

About White Supremacy, Ideology and War

Driven by technological developments, like intercontinental ballistic missiles, in-air refueling and long-range bombers, military strategy was largely redefined. The ability to attack targets from far away with only a very short early warning time is a key component of modern warfare. The attacks against Iraq, Sudan, Afghanistan and Yugoslavia have in common, that the aggressor was using a strategic level not available to the attacked.

Air supremacy was never challenged, or achieved within few days. Without any serious defence against missiles, bombers and other aircraft, the attacked can only watch the destruction of their cities and infrastructure. They also have no means to strike back by targeting the installations and infrastructure used to assault them. When Cheney says, the U.S.A. needs to attack Iraq now because once they have any weapons to retaliate it will be much more difficult, he talks about the core of the issue. The U.S.A. wants to defend its ability to bomb all but very few countries without any danger of retaliation.

Iraq is central for the Arab nation

Iraq is said to have ambitions to a leading role in the region and among the Arab countries. This is naturally so and quite legitimate given its size, location, history and resources. The claim put forward by the U.S.A., that this is threatening their vital interests in the region, can only mean that they are rejecting any independent development of the Persian Gulf region and the Arab nation. Their political independence shall not become a platform from which to launch an effort to achieve real independence and regional integration for their own benefit. Iraq will undoubtedly be a major, if not the most important country in any regional framework not dominated by foreign powers.

The Arab OPEC countries heavily depend on selling oil

The vital interests of the U.S.A. and the West are widely assumed to be access to the natural resources of the region. But how strong an argument is that really? The crude oil exporting countries of OPEC are typical 'have only one thing to sell' economies. All depend on oil revenues as their main source of income. That's particularly true for the more populous of them like Iran or Iraq. No reason far and wide why they wouldn't want to sell.

The next argument is about the price of crude oil. It is said that the exporting countries want to manipulate the price of crude oil in their favor and at the expense of the importing countries. But a quick look at the market forces and organization of the crude oil market shows that OPEC doesn't have the necessary market share for monopoly power, and that the member states rarely share the same interests regarding price and quantity. Moreover, the history of the oil market shows that there was always a strong tendency that the major producers (corporations or governments) regulate price and quantity to a certain degree.

Iraq articulated its prime interest to have a stable revenue base to be able to plan their budget and development. Importers and exporters would negotiate mid term agreements in which the exporters guarantee production and availability of crude oil within a quantity range and importers guarantee a certain price and minimum import quantity. Both sides would have a stable situation to plan upon.

Unlimited Greed and Disrespect

Why is that unacceptable for the U.S.A.? First of all, the idea to sit down and negotiate with countries the U.S.A. sees as easy prey, about resources, which the U.S.A. claims control of for itself, seems ridiculous. Second, and more immediately threatened, is that the Iraqi offer seems quite attractive for Europe in particular, or Japan. In fact, it is exactly what Europe would like to see.

But if it is so, why did Europe support the U.S.A. plans to attack Iraq and systematically destabilize the Persian Gulf region? To answer this question we must recall that the end of the Cold War was profoundly changing relations in Europe with a lot of unknown and potentially destabilizing factors. It was a situation in which the European planners felt they couldn't risk any open and serious tension with the U.S.A. at least for the crucial transition period ahead. But beyond that we shouldn't fail to see the fundamental agreement of the Western countries in relation to the rest of the world. If it comes to dominating the others they stand as one. Although they will always fight among themselves about shares.

The West is United for Re-colonization

The re-colonization of parts of Africa, Asia, the Persian Gulf region and also Central and South America must be understood in the context of the centuries long war of the West against the rest of the world. The wealth of the "industrialized countries" depends too much on the continued flow of profits from the "developing" or "underdeveloped" parts of the world that they could ever accept the rights of those people to control their own resources and decide for themselves about their future.

De-colonization was never meant to be anything but a refinement of control and exploitation. Quite like the official end of slavery in the U.S.A. never meant an end of white supremacy and the brutal exploitation of the former slaves. Slavery was simply not the appropriate organizational means to get the black people into the factories. They needed free workers forced to compete among each other with millions of un- and underemployed for even the worst jobs. On the other hand, the more recent expansion of imprisonment and prison labor shows that old models can come out of fashion for a while but are always good for a revival also. So is it with re-colonization. While colonies where out of fashion, it turned out that controlling and managing all the nominally independent states is not without difficulties either.

The New Totalitarian Societies and Population Control

Especially one simple fact concerns the planners of the New Totalitarian Societies. The wealthy minority, which claims most of the resources of the earth for itself, constantly shrinks relative to the rest. Although population control and related polit-economic measures accelerated mass extermination, the battle for control over resources intensifies and will continue to do so. Total control and oppression is an equally valid option for the West like total extermination of peoples and the de-populization of whole regions. There will always be some natural disaster or disease to explain and justify the mass extermination to the privileged consumers. And the UN can report another success in their fight against poverty. Less people live in absolute poverty because less of the poor live.

Did we really believe that de-colonization was anything but a tactical manoever and was eventually going to be reversed if so decided by the dominant powers? Did we really expect respect from the white peoples who mercilessly and restlessly murdered, plundered, enslaved, exploited and humiliated other peoples for centuries? What should have suddenly caused that change in attitude and behavior? The imminent goodness which we always claimed as being the superior peoples? An enlightening of our minds that we are all the same and that the other is like me? Did we really expect that freedom and dignity would come cheap and easy and that the ubermenschen would be willing to consider peace and justice as a valid option?

We will not change voluntarily

How can the U.S.-Americans, who build their country by exterminating the native inhabitants close to extinction and using millions of African slaves to enrich themselves, still be seen as freedom loving, democratic and civilized people, or the Belgians who murdered half the population of the Congo under their direct rule, or like the German KZ officer can be a good father and neighbor? As long as we believe these lies and don't realize the moral and spiritual bankruptcy and reprehensibility of the white peoples and Western industrialized societies we are headed for more bad surprises.