

Is a new 'cold war' coming?

Dr T P Wilkinson

This question is asked repeatedly in the English-language media – probably the most heavily censored data streams in the world (a point to which I will return). Why should anyone worry about a new 'cold war'? Perhaps it would be more relevant to worry about the extent of current and future 'hot' ones?

The 'old Cold War' was an invention of the US regime. Bernard Baruch, one of two prominent South Carolina banksters (the other being James Byrnes) introduced the term into American political discourse with, *inter alia*, the aid of the dean of political propaganda, Walter Lippmann, as the US Empire was mobilising to absorb the remains of European empires after the defeat of Japan.¹ The subsequent 50 years of US aggrandizement were orchestrated by an unending march against any attempt to actually apply the preamble to the United Nations Charter.² Domestically this 'Cold War' comprised both covert and overt action against any form of

1 James Byrnes (1882–1982) congressman US senator and governor of South Carolina, US Secretary of State under F D Roosevelt and H S Truman, ardent segregationist and anti-communist. Bernard Baruch (1870–1965) stockbroker, banker, chair of the War Industries Board under Woodrow Wilson and a principal political-economic advisor to Roosevelt and Truman. Walter Lippmann (1889–1974) US journalist and Wilson propagandist, author of *Public Opinion*, argued that the masses were not competent to direct public affairs and therefore needed to be guided by a governing class, as opposed to popular democracy.

2 'We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. And to these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace

Continues at the foot of the next page.

political dissent, coordinated by the FBI (e.g. COINTELPRO) and CIA but ultimately initiated and maintained by the major corporate conglomerates whose central goal was to perpetuate the military-industrial gravy train that World War II brought them.³ In short the 'Cold War' meant for anyone except the white middle-class and the ruling elite, the suppression of demands for peacetime economic justice. As Tony Benn, the recently deceased UK Labour politician, once said: after the war people asked, if we could organise full-employment for war, why couldn't we organise full-employment for peace?⁴ This question was answered with the domestic side of the 'Cold War' – namely employment for war is the only employment profitable enough to justify the engagement of private enterprise.

After the surrender of Italy, Germany and Japan in 1945, the world was exhausted – except for the USA, which ended the war unscathed and with minimal losses of men in combat. Already after the end of the World War 1, the US elite had made great inroads toward usurping its European rivals. France and Britain owed enormous sums to the US banks that

Note 2 continued:

and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples...'

In his speech, delivered to the UN General Assembly in 2009, the Libyan leader M Gaddafi, assassinated in 2011 by soldiers overthrowing his government under US/NATO direction, criticised the fact that the only part of the UN Charter that expressed what all nations desire is the preamble, while the rest was drafted by experts to privilege the permanent members of the Security Council.

3 See, *inter alia*, Frank Donner, *The Age of Surveillance* (1980), Ward Churchill & Jim Vanderwall, *The Cointelpro Papers* (1990).

4 Tony Benn (1925-2014) 'After the war people said, "If you can plan for war, why can't you plan for peace?" When I was 17, I had a letter from the government saying, "Dear Mr Benn, will you turn up when you're 17 and 1/2? We'll give you free food, free clothes, free training, free accommodation, and two shillings, ten pence a day to just kill Germans." People said, well, if you can have full employment to kill people, why in God's name couldn't you have full employment and good schools, good hospitals, good houses?' Quoted in the *New Statesman* (14 March 2014) but also heard by the author at a talk given in London in 2009.

financed its war efforts from 1914–1918. However, the US was not quite equipped to dominate Europe directly so France and Britain maintained their empires, while helping the US regime in its attempts to suppress the Russian Revolution.⁵ This part of US history, kept in obscurity, was a hot war in which US troops were deployed in the Soviet Union to support an aspirant fascist dictatorship and destroy the government under Lenin. Military action ended around 1922 when the last of US, British, Czech Legion and Japanese troops withdrew from the territory of the USSR. In contrast, World War II ended with the USA as the sole undisputed imperial power on the globe. It had essentially made the formal continuation of the British and French empires dependent on these governments granting open and unrestricted access to the colonial markets – and, with the Marshall Plan, virtually unrestricted access to Western European markets.

