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Containment Risks Permanent Brinksmanship  May 2, 2012

Tom Hayden writes and teaches in Los Angeles. He is the author, most recently, of "The Long Sixties."

Driven by market interests and lingering superpower aspirations, our government is heading into a new cold war against China with little public debate or Congressional oversight.

We may deny it, but it's already a new cold war to China’s top defense spokesman, Col. Geng Yansheng. President Obama’s national security adviser, Tom Donilon, boasts that “American is back” in the Pacific while Hillary Rodham Clinton extols America’s “Pacific Century.” The United States is deploying nearly 100,000 military personnel in the Asia-Pacific region, including Japan, South Korea, Guam, and new joint ventures with the Philippines, Singapore and Australia. Eleven aircraft carriers are afloat and 11 littoral combat vessels are readied for close-to-shore skirmishes against any Chinese effort to "erode the U.S. ability to project power into ... distant regions." Behind the military muscle is a plan for a free-trade zone involving
nine countries — including Chile, but not yet China.

What if China deployed combat vessels and 100,000 troops on our coasts to protect its access to the sea lanes of the Americas?

Are we blindly solipsistic by nature, or is it once again a reputational anxiety about appearing “soft”? Does the phrase “post-cold war” make some people feel adrift? By comparison, what if China deployed close-combat vessels and 100,000 troops on the Atlantic or Pacific coasts to protect its access to the sea lanes of the Americas?

China is a secretive one-party state with ambitions to project military dominance to the edges of its historic sphere of influence. Nations like Vietnam, Indonesia and Myanmar welcome a certain American role in balancing the Chinese impulse to hegemony. But the new containment policy also increases the risks of permanent brinksmanship and unwinnable wars.

Militarizing of the U.S.-China relationship does nothing to advance transparency, democracy or sustainable economic development in either country. Instead it promotes the corporate export of thousands of union jobs from the United States to a brutal sweatshop economy, allowing Apple to become the world’s most profitable corporation. Claims that market forces will transform China into a democracy have little credibility these days, 22 years after Tiananmen Square.

If we can intervene so easily with military forces in China’s backyard, why is it impossible to cut subsidies for Apple and other multinationals or enact an enforceable code of corporate conduct for American businesses employing teenage labor in China?

Further, buttressing the fossil-fuel status quo by deploying our Navy to protect the choke points of oil and commerce strangles any possibility of a rapid American transition to conservation and renewables.

Critics of cold war thinking are not isolationists at all. But where is the push to internationalize democratic processes and a sustainable resource economy? Cold war thinking reinforces the military hardliners on all sides in a dynamic that becomes permanent precisely because no one dares to “lose.”

Join Room for Debate on Facebook and follow updates on twitter.com/roomfordebate.

CHINA’S PACIFIC EMPIRE
Report by Dick Bennett

The revelation of China’s secret eastward expansion burst upon the world as unexpectedly as a tsunami. Ironically with the tons of money paid to China by the US for interest on loans and from the trade deficit, China—the CIA and Pentagon announced today—had purchased islands eastward half way across the Pacific and had made plans to buy more almost to the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

The Capitol, even Capitol Hill shook with outrage. We knew they were still communists and our enemies. Look how they captured China after WWII. Look how they have undersold us for the past generation, while we generously funded their economic revival. We will stop their aggression!

After the noise died down a little, media began to provide information and analysis. Japan’s economic desperation following the earthquake and tsunami of 2010 triggered the eastward movement. World economic crisis, initiated by the US meltdown of 2008, made
the expansion easier, though other factors played a part. Especially worrisome was the
speed and trajectory—one US official, who declined to give his name because of national
security, said it was like several spears beginning at Beijing thrown from stepping stone to
stone eastward toward San Francisco forming roughly a “U”.

Apparently China first bought islands from Japan within a few months following the
tsunami. The first purchase was Iwo Jima, southeast from Beijing. The Japanese thought
they got a good price, since the island was anyway virtually uninhabitable from the thousands
of unexploded shells throughout the island. At first China was prepared to buy all of the
Bonin Islands, but since, declared one CIA report denied by the CIA later, its purpose was to
secure the ocean from US threats, it purchased Marcus Island instead, but for a much greater
price per acre since (one anonymous source suggested) Japan had realized the closer their
islands were to the US the more valuable they were.

Southward China moved to buy one in the Solomon Islands, the Kiribati, Tuvalu (their
population fleeing to New Zealand, but the water-soaked airfield can be raised), Wallis and
Futuna (France not needing it, nor New Caledonia), Vanuatu, altogether a shield between
Australia and the US.

Back to its more directly eastward movement, China bough more islands from Japan in
the Parasel and Sakishima, and then found islands in Micronesia—Palau, Truk, Yap. Their
plans, with an immense sigh of security, were to buy from there eastward to west of Central
America.

But then the secret slipped out. The US had not spent a trillion dollars on electronic
spying for nothing. And the CHINA PLOT was exposed.

