power as the world's policeman. Michael McCusker thinks policing the planet is simply a euphemism for subordinating it and that no single nation should be permitted to be sole enforcer of international law regardless of its Herculean stature.

William Gilbert, of Gilbert & Sullivan operetta fame, a magnificent satirist and political critic during England's Victorian era, used a line in one of his creations which said, "A policeman's lot is not a happy one." That observation is as valid today as when it was written. In fact, it has always been one of civilization's truisms. The role of a policeman is one that, although it may be extremely difficult, is one that is absolutely vital to society, be it a small village, a huge metropolis, an entire nation or the world. Without ultimate authority, chaos, anarchy and general disorder would rule — a situation in which no civilized person would desire to exist.

The world in which we live has been described by many as "a jungle." That description, in my judgment, is an appropriate one, given the fact that throughout history nations have attacked other nations for any number of reasons — and there are many. Lasting harmony and order, it's been proven through the ages, is simply an impossible dream — a way of life which has never existed nor, based on history beginning with Cain and Abel through this very day, will never exist. It appears to be part of human nature for people to want what does not belong to them. Unfortunately, some of the evil ones will stop at nothing to acquire whatever they desire.

Getting back to Mr. Gilbert's observation vis a vis "a policeman's lot," the duty of trying to keep some sort of semblance of order in the world has, by default, been thrust into the hands of the United States — like it or not. The world today is filled with tin-horn dictators and tyrants ruling over Third World countries, realizing that in view of what we consider "ultimate weapons," i.e., nuclear devices, they are capable of bullying their neighbors or even invading and enslaving them. Maniacal brutal tyrants like Iraq's Saddam Hussein, who was among the most dangerous of his time given the fact that he ordered his military forces to invade and subjugate Kuwait.

What might have ensued had the U.S.-led coalition not stepped in to rectify that matter? A very real scenario is that he could have eventually taken over the entire Middle East and

controlled an enormous percentage of the world's oil. Evidence has been uncovered that he was working on developing nuclear capabilities. Had he been given enough time to succeed in that effort he would have been able to use those weapons to black-mail the civilized world.

This in itself could have caused worldwide economic disaster with a madman such as Hussein dictating terms to the world community. There is that element in our population decrying the fact our economy is so dependent on oil but it is a fact that must be accepted until another efficient practical form of energy can be developed. Our hand was forced finally when Middle Eastern terrorists actually attacked us within our own borders in such a spectacular and tragic manner on September 11, 2001.

Over recent years terrorist Muslims attacked us when they killed 17 U.S. sailors in the bombing of *USS Cole*, killed six Americans and injured a thousand others in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing; the 1996 bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia (19 U.S. military personnel killed); the 1998 bombing of U.S. embassies in Africa killed 224. The only responses by then-President Clinton was blood-and-thunder rhetoric and the launching of a few long-range missiles which fell harmlessly into some Middle East deserts. Consequently, the terrorists perceived that we didn't have the stomach to confront them militarily which apparently emboldened them to destroy the World Trade Center Towers.

One element of critics and armchair generals insisted that President George W. Bush should have left the "policing" to the United Nations. It is quite obvious the UN is completely impotent when it comes to military action. The one and only time that the UN militarily confronted an aggressor was fifty years ago on the Korean peninsula, and that war was fought mainly by the U.S. military. President Bush and Secretary of State Colin Powell actually went before that body of useless parasites to present their case against Iraq. Of course, the Security Council yawned and refused to take any action despite

overwhelming evidence that Iraq was involved in acting as training ground and staging area for terrorists. As it was eventually revealed, member nations of the Security Council, namely France and Russia, were siphoning off millions of dollars in the Oil for Food program which had been created to help feed the needy in Iraq.

So, it was shown that in addition to being impotent in dealing with aggressors, the UN was riddled with corrupt politicians headed by Secretary-General Kofi Annan. This is the organization that U.S. Senators John Kerry and Ted Kennedy, plus a host of others of their ilk, wanted us to depend on to deal with the world's problems.

The United States is the most powerful nation in the world. It is so very fortunate that the world's number one power is in the hands of responsible people headed by a government which is not in the business of occupying and colonizing other nations. Indeed, we were the first to develop nuclear bombs — only of necessity — and we were the only nation to ever use it on an enemy.

Since that time several other nations have joined the "nuclear club," Russia, China, England, France, Israel, India, Pakistan, and chillingly, North Korea. This latter nation is headed by a very questionable character, Kim Jong Il who, observers say, is not the most stable leader in the world community. I compare that situation with a 6 year old holding a loaded .38 pistol. It is hoped that China can be persuaded to use its influence to keep the wraps on Kim and to prevent him from causing military mischief.

Now it appears as if we have the Iranians who reportedly are aiming toward obtaining nuclear capabilities. Nations such as Iran, North Korea, Libya and formerly Iraq, are being led by very unstable leaders. For the most part member nations of the nuclear club seem to be considered relatively responsible and not likely to bully their neighbors. The ones we have to worry about are the third-rate countries, the ones President Bush labeled the "Axis of Evil."

The role of the U.S. is to employ diplomacy in every possible way. However, failing to do that, it is our duty, as one of our great Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, once said, to "use a big stick." No other nation is up to the task for whatever reason. It is left up to us to attempt to keep some semblance of world order with whatever method effective — diplomacy or as a last resort, militarily.