All this had been more or less agreed at Bretton Woods in 1944 and in the preliminaries to the United Nations conference in San Francisco in 1945. The US dollar would become the world currency and international 'trade' would be regulated by dollar convertibility.⁶ However neither the US regime nor its European vassals anticipated that the end of

⁵ In 1918 the US sent troops under MG William Graves in support of the Allied intervention in the Russian Civil War, ostensibly deployed to aid in the evacuation of the Czech Legion that had been caught in Russia when the revolution began. During this period ADM Alexander Kolchak had established a White government in Omsk and was waging war against Lenin's revolutionary government with Allied support. Allied troops only left Russian territory in 1922. The so-called Far Eastern Republic was created to serve as a buffer between Japanese and US troops in Asia and the new Soviet Union. It was abolished in 1922 when the Soviet government finally succeeded in securing its Asian borders.

⁶ The so-called Bretton Woods System, including the IBRD (World Bank) and International Monetary Fund, was organised on the principle that currency convertibility was essential for free trade (the primary US interest) and that this could be accomplished by linking currencies to the fixed gold value of the US dollar. Imbalances in exchange rates or trade were to be compensated by extending credit to countries, called special drawing rights (SDR), ultimately intended to adjust the borrower's currency value against the US dollar. The Bretton Woods System was constituted like a joint stock company in which control was vested in the majority stockholder – in this case the US.

World War II would give such enormous impetus to anti-colonial struggle in all the colonial empires. As Michael Manley, former Jamaican prime minister, pointed out, the Bretton Woods agreements were made by the major colonial powers for their interests, assuming that all the countries, like his Jamaica, would simply function as part of their respective empires.⁷ No provisions were made for a post-war economic dispensation that included newly independent countries – they were not even contemplated.

Nevertheless, after 1945 the colonies of France, Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, and even the US itself, demanded independence and equality after what had sometimes been centuries and sometimes only decades of exploitation and oppression for the enrichment of Europeans on both sides of the Atlantic. The reluctance and refusal to entertain such demands provoked political and military responses as the inhabitants met these denials with varying degrees of resistance. As a result the world war continued, not against Europeans, but against the three quarters of the world's population struggling to escape Euro-American domination.

The combined resistance of colonised peoples to the restoration of Euro-American domination once the war had ended summoned the Euro-American elite to focus enormous efforts to economically suffocate newly independent countries and strangle those who were struggling to establish independence. This was the 'hot war' waged unabated from 1945–1989. This was the war that both Baruch and Byrnes – leading insiders in the US national government and paragons of the white settler regime (whose spiritual home still lies in the Deep South) that created the USA – knew had to be fought to maintain US claims on most of the world's natural resources. Both Baruch and Byrnes were aware that it would

⁷ Michael Manley (1924-1997) recorded in an interview used in the film 'Life and Debt' (2001) by Stephanie Black. Manley's social democratic government was usurped in no small part by US covert action. This was aggravated by IMF/World Bank refusal to assist Jamaica during the 1970s oil crisis without demands for so-called 'structural adjustment'. Manley was also opposed by the US regime because of his support for Cuba and membership in the Non-aligned Movement.

be very complicated to sell multiple attacks on resource-rich countries without the capacity to prevail at home. On the other hand, the Soviet Union – held in good esteem by much of the working population even in the US – could pose a major obstacle to US expansion. Although the end of World War II left the USSR with nearly 30 million dead and much of the infrastructure it had built since the Revolution destroyed, both Southern banksters knew – along with their North-eastern counterparts in the white oligarchy – that the Soviet Union was incredibly resilient, having defeated the German *Wehrmacht*.⁸ They also knew that even a mildly successful ‘socialist’ regime of that magnitude would present both ideological and economic challenges to the rapacious plutocracy that dominated the West. The Soviet Union offered the US oligarchy the perfect alibi for its wars of colonial conquest after 1945. Baruch and Byrnes *inter alia* helped establish in the minds of Americans and those under US ideological sway that the US was not conquering to promote an ever-expanding empire but ‘protecting’ the world from an ever-expanding Soviet Union.