Congress exploded with righteous anger. Why would China do that to their trade ally
and financial friend? And when a Chinese official claimed they were only balancing power in
the Pacific, Congressman Froth expressed astonishment that the Chinese would equate
eastward movement to the U.S. westward. After all, the US had been moving westward—
away from Europe he emphasized—for over 300 years! And at enormous expense and
sacrifice. The US westward movement was virtually preordained, something inevitable. But
China moving eastward was clearly envious and spiteful.

The US, he argued, fought war after war to bring civilization and progress to the
continental USA. And then we extended our largesse across the Pacific. Think of it! Look at
the achievement on your map: Hawaiian Islands, Midway Islands, Johnston Atoll, Marshall
Islands, Wake Island, the N. Marianna Islands, Guam, the Philippines* (forming a boundary to
the South China Sea), South Vietnam (well, attempted), Okinawa (the east boundary of the
East China Sea), Formosa, South Korea (the east boundary of the Yellow Sea), Cheju
Island?? Jeju??, and all the islands we purchased with US blood against the Japanese, and
now our latest base in Australia.

We have earned the right to our westward possessions. They are integral to our
meaning, to our unity. They are (for Froth was devout) our paraclete. MORE TO COME

ASIAN NAFTA ON STEROIDS
From: Beatriz and Brooke, Global Trade Watch [mailto:gtwinfo@citizen.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 11:38 AM
To: suesactivism@mchsi.com
Subject: Round of secrecy continues
Sue,

As trade negotiators and their corporate "advisors" resume their secret talks on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) free trade agreement, Australian activists have taken to the streets, while advocates from all of the involved countries are trying to pry out any information about what is happening behind closed doors.

Join activists in demanding transparency. [http://action.citizen.org/p/dia/action/public/?action_KEY=9711 ]

From the few draft chapters of the pact that have leaked, it is clear that this deal is heading towards being NAFTA-on-steroids with Asia - *with more job offshoring, more unsafe imported food and products, and even a ban on Buy America procurement.*

While 600 U.S. corporate trade "advisors" have full access to the negotiating texts and negotiators, the rest of us are locked out. Even the Australian Chamber of Commerce joined with civil society groups demanding access to the texts from the chief negotiators of the involved countries. If this is supposed to be a 21st century agreement, a representative from the Chamber rightly asked, then why not make it transparent?

But, the chief negotiators continued to refuse access. In fact, the lead Australian negotiator, in response to someone noting that even the World Trade Organization - hardly a paradigm of openness - allows access to draft negotiating texts, proudly announced without the slightest sense of irony: "THIS is not the WTO!"

Lori Wallach, director of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch, has been in Australia on the hunt for text. Unfortunately, not even the best binoculars could view the text details at the Melbourne Australia Convention Center (see photo [http://www.flickr.com/photos/75610371@N08/6818300962/in/set-72157629540222629 ]).

*Join activists from around the Pacific and take action before another round of secretive negotiations is wrapped up.*

Get inspired! Tell your governor and members of Congress to demand transparency and stop the corporate-power overload in the TPP. [http://action.citizen.org/p/dia/action/public/?action_KEY=9711 ]

After you take action, be sure to check out pictures from activists in Australia and follow Lori on Twitter as she navigates the secrecy from down under.

Sincerely,

Beatriz and Brooke
STILL MOVING WESTWARD, SURROUNDING CHINA
JEJU ISLAND

Tuesday, March 06, 2012

A LIGHT IN THE DARKNESS

Here is the evidence Capt. Kim. The mayor of Gangjeong village with other Jeju Islanders and their supporters yesterday protesting against the plan to blast Gureombi rock. You can't keep denying the growing international opposition to this Navy base! (See below for details about Capt. Kim)

- I just finished an hour long radio interview with a station in Vermont. Longtime peace activist Joseph Gainza hosts the show and several folks called in. We talked a good while about Jeju Island and the Aegis destroyers (made here in Maine) that will be ported at this base. I asked listeners to call the South Korean embassy in Washington DC (202-939-5600). I just called myself and spoke to a very combative Capt. Kim who tried to tell me that the people of Gangjeong village support the Navy base and that U.S. warships will never port there. I told him I had just returned from a conference on Jeju Island where I heard the elected mayor of Gangjeong, the former governor of Jeju, and the head Catholic Bishop of Jeju all speak out in opposition to the base. Capt. Kim is full of lies and he is trying to blunt the opposition to the base. I concluded my conversation with him Korean-style (forceful with each other) and told him that their right-wing government's cover was blown - that people all over the world know that they have become military partners with their former imperial occupier (Japan) and the U.S. in a tragic and dangerous new strategy to surround China.

- Evidence that people all over the world are becoming aware of this is the work of many dedicated activists who are pushing hard to share information about Jeju Island. Just a couple examples are the emails I saw this morning from Australia, Japan, the UK and Guam where they are also organizing on behalf of the villagers. Below is a remarkable email I received this morning from GN board member Agneta Norberg who lives in Stockholm, Sweden. She was one of those arrested with us last week when she nimbly moved her 75-year old body under the razor wire on Gureombi rock.

It is amazing what kind of reaction it has been since I returned to Sweden from Jeju. First, the newspaper in the county were I was born, up in the North, a rather prestigious liberal paper gave me a whole page today. With photo and correct text. Now the national radio called and a very popular journalist will visit me and make a portrait of who I am and what brought me to Jeju and he asked me specifically to give a frame why people are resisting there. So it is worth getting arrested. But the result must be a large protest storm all over the world. I just wanted to give a small positive glimpse in the darkness.