Most of us can remember the dark tragic days of Adolf Hitler, who admittedly planned on enslaving the world with his German legions. His Nazi murderers conquered most of Europe with brute force, viciously crushing any opposition, slaughtering millions of helpless victims. At least six million Jews were killed by various methods in the so-called "death camps."

Hitler faced powerful opposition when he invaded the Soviet Union and may even have succeeded there had not the United States shipped supplies to aid the beleaguered Russians.

And, in the Pacific, the Japanese ran roughshod over much of that part of the world before they made the mistake of awakening a "sleeping giant," a completely unprepared United States. The Japanese and Germans formed an unholy alliance with plans of eventually subjugating the civilized world. Had the U.S. and Great Britain listened to the masses of pacifists in their respective nations, Americans would have undoubtedly been raising the Nazi salute east of the Mississippi River while the West would be bowing to Japan's "Rising Sun."

Naysayers, pacifists, whiners and critics in our country — particularly in the halls of Congress — continually criticize publicly what our government is doing. The leading and loudest critic is Senator Kennedy who, of course, is best known for his social high-life and all that involves, and for leaving a young woman to drown in the icy waters of Cape Cod (Mass.) Bay following a party many years ago. His brother, former President John F. Kennedy, said in his inaugural speech, "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is a far cry from the surviving Kennedy, who was quoted as saying during the Vietnam War that he would crawl on his knees to the North Vietnamese leaders if they would release our prisoners and end hostilities. Fortunately, then-President Nixon quickly stated that no American would debase himself in that manner to anyone. Also fortunately, the United States government is not run by the likes of "Cut & Run" Ted Kennedy.

We have been handed the baton and, like it or not, we are the policemen of the world mostly because we are the only nation which has the ability, the courage and the willingness to assume the awesome responsibility. We should have no illusions because, to once again quote operetta librettist William Gilbert who wrote: "A policeman's lot is not a happy one." I might add, no, not a happy one, but for the eventual survival of the civilized world, certainly a vital one.

—E. ROBERT NASSIKAS

The case made for American empire by its adherents is framed in terms of power: they claim that if the United States does not use its tremendous military superiority much of the world would either dissolve or enflame in chaos. Their aspiration is that the manifest destiny of the United States is to ultimately envelop the planet as its imperial guardian against chaos and disorganization — and to also suppress any other nation or combination of them competing against the United States for worldly power.

This is the New World Order: world military supremacy by the United States — space-based weapons, new nukes and combat weapons at least a generation ahead of anyone else in military technology. The USA is the only reigning superpower — the world's first truly 'hyperpower.' Not only does the U.S. intrude its power of "protection" (a Mafia activity) into critical areas of the world, it engulfs their cultures and exports its own ideology to supplant them.

The paradox of 'Pax Americana' is that the more the U.S. projects its power, the more it will be forced to protect it. The Bush administration wants the USA to be as strong as possible and every other nation as weak as possible.

We are a nation obsessed with military power. We forget the bankruptcy and failure of conducting our business in the world with martial arrogance. Our own political liberties degenerate when we give power to generals and clerics. It is difficult to not laugh at the solemn impostors who request our wealth and children for the abyss of military supremacy. But we also cringe at their pious exhortations for war worship.

We think we are going to make the world over in our image with our armies — the problem is we will no longer be who we think we are; our use of armies to import democracy will have made us over into tyrants and our tyranny will be imprinted onto foreign nations the way foreign invaders always do.

The United States is not making the world safe for democracy but is instead recklessly inciting new and old hatreds — and every attempt to impose its will on any other people will be met with iron implacability.

And here is the real conflict: the test of the future as a world civilization loosely ruled by a confederation of United Nations or a U.S. mandated world (which might very well set precedence for China assuming ascendancy down the road). If indeed the U.S. uses its superpowerdom to recreate the world as an American clone as consummation of its Manifest Destiny, which America are we thinking about — the America of the Revolution; the America of the Emancipation; the America of the Cold War; or the America that demands the imperial prerogatives of being the world's sole superpower?

Empires like Rome or Great Britain have no place in the 21st century world: Hitler and Stalin's successors learned that in the last century. One nation and one people are unable to dominate a polyglot world for very long — and history has indicated world domination has shortened in time over the millennia: Rome was boss nearly 500 years; England little more than a century; the USSR reigned for 75 years; Hitler's Nazis lasted only a dozen years.

The same narrow interests that doomed American participation in the League of Nations following World War 1 continue to thwart U.S. participation in the United Nations despite its achievements of helping prevent nuclear war during the Cold War. The Bushites in particular wish to incapacitate the UN as a multilateral form of international authority.

The real problem the U.S. has with the UN is that despite its hyperpower status it does not reign but is instead reduced to being only one power among many, even in the Security Council, and though it has tremendous influence, is only able to lobby for its advantage rather than exert force.

The United States gloats in its reigning hyperpower status and acts in the old Roman way, inflicting its immense capacity for war upon the world, which is its main offering to the 'New World Order'. But it is a defective colossus and the imperial fabric is tearing apart, primarily due to its own internal cupidity that has put the nation at the brink of ruin.

—MICHAEL McCUSKER



**NORTH COAST
TIMES EAGLE**

A JOURNAL OF ART & OPINION
PUBLISHED IN ASTORIA, OREGON
757 27TH STREET 97103
MICHAEL PAUL McCUSKER
EDITOR & PUBLISHER