Pleasure and pain: consumerism over communism

As Edward Bernays and then Walter Lippmann fondly proclaimed, consent is manufactured and it is essential for the political class in the US to master the manufacture of public opinion as a substitute for democratic political processes.⁹

8 For an extensive analysis of the role of the US regime in World War II and its legacy of profiteering and bad faith, especially toward the Soviet Union, see also Jacques R Pauwels, *The Myth of the Good War* (2002). For a thorough discussion of the roots of US imperialism, especially in Asia and the Pacific, see Bruce Cumings, *Dominion from Sea to Sea* (2010).

9 Edward Bernays (1891–1995) nephew of Sigmund Freud, author of *Propaganda* (1928), public relations advisor to Woodrow Wilson. He coined the term ‘public relations’ to avoid the negative connotations of the wartime use of the word propaganda. See, *inter alia*, Stuart Ewen, *PR! A Social History of Spin* (1996) and Adam Curtis’ 2002 documentary *The Century of the Self* (at <<http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/the-century-of-the-self/>>). Bernays worked closely with US corporations and was instrumental in the propaganda campaign funded by United Fruit and the CIA to overthrow the government of Guatemala in 1954.

Manufacturing opinion is related to censorship but is not censorship as popularly defined – a prohibition against writing or saying something. Yet Bernays meant propaganda – or as he would later call it ‘public relations’ – censorship combined with manipulation.

Censorship in the English-language media rarely involves ‘official’ intervention. Although such official intervention does occasionally occur, most if not all media control is exercised by virtue of absolute property rights and not by state licence or interdict. Classical censorship is confined almost entirely to the military, where it is generally accepted as legitimate – like war, too. Journalists – professional corporate propagandists – have a vested interest in maintaining the illusion that public information, the direct and unfiltered access to what are now largely data streams, is threatened by state censorship.¹⁰ Such fear-mongering in the US or UK has the effect of discrediting public (to an extent subject to residual democratic accountability) control in preference to ‘private control’. The recent trumpet fanfare for Glen Greenwald is a perfect example of this sentimental distraction. Mr Greenwald left the *Guardian* (once more fittingly named the *Manchester Guardian* – as in guardian of Manchester capitalism) to publish selectively his brand of private journalism with the financial backing of the

¹⁰ The Missouri School of Journalism, the first of its kind in the US, was founded with money from Joseph Pulitzer in 1908 to train professional journalists. Professionalism in journalism was seen as antidote to the tradition of partisan newspapers that had prevailed until the so-called Progressive Era. Mainstream interpretation of the Progressive Era has been that it ushered in democratic reforms. However one effect of this professionalisation was to isolate journalists from popular movements, making their job ethic conform to the business interests of newspaper cartels, e.g. Pulitzer and Hearst. Thus ‘objectivity’ meant reporting according to the standards of major newspapers owned by media magnates. Since unlike in Europe ‘Business’ has always claimed to be a citizen rather than part of the state, the newspaper owner was deemed to be an ordinary person in the republic – his definition of truth or objectivity was supposedly subject to the same values as the rest of the citizenry and in opposition to the state. This misconception persists today leading many people to complain that mainstream media fails as a citizen so to speak. This mistake is reinforced by the centrality of business to the US regime’s definition of ‘freedom’, corporate freedom that is.

ebay fortune (News for auction? one might ask).¹¹ During the Vietnam War there was an intensive *quid pro quo* between corporate journalists and military commanders and imperial officials operating under other cover that persists today.¹²

The principal form of censorship in the English-language mass media is merely the exercise of ownership, of sanctified property rights. Probably in no other culture in the world is the idea of speech as private property so radically defended as among the English-speaking peoples – who since 1945 have dominated the mass media more than anyone else besides perhaps the medieval Catholic Church. This has had the effect of making the protection of private property – capital – the most powerful interest controlling the mass media today in all its forms. This control over the mass media has been used to create consensus and failing that the appearance of consensus for whatever might serve the interests of media owners – as owners, as members of the class whose defining attribute is that they own everything.