- Agneta

Bruce K. Gagnon
You have one new message.

Dick: Strangely, some of our acquisitions disliked our occupation, Philippines in particular, the “first Vietnam” some have called it, for their fierce, bloody resistance. And the US continues to occupy the country, as Prof. E. San Juan has told in several articles and books. See, for example, the US participation in putting down several ongoing rebellions:


**UNRELENTING U.S. INTERVENTION IN THE PHILIPPINES AND MORO SOVEREIGNTY**

philcsc | January 4, 2011 at 4:58 pm | Tags: ABU SAYyaf.us imperialism, colonialism, Islam, Moro, neocolonialism, State terrorism, terror | Categories: COMMENTARY ON CURRENT EVENTS, SPECULATIVE PROVOCATIONS, UNTIMELY OBSERVATIONS | URL: [http://wp.me/phYOK-9M](http://wp.me/phYOK-9M)

unrelenting U.S. Intervention in the Philippines and the question of Moro Sovereignty by E. San Juan, Jr.

PART ONE:

RE-VISITING THE MORO HOMELAND
Except for natural disasters such as the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo, or the sinking of a ferry with hundreds of victims, nobody notices what’s going on in the Philippines today. But now that Britney Spears just belted out her tempting warble of “sneaking into the Philippines,” can the PENTAGON Special Forces not be far behind to get a piece of the action? Before you can say “Yo Mama!” US troops are found already “embedded” in the Empire’s most Americanized islands where savage class wars have been raging for decades. The US invaded the Philippines in 1898 during the Spanish-American War, but it created the “first Vietnam” (to quote the historian Bernard Fall) when 1.4 million Filipino recalcitrants had to be “neutralized” to convert the revolutionary Philippine Republic into an “insular possession.” Mark Twain praised the US government’s success in acquiring “property in the three hundred concubines and other slaves of our business partner, the Sultan of Sulu,” referring to the “civilizing mission” of US diplomacy over the Muslim inhabitants of the southern Philippines (E. San Juan, US Imperialism and Revolution in the Philippines, 2007). But in the 1906 siege at Mt. Dajo and the 1913 rout at Mt. Bagsak, both in Jolo, the US military had to massacre thousands of Muslim men, women and children to complete the islands’ pacification. The victors seemed not to have learned anything, so history is repeating itself. A hundred years after, the U.S. seems to be doing the job again. By the last week of September, the total casualty figure surpassed three hundred as government troops (with their US advisers/trainers) and Moro (Muslim citizens of the Philippines) militants clashed in the southern Philippines. The scale of violence and magnitude of civilian suffering reached a crescendo enough to alarm the European Union, but not Bush, Condoleeza Rice, nor the two US presidential candidates. BBC News (9/26/2008) reported that the International Committee of the Red Cross bewailed the plight of tens of thousands of refugees and evacuees, the indiscriminate killing of civilians, and the potential for sectarian “ethnic cleansing.” More than 120,000 people have died since fighting broke out 40 years ago between the Muslim separatists and the neocolonial state, with no end in sight.

With full-scale war between the formidable Moro guerillas and the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) about to sweep the country, the U.S. military presence suddenly caught media attention. It was confirmed by government officials that the headquarters of the U.S.-Philippines Joint Special Operations Task Force Philippines (JSOTF-P) is found inside Camp Navarro of the AFP’s Western Mindanao Command in Zamboanga City, Mindanao. Accessed only by U.S. personnel, the physical infrastructure was sealed by permanent walls, concertina wires and sandbags, with visible communication paraphernalia (satellite dishes, antennae, etc.). From this place, US military operations against domestic insurgents—whether belonging to the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) or to the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), the Moro
National Liberation Front (MNLF), or the New People's Army (NPA)–are launched and directed. In lieu of economic-social reforms, the government’s militarist solution to poverty, unemployment, and extra-judicial killings and kidnappings–over 1,000 victims so far–will only create a refugee crisis, more atrocities and “collateral damage” of innocent civilians, loss of national sovereignty, and impunity for criminal violence committed by the military and police. . . . [This is a major article. D]

US IMPERIALISM PACIFIC OCEAN

Imperialism

AmericanImperialismInPacific

In the latter half of the 19th century the industrialized nations within Europe were aggressively laying claim to land across the globe in an effort to build empires. A map of the world from the period looks like a patchwork quilt of competing Imperial countries. The United States was not blind to this phenomenon of expansion and knew that its survival as a respected world player would rest on its ability to take and maintain overseas possessions. After what is now the western United States was tamed the expansionists within the U.S. began to look across the Pacific for areas of influence. There were many forces driving the imperialist cause; nationalism, capitalism and Social Darwinism (Also see: Social Darwinism) to name a few. International trade and improvements in technology had created a smaller more intimate world and American expansion and Imperialist moves in the Pacific saw the U.S. extend its influence in the region and gain territory while at the same time exporting (sometimes forcing) its own way of life on to the local populations with mixed results. This process continued after the end of the Second World War in response to the perceived threat of the spread of communism. The aim was always to protect American interests within the pacific while at the same time attempting to ensure the growth of a pro-American democratic government. This is pattern of American international involvement that has been repeated across the planet.

Pacific Ocean (Library of Congress)

Hawaii

Since its official discovery in 1778 by Captain James Cook of Britain Hawaii has always been seen as a strategic midway point between the west coast of America and Asia. American missionaries arrived as early as 1820 to preach Protestantism and through their hard work managed to convert most of the chiefs and local populations of Hawaii. Sugar quickly became the main export of Hawaii and the majority of the plantations were held by wealthy Americans. In fact American citizens by 1890 were in control of over seventy-five percent of Hawaii’s wealth. The country was united under the Kamehameha dynasty of rulers until 1874 when the final king died without and heir. Elections were
held and with great controversy King Kalakaua was elected. Unrest over his election led to the eventual intervention of the United States and Britain who landed troops at Honolulu. 1887 saw a group of wealthy Americans on the island force the King to accept changes to the constitution. The changes ensured that only the wealthy would be allowed to vote and striped the Kings powers and transferred them to the elected legislature. The McKinley Tariff of 1890 further undermined the local government by negatively affecting the sugar trade which in turn pushed the wealthy Americans on the island to lobby for annexation. On July 7th, 1897 congress passed the Newlands resolution to annex Hawaii.

Although all people on Hawaii became U.S. citizens in 1900 the U.S. handling of Hawaii speaks volumes to American opinions to the peoples of the Pacific. They scoffed at the local Kings and covertly looked to install the American style of governance. Money inevitably was an integral factor in the eventual annexation of Hawaii. As stated above wealthy Americans owned the vast majority of wealth and naturally they would want to protect it. The economic fruits of Hawaii proved too valuable for there to be a chance of them to fall under an opposing European powers control. Hawaii also was the next natural step of American western movement. The islands in regards to American interests were simply too important for control to be in the hands of an opposing imperial power. See also American Imperialism in Hawaii

Midway, Samoa and Japan

In 1867, Secretary of state William H. Seward claimed the islands of Midway in the Pacific. Given its prime location northeast of Hawaii and approximately half way between the West coast of the United States and Japan it is a perfect way station for both military and merchant vessels. Due to the islands being uninhabited little stood in the way of the United States annexing the islands. This marks America’s first annexation of a territory not on the North American continent. These islands were also the setting for a major turning point in the Second World War, the battle of Midway, where the Japanese navy was soundly defeated by U.S. forces.

The United States won exclusive coaling rights at the port of Pago Pago of Samoa in 1878 and officially annexed the area in 1889. This was a result of escalating tensions between competing Samoan warlords and the arrival of warships from the United States, Britain and Germany respectively. To diffuse tensions, and possibly war, the three powers met in Berlin and split the islands into three different protectorates. All this was done without consulting the local Samoans. This agreement between the three powers speaks to the growing influence of America within the pacific. Had the United States not previously expanded its control into Hawaii and Midway they would not have had the leverage and strength within the region grab themselves a share of these valuable islands. American Samoa still exists as a territory of the United States.

Japan and the United States have had a contentious relationship. It was Commodore Perry of the U.S. navy who steamed into Japanese waters aboard modern warships bristling with cannon in 1854. The Japanese had no weapons that could counter such fire power. This was due to the fact that for over
two hundred years Japanese ports had been closed to foreign merchants and rifles and cannon were shunned in favor of the traditional sword and bow. Despite being a highly developed culture which rivaled that of the European powers in terms of knowledge and higher thinking they could no longer resist modern weapons. Thus the Shogunate in control of Japan reluctantly signed the treaty of Kanagawa in 1854. This treaty officially opened up Japan to western trade and influence. While America used it superior firepower to force Japan to enter the world stage they did not, like other pacific territories, allow themselves to be controlled by western powers. They gladly jumped into modern techniques and used America, among other nations, as a model for becoming a modern nation. Fifty years after Perry the Japanese defeated the Russians in a modern war, marking the first time a “yellow” race had defeated a major Western power. The U.S. by forcing Japan to accept its trade had opened a Pandora’s Box and unleashed a new world power which had direct control within the Pacific and would, in time, threaten the United States itself.

The Philippines
The Philippines (Library of Congress)