Since there was no anti-Soviet consensus in 1945 – except among the white ruling elite – it was necessary to create one. And this consensus was created with great élan. The ‘Moses’ of post-war anti-communism, George Kennan, brought his tablets from Moscow to the Council on Foreign Relations where it was minted as holy coinage.¹³ Just as

11 Glen Greenwald resigned from the *Guardian* in 2013, announcing that he would start a new media organisation funded by ebay mogul Pierre Omidyar.

12 The US war against Vietnam is considered to be one of the most heavily televised. Media management by the military in Vietnam included access – e.g. military transport to combat zones or access to interviews in return for favourable or selective coverage. During the so-called Church and Pike Committee hearings (1975–76) even then CIA director William Colby – who had been responsible for Agency operations in Vietnam – admitted the extensive ‘cooperation’ between the media and the Agency. There is of course both witting and unwitting collaboration with the regime’s propaganda goals. ‘Sources’ are a journalist’s capital and the demand for sources can and does lead to media manipulation by other government agencies.

13 George F. Kennan (1904–2005) US diplomat, ambassador to the Soviet Union and author of the infamous ‘long telegram’ later published in the elite journal *Foreign Relations* as ‘The Sources of Soviet Conduct’ by ‘X’ in 1947.

Freud cast doubt on the veracity of Mosaic tradition, one ought to wonder how a post-adolescent Ivy League graduate, traveling by train to Moscow, with no idea about the country except from scripture, and with utter disregard for the recent vicious war of annihilation against the country, could presume to explain 'Soviet conduct' .

Consistent with the mendacious and hypocritical tradition upon which the USA was originally founded, all domestic demands, e.g. for real racial equality and an end to apartheid, especially in its most obvious and violent Southern form, were converted into communist/Soviet subversion. The fundamental hatred the white settler-capitalist class harbours for the descendants of its slave population was now reshaped as a version of anti-communism, which of course had to be rooted in an alleged foreign conspiracy – conceived in the Soviet Union of course. In the ante-bellum era as well as the period before the UDI of 1776, slaveholders regularly asserted that it was outside or foreign influences which were whipping their otherwise 'happy' slaves into discontent and revolt. It was inconceivable that slaves would revolt on their own to obtain their freedom. Within the USA itself, all demands for justice from the white elite were classified as Soviet-inspired and hence potentially traitorous. Abroad, independence movements were immediately classified as communist/Soviet-managed if they did not acknowledge US world hegemony. 'X' (George Kennan) did not have to consider facts, his job was to deliver a justification by faith alone – one adopted by the entire US political class and deeply held to this day. In the English-speaking world, mainstream journalism is the principal agent of what Orwell called 'the thought police' .

CIA: the ministry of love and peace

Instrumental in the creation of a permanent war system – true to Orwell's predictions, always called 'peace' – was the establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency. Although officially the purpose of the CIA was to coordinate all the national intelligence activities for the executive branch of the US regime, this begs the question: what are those activities?

¹⁴ The official history claims the CIA was established as a revived OSS. The Office of Strategic Services was a wartime intelligence/ counter-intelligence organisation. Conventional wisdom or myth has it that intelligence in wartime is the process of learning what the enemy plans or is capable of doing – so as to prepare adequate offensive or defensive operations. However, this academic description obscures the actual roots of the OSS and its CIA successor. Prior to WWII, US corporations established and maintained control of their overseas fiefs by employing mercenaries and buying political leaders. This activity was sometimes managed directly, but in order to protect these corporations from direct attacks on their assets and to simplify the competitive environment (another term for undercutting the competition), a class of law firms arose specialised in managing corporate warfare, if necessary at arm's length. The paragon of these law firms was Sullivan & Cromwell, the alma mater of the notorious Dulles brothers.¹⁵ The chief of the OSS was William Donovan, a lawyer-adventurer who had established his own mercenary law firm, Donovan, Leisure. WWII catalysed the process by which much of heavy industry became directly regulated by government agencies dominated by the regulated industries. The state became a central instrument for the exercise of power over the economy and society by corporate cartels and their