Whereas the acquisitions and actions mentioned above were important first steps in the spread of American influence in the Pacific they were not significant enough to make the United States serious players in Asian affairs. The sinking of the USS Maine in Havana gave the United States a unique opportunity to extend itself right into the heart of Southeast Asia. The destruction of the Maine led to the outbreak of the Spanish-American war, and while the War began over events that occurred in the Caribbean, it meant that the war would also be fought in South East Asia. The Spanish held the Philippine islands and it was the last remaining jewel in their crumbled former empire and it was here that the first victory of the War was won. Commodore George Dewey defeated the Spanish fleet in the Philippines at Manila bay. This coupled with events in the Caribbean saw the Spanish resistance in the war crumble and in December of 1898 the treaty of Paris was signed between the warring nations. The treaty saw Spain cede possession of Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines to the United States in exchange for twenty million U.S. dollars. Despite the Filipinos controlling much of the country and declaring themselves a democratic nation with a constitution, the United States refused to end the occupation. As a result the Philippine-American war broke out, lasting on and off for the better part of a decade. The Americans saw their role in the Philippines as one of delivering civilization to the savages but the Filipinos felt betrayed by America installing itself in the place of the previous imperial rulers. The war was a fierce guerilla war which can be compared to that fought between the U.S. and the Native Americans. Regular civilians suffered while the war dragged on for years. The main insurrection was put down in 1901 and saw two hundred thousand Filipinos killed and five thousand American troops dead. Sporadic fighting continued on the islands for years after. Despite the animosity between the locals and American forces the Philippine economy grew well. The United States promised to remove themselves from the Philippines once a “Stable government” had been established while those that voiced their dissent against the American colonial power were sent to prison. An obvious hypocrisy appears in that the U.S. leaders in the Philippines took the rights of free speech that they enjoyed as Americans away
from those they governed. These rights were suspended in order to bring an American system of
government into place.

China (Pre-WWII)

China, much like Japan, was treated differently by the United States. Long before the United States
had become players within the pacific region, Imperialist European powers had been growing rich on
China’s valuable trade resources. While too large and populous for any one Western nation to control,
the areas next to the coast had been divided into separate spheres of influence that were presided
over by each European nation. The U.S. government needed a way into the Chinese markets. While
they had already negotiated the treaty of Wanghia in 1844 that granted America a “most favored
nation” clause, there were similar treaties created a few years later that guaranteed other nations the
same rights⁷.

The outbreak of the Boxer rebellion in 1900 in Beijing led to America and other European nations to
send military forces into the city and end the rebellion. Yet another move that was welcomed by the
American merchants. After the rebellion Secretary of State John Hay sent a message to the other
Imperial nations asking that Chinese borders and territories be respected and to promote free trade
with China. This became known as the open-door policy and would become an important aspect of
American diplomacy. America as a nation was built upon free trade and enterprise so it should come
at no surprise that they should wish to foster the same spirit within the largest, most populous and
potentially richest nation in the Far East.

China (Post-WWII)

Now it is time to fast forward to after the end of the Second World War. In December of 1945 President
Truman sent Gen. George Marshall to China to attempt to end the civil war that was raging between
the Nationalists under Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists (CCP) under Mao Tse-tung. Marshall as
treated well by the CCP and was led to believe that the CCP “desired a democracy based… on the
American style”⁸. This led to Marshall pressuring Chiang not to pursue the communists into northern
Manchuria by threatening to remove American aid. This led to a fifteen day respite in fighting. A delay
that cost the Nationalists the civil war for it gave the retreating CCP forces time to regroup and
establish rail links to the Soviet Union and build an unshakeable base in Northern Manchuria. From
this base the CCP forces would go on to conquer the whole of China. The decision by Marshal to halt
the advance of the Nationalists is one of the worst mistakes in the history of American foreign policy.
For not only did it allow one of histories most brutal leaders to assume power over the largest
population in the world, it led to the vast Chinese markets being closed off to the entire western world
for the remainder of Mao’s life⁹. It also allowed for Chinese troops to assist in both the Korean and
Vietnamese wars, surely increasing American casualties in both wars.

Vietnam (Pre-War)

Vietnam 2001 (Library of Congress)
American actions in Vietnam before the outbreak of the Vietnam War were also mishandled. Before American involvement, Vietnam had been a colony of France and after the end of the Second World War they wanted to keep it. The Vietnamese, under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh began to revolt and began a war of independence that would last for almost a quarter century. The United States saw Vietnam as the keystone to a free and democratic South East Asia. Senator John F. Kennedy argued that the Vietnamese economy was vital to the economy of South East Asia, and thus by default equally important to the U.S. economy. If Vietnam were to fall to the communist threat as domino theorists warned then the rest of the region would quickly follow. Instead they wished to create a thriving democratic nation that could spread the tenets of free trade and thus advance American influence. This was never going to be easy. The North was the industrialized section of the country with Southern Vietnam trapped in a colonial economy based upon rice and rubber. Slowly the United States began to move France out of the picture and claim full control over building Southern Vietnam into a prosperous nation.

The U.S. backed a man called Ngo Dinh Diem. They did not back him because he would make the especially charismatic leader required to rule a nation in such turmoil. Instead they gave Diem U.S. support because he was the most pro-American man with the correct training available. It helped that he lived in New Jersey for a time in exile. Diem’s government was oppressive and he began to make authoritarian reforms to consolidate his own power. The U.S. was not ready to back the Elections that the U.N. had mandated because it feared that Ho Chi Minh would prevail. Once again this shows a U.S. tendency to undermine its own message of a free and equal society in territories that they are attempting to build just that. The government itself was corrupt and positions within government were awarded upon loyalty to Diem, not ability. The aid sent from the U.S. to Vietnam went into the wrong areas such as building an army and importing consumer goods, when the majority of it should have been used upon building and improving infrastructure and the quality of life within the rural areas, in which ninety percent of the South Vietnamese population lived. By the time the United States realized that wholesale changes were needed to bring about the desired result, the situation in the country had deteriorated to the point where a military presence was required. And we all know what happened after that. Also See: cold war containment

Conclusion

Can American Imperialism within the Pacific region be considered a success? Like many things America has undertaken it did well in some aspects and terrible in others. Unlike other Imperialist powers the U.S. did not lose all off their territories within the region. Hawaii and Samoa respectively show this and allow America to still wield influence within the region. We were very successful in helping the Japanese become the world power they are today, you could say we forced them into it, but after our initial prods their pace of modernization is unparalleled and in current times the two countries maintain a strong relationship. The mistakes though, are incredibly glaring. America seems to have always held a strong paternalistic feeling towards those countries we are attempting to “help”. It seems that it always comes down to America demanding something or it will withdraw aid. This is because Americans have always served their own interests first, sometimes to their own
detriment. Let's hope that as the great nation of the United States of America moves into the Twenty-First century it develops an ability to listen to those we want to extend our great institutions towards, perhaps they will be more willing to listen in return.

“Vandenberg Space Command Dominates the Pacific”
Vandenberg Space Command is located in Southern California 200 miles north of Los Angeles. Poised at the edge of the Pacific, the base routinely tests Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (IC BM’s). These long-range high speed hydrogen bomb delivery systems are tested several times a year landing in the once beautiful Kwajalein atoll in the Marshall Islands.

Every three years Vandenberg does an extended range test all the way to Guam. If North Korea or Iran tests a few missiles, hysteria breaks out worldwide. When the US does these routine tests, it does not even make the news except as a local story. Many peace activists are not aware that these tests occur, much less the general public.

David Krieger, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, said, “The US moratorium on nuclear testing remains incomplete as long as we continue testing missiles designed to carry nuclear warheads. Minuteman III missiles are used solely to deliver nuclear warheads. “The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation seeks the abolition of all nuclear weapons worldwide. The Foundation calls on the US and all countries around the world to recognize their full obligation to halt all nuclear testing – not only of the warheads, but also of nuclear-capable missiles. The preamble to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) calls upon the 189 countries that signed the NPT to facilitate ‘the elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery.’
The US is demonstrating a stark double standard by condemning missile
tests of other nations while continuing to conduct them on a regular basis itself. Continued testing of Minuteman III missiles by the US sends a provocative message and encourages other countries to pursue their own nuclear weapon and missile delivery programs.” Over the years, a dedicated band from Catholic Worker communities, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, and the Global Network (since 1999) have held protests at the base. These protests also opposed the Star Wars “missile defense” interceptor test launches that also take place from Vandenberg (mostly failed interceptions) and the launch of the polar orbit satellites used to conduct war from space. Until 2008, most of the protests were held during Keep Space for Peace Week, Hiroshima Day, or other special days chosen by the peace movement. In August of 2008, a small protest was held at night at the time of an IC BM launch. The base authorities over-reacted with heavily armed security surrounding the protesters (three women) and trying to intimidate us. Since then, IC BM launch time protests have been held at Vandenberg. Twice there have also been companion protests at the Los Angeles Space and Missile center in El Segundo, which tracks the IC BM trajectory. There have been nighttime arrests of Fr. Louie Vitale, Sister Megan Rice and myself, who have gone onto the base to ask the commander to comply with international law. On September 21, 2011 the USAF scheduled an IC BM night launch toward Kwajalein atoll. September 21 is the UN International Day of Peace. That day is officially recognized each year by the United Nations General Assembly as a day for “commemorating and strengthening the ideals of peace both within and among all nations and peoples.” This launch was denounced all over the world, with many nations expressing surprise that the tests were being conducted. This campaign made people
worldwide aware that these launches are taking place. The 9/21 launch was postponed. These IC BM Minuteman III nuclear capable delivery systems are the ones that are armed and set in silos in 450 locations around the Midwest of the USA. These cold war legacy hydrogen bombs are on hair trigger alert, thus greatly increasing our risk of accident. Each IC BM carries up to 3 to 12 warheads and can travel 5,000 miles in 30 minutes. Once launched they cannot be recalled. (www.nucleardarkness.org)
The launching of these tests increases tensions around the world, and sends a message that the US disregards its moral obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation T reaty. This states that the nuclear powers must engage in good faith disarmament efforts. It also violates the 1996 International Court of Justice decision stating that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is a violation of international law. The few medium range missiles of the DPRK (North Korea) are used as a pretext for the military build up in the Pacific. The proposed naval base at Jeju Island, although directed toward China, Vandenberg AFB is a key launch site for US ICBM and Star Wars tests. uses the North Korea missiles as its pretext. The Pacific Missile Range Facility at Barking Sands is being expanded on Kauai in the Hawaiian Islands. This build up also uses the North Korean “threat” as an excuse. The island peoples of the Pacific pay the price for this military build up. Jeju, Guam, the Marshall Islands, Hawaii, Okinawa all join in the call for peace in the Pacific.
On February 24-25, protests are planned around the world to demand a stop to the next IC BM test launch. In Santa Barbara, Daniel Ellsberg and David Krieger will hold a press conference and rally at 11 am on Feb 24 to
demand a halt. At midnight (11:55 pm Feb 24), a front gate protest will be held at Vandenberg Space Command six miles north of Lompoc in California. In the Los Angeles area, a noon protest will be at the Space and Missile tracking center in El Segundo, which is key to the launch. These launches are world events and a protest can be held at a US embassy or consulate anywhere. Contact macgregoreddy@gmail.com for details about the Vandenberg and El Segundo events.