¹⁴ In NSC 68 the authors explain the challenge of the Soviet Union: 'By the same token the "peace policy" of the Soviet Union, described at a Party Congress as "a more advantageous form of fighting capitalism", is a device to divide and immobilise the non-Communist world and the peace of the Soviet Union seeks is the peace of total conformity to Soviet policy. The antipathy of slavery to freedom explains the iron curtain, the isolation, the autarchy of the society whose end is absolute power.' And 'We must with our allies and the former subject peoples seek to create a world society based on the principle of consent... It will consist of many national communities of great and varying abilities and resources and hence of our war potential.'

¹⁵ Nancy Lisagor, Frank Lipsius, *A Law Unto Itself: The Untold Story of the Law Firm Sullivan & Cromwell* (1989). Sullivan & Cromwell is just one of a number of so-called 'white shoe' law firms in the New York City. Covington & Burling is an example of the same type of elite law firm in Washington. These firms are not only noted for their powerful clients but for the frequency with which their partners enter high government office or are recruited from there – a kind of revolving door.

owners. The mercenary law firm sector, including the investment banks, also seized the opportunity to organise a state agency to regulate the international corporate policing activities. OSS was essentially the kernel of what the CIA would become – what Philip Agee called ‘capitalism’s invisible army’ (one ought to add its ‘secret police’, too).¹⁶

The creation of the CIA and the origins of the ‘Cold War’ are inseparable. The CIA was founded in 1947, the same year that Bernard Baruch gave his notorious ‘cold war’ speech in South Carolina.¹⁷ In the process of retooling the post-war US for massive rearmament, permanent wartime footing, and the conquest of soon to be abandoned European dependencies, the lessons of the Creel Commission – charged by Woodrow Wilson (another South Carolinian) with selling US intervention in World War 1 – were applied.¹⁸ The ‘American dream’ was revived despite the fact that black Americans were almost entirely excluded from it. The Marshall Plan was launched to

¹⁶ The contribution of Philip Agee (1935–2008) to understanding the CIA and how it works simply cannot be overestimated. Unfortunately he seems to have been virtually forgotten by those writing on the subject today. See, *inter alia*, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary* (1975), *Dirty Work: The CIA in Western Europe* (1978), *Dirty Work 2: The CIA in Africa* (1979), *On the Run* (1987). This work was given considerable attention since much of it was published around the time of the Select Committee reports. See also John Stockwell, *In Search of Enemies* (1984). Interest persisted in exposing CIA operations until about 1989 when one could argue it either waned or was suppressed. Probably the second most significant work on the CIA published is Douglas Valentine’s *The Phoenix Program* (2002). Valentine succeeds in explaining the creation of an enormously complex counter-terror/terror system by the Agency, copiously documented through interviews with those who actually created, introduced and managed it. He also shows how the system works within the US itself and provides a template for understanding Agency operations throughout the world.

¹⁷ ‘Let us not be deceived – we are today in the midst of a cold war. Our enemies are to be found abroad and at home. Let us never forget this: Our unrest is the heart of their success. The peace of the world is the hope and the goal of our political system; it is the despair and defeat of those who stand against us.’ Speech to the South Carolina Legislature, Columbia, SC (April 16, 1947); reported in *Journal of the House of Representatives of the First Session of the 87th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina*, p. 1085. Baruch was a good friend of Lippmann, who then proceeded to popularise the term.

¹⁸ Committee on Public Information, a.k.a. Creel Commission. George Creel, *How we advertised America* (1920)

sell the myth to destitute Europeans, while US corporations invaded their economies. NATO was created to subordinate the various Western European militaries to US command and to restore the threat against the Soviet Union that had disappeared when Hitler's *Wehrmacht* was defeated. NATO also created vehicles for the of the customer base for US armaments manufacturers while stimulating demand.