—MacGregor Eddy is a member of the Women’s International League for Peace & Freedom and serves on the Global Network’s Advisory Board.

1. Peace Protests at Vandenberg Space Command / Air Force Base
vandenbergprotest-macgregor.blogspot.com/Cached - Similar
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
Jan 23, 2012 – posted by MacGregor at 4:32 PM 0 Comments Links to this post ...
Vandenberg Space Command dominates the Pacific ... embassy or consulate anywhere.
email macgregoreddy@gmail.com for details about the Vandenberg ...

2. Peace Protests at Vandenberg Space Command / Air Force Base
vandenbergprotest-macgregor.blogspot.com/2012_01_08_archive.ht...
Cached
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
Jan 8, 2012 – Vandenberg Space Command dominates the Pacific. Vandenberg .... Bud Boothe and MacGregor Eddy Oct. 5 Keep Space 4 ... Keep Space for ...

3. 2011-10-02 - Peace Protests at Vandenberg Space Command / Air ... 
vandenbergprotest-macgregor.blogspot.com/2011_10_02_archive.ht...
Cached
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
Oct 2, 2011 – Peace Protests at Vandenberg Space Command / Air Force Base ... space, and the 21st-century mix of orbital platforms is 70 percent dominated by the military. ... Bud Boothe and MacGregor Eddy Oct. 5 Keep Space 4 Peace ...

4. Keep Space for Peace -- How Rockets From Vandenberg Control ...
48south7th.org/2-Vandenberg.html/Cached
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
MacGregor Eddy reveals what those launches from Vandenberg Space Command near Lompoc, California, are really all about -- they're part of U.S. military ...

5. Vandenberg Witness
vandenbergwitness.org/Cached - Similar
Jan 22, 2012 – Vandenberg Witness - Resistance to Missile Testing, Space-based ... 24) at front gate protest will be held at Vandenberg Space Command six ... E-mail macgregoreddy@gmail.com for details about the Vandenberg and El ... 6. [PDF]

20 Years of Organizing to Keep Space for Peace
www.space4peace.org/newsletter/Space%20Alert%2025.pdf
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - Quick View
Dec 31, 2011 – Vandenberg Space command is locat- .... Vandenberg Space Command Dominates the Pacific ... —MacGregor Eddy is a member of the ...
7. Report WILPF Space for Peace Week events - Disarm Update
www.disarm.wilpf.org/Sept05/sept05events.html
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
MacGregor Eddy’s report on the October 8 rally and demonstration follows below: WILPF MEMBER CHARGES VANDENBERG SPACE COMMAND WITH WAR .... Stacey talked about how the U.S. drive to dominate the world will extend to ...
8. Peace Protest at Vandenberg Air Force base launch ICBM midnight ...
www.indybay.org/newsitems/2009/06/08/18601013.php?show...1Cached - Similar
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
Jun 8, 2009 – by MacGregor Eddy Monday Jun 8th, 2009 5:55 PM ... The protest will be held at the front gate of Vandenberg Space Command - Intersection of Hwy 1 .... massive US military buildups that are all about dominating the world.
9. democracyforwashington : Message: FW: Space Week Local Actions ...
groups.yahoo.com/group/democracyforwashington/message/11551Cached
You +1’d this publicly. Undo
2 posts - Sep 12, 2007
MacGregor Eddy (831) 206-5043 macgregoreddy@ ... 27) Vandenberg AFB, CA (Oct 13 Vigil at main gate, 1:00 pm) Dennis Apel jdapel@. ... rejecting the U.S. Space Command Vision for 2020 that would dominate space for ...
Get more discussion results

10. [PDF]
On UN Day, at a panel on Nuclear Disarmament, Secretary General Ban-ki Moon spoke about his 2008 five-point proposal for nuclear disarmament, including the requirement for negotiations to ban the bomb. It was dismaying when the next speaker, a retired US Air Force General, Michael Mosley, breezily assured the audience and his fellow panelists that it certainly was now possible to rid the world of nuclear weapons, since atomic bomb technology is thoroughly out of date. He boasted that today “we” have long range attack weapons of such “unbelievable precision and lethality” that we no longer need nuclear weapons in the US arsenal.

Our conventional weapons are ever so superior to those of any other nation. He said this as his fellow co-panelists, the Russian and Chinese ambassadors, took in the full import of his braggadocio, to my extreme embarrassment as a US citizen. Did the General consider for a moment the effect his words were having on the ambassadors and the other non-US participants in the meeting? His astonishing disregard for the effect of such provocative war talk on our fellow earth mates seems to be a major failure of our “tin ear” foreign policy.

Hillary Clinton proclaimed a similarly tone-deaf policy in an article in November’s Foreign Affairs, “America’s Pacific Century,” remarking that now that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were winding down, we are at a “pivot point” and that “one of the most important tasks of American statecraft over the next decade will be to lock in a substantially increased investment—diplomatic economic, strategic and otherwise—in the Asia-Pacific region.” Calling for “forward-deployed” diplomacy, she defined it to include “forging a broad-based military presence” in Asia...that would be “as durable and as consistent with American interests and values as
the web we have built across the Atlantic… capable of deterring provocation from the full spectrum of state and nonstate actors.” She added that just as our NATO alliance “has paid off many times over…the time has come to make similar investments as a Pacific power”. Citing our Treaty alliances with Japan, South Korea, Australia, the Philippines and Thailand as the “fulcrum for our strategic turn to the Asian-Pacific,” she also spoke of the need to expand our relationships to include India, Indonesia, Singapore, New Zealand, Malaysia, Mongolia, Vietnam, and the Pacific Island countries. While acknowledging “fears and misperceptions that “linger on both sides of the Pacific,” stating that “some in our country see China’s progress as a threat to the United States; some in China worry that America seeks to constrain China’s growth” she blithely asserted, “we reject both those views … a thriving America is good for China and a thriving China is good for America”. This said as the US aggressively lines up a host of new nations in an expanded Pacific military alliance, providing them with missile defenses, ships, and warplanes, encircling China. What is she thinking? Shortly after Clinton’s article appeared, Obama went to Australia to open up a new military base there with a token 250 US soldiers, and a promise of 2,500 to come with plans for joint military training, promising that “we will allocate the resources necessary to maintain our strong military presence in this region.” He also adopted the “Manila Declaration,” pledging closer military ties with the Philippines and announced the sale of 24 F-16 fighter jets to Indonesia. Clinton also recently paid a visit to Myanmar, long allied with China, to re-establish relations there. In her article’s conclusion Clinton bragged, “Our military is by far the strongest and our economy is by far the largest in the world. Our workers are the most productive. Our universities are renowned the world over. So there should be no doubt that America has the capacity to secure and sustain our global leadership in this century as we did in the last.” Didn’t anyone tell her that the number of Americans living below
the official poverty line, 46.2 million people, was the highest in the 52 years the census bureau has been publishing those figures? Or that the United States deteriorating transportation infrastructure will cost the economy more than 870,000 jobs and would suppress US economic growth by $3.1 trillion by 2020, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers?
The tone-deaf quality of US foreign policy pronouncements is like an infant who pulls the covers over his head to play peek-a-boo, thinking he can’t be seen so long as he can’t see out. C hina has responded as would be expected. A Pentagon report warned C ongress that China was increasing its naval power and investing in high-tech weaponry to extend its reach in the Pacific and beyond. I t ramped up efforts to produce anti-ship missiles to knock out aircraft carriers, improved targeting radar, expanding its fleet of nuclear-powered submarines and warships and making advances in satellite technology and cyber warfare. What did we expect? And now, having provoked C hina to beef up its military assets, the warmongers in the US can frighten the public into supporting the next wild burgeoning arms race in the Pacific for what appears to be endless war.
This month, Mikhail Gorbachev, writing in T he Nation, observed the US elite’s “winner’s complex” after the end of the Cold War, and the references to the US as a “hyperpower,” capable of creating “a new kind of empire”. He said, “thinking in such terms in our time is a delusion. No wonder that the imperial project failed and that it soon became clear that it was a mission impossible even for the United States.” T he opportunity to build a “truly new world order was lost.” T he US decision to expand NATO eastward “usurped the functions of the United Nations and thus weakened it. We are engulfed in global turmoil, “drifting in uncharted waters. T he global economic crisis of 2008 made that abundantly clear.”
Sadly, the powers in control of US public policy and their far-flung global allies appear to have learned nothing
from the extraordinary opportunity we lost for a more peaceful world at the Cold War's end. We are now repeating those expansionary designs in Asia, and "thus we continue to drift towards unparalleled catastrophe" as Albert Einstein observed when we split the atom which "changed everything save man’s mode of thinking".

— Alice Slater is the New York Director of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and serves on the Board of the Global Network.

“Hawaii Hosts Largest Pentagon Command”
Space Alert! (Winter 2012). P. 11. US control in the Asia-Pacific is made possible by its heavy military presence across the vast Pacific Ocean, which is directed from Hawaii. “We’ve seen over the past 30-plus years the region really blossom both economically and politically and people tend to forget or not even realize a reason for that is that the US has ensured stability in Asia and the Asia-Pacific,” said Michael Mazza, a security expert at the conservative American Enterprise Institute think tank. Based just outside Honolulu USPACOM (Pacific Command) covers an area from California to India that is home to five of the world’s 10 biggest economies. On any given day, the US Navy has 50–60 ships in the region. Some 325,000 military and civilian personnel, or about one-fifth of total US military strength, serve under USPACOM, including about 80,000 troops stationed in Japan and South Korea. Lately, [Secretary of War] Leon Panetta has gone to great lengths to reassure allies that the US military will maintain a strong posture in the Pacific despite looming Pentagon spending cuts at home. “We are not anticipating any cutbacks in this region. If anything we are going to strengthen our presence in the Pacific,” Panetta said in Tokyo late last year.
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