By 1949, the US regime had succeeded in manipulating the elections in most European countries to its advantage, establishing right wing or 'centre-right' governments, despite large majorities favouring socialist or social democratic parties.¹⁹ It had stabilised the position of its two dictatorial allies, Franco and Salazar, within NATO and, together with Britain, had subdued anti-fascism in Greece. With Europe pacified, it could turn its attention to absorbing or seizing the rest of the world not protected by the Soviet Union.

The original 'Asian Pivot'

Everything seemed brilliant until 1 October 1949 when the US regime had to accept the defeat of its client army under the warlord Chiang-Kai-Shek. All of a sudden, the US had 'lost China'. The so-called China Lobby – a coalition of banking, contraband (e.g. drugs) and feudal military interests, exemplified by former colonial governor of the Philippines, Douglas MacArthur – began a far-reaching campaign to mobilise the US as a whole to forcibly restore Euro-American control over China's economy.²⁰ Whether relative sanity in the US or the extremism of the Lobby itself (in its day almost as powerful as the Israel lobby today) prevented outright war is a matter of dispute. The psychological impact of 'losing China' certainly enhanced the status of the emergent national security state which then turned the 'loss' into an argument

¹⁹ See, *inter alia*, William Blum, *Killing Hope* (1995), updated in 2004.

²⁰ The China lobby originated from the commercial banditry of American (and European) enterprises based in Shanghai and HongKong since the Opium Wars (1839-42 and 1856-60). When the Chinese civil war started, these banks, drug dealers and other colonial enterprises sided with Chiang Kai-Shek. The Japanese occupation

for even more rigorous control of domestic and foreign political activity.

However it did not take long for the US regime to mobilise militarily in Asia again. Defeat of the Japanese empire had been an essential element of US imperial expansion in the Pacific. Prior to World War II, in fact with the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War, the US regime aimed to dominate Asia through Japan. Thus it was US President Theodore Roosevelt who licensed the Japanese occupation of Korea in 1905 and its annexation in 1910. With Japanese surrender in 1945, the US replaced the Japanese army as the occupying force in Korea, retaining Japanese police units in the country to control the population. US Asia policy was essentially to rebuild Japan as a base from which to control the mainland. To do this it was necessary to continue the supply of cheap food to Japan's population. That meant domination of Korea and Indochina, the 'rice bowls' for Japan. The US attempt to colonise Korea from Japan encountered heavy resistance since the Military Government in Korea (MGIK) was determined to defend exports of rice to Japan even if it meant the bulk of Korea's peasantry would starve.²¹ Any Korean attempts to resist US-Japanese exploitation were labelled 'communism' and viciously suppressed using methods that would later be

Note 20 continued:

forced Chiang and the Chinese Communists led by Mao Tse-Tung into an alliance that continued until Japan's defeat. Despite extensive support by these interests, Mao was able to defeat Chiang, forcing his evacuation to Taiwan. The Shanghai colonialists were ejected from the Chinese mainland with Chiang. Douglas McArthur, once the quasi-hereditary (his father had also been governor of the Philippines) colonial governor of the US Philippines and subsequently governor of occupied Japan, was effectively a major player in both US Pacific imperialism and de facto supporter of the China lobby until his dismissal in 1951.

21 Cumings points out that much of the riots and resistance in the countryside was due to Southern landlords continuing to take virtually all the grain (rice and wheat) from the peasantry because it was being exported to Japan. The US Military Government in Korea defended the landlords and their property rights against the peasantry.

institutionalised as the Phoenix Program in Vietnam.²²

The northern half of Korea had regained its independence when the Red Army withdrew in 1947. Meanwhile the US regime continued to occupy the southern half of the peninsula with the aid of a US-educated Christian fascist Rhee whose own nationalism called for reunification of Korea under a fascist regime aligned with the US (not unlike those supported by the US elsewhere).²³ In 1950, hostilities on the demarcation line separating independent Korea from US-occupied Korea resulted in a massive assault by armies of the PDRK (North Korea). This event was presented by the US to a rump UN Security Council as a quasi-international attack on sovereign Korea.²⁴

Punditry and official history present this conflict as part of the 'Cold War' or as a catalyst for those elements of US policy deceptively described as pertaining to the 'Cold War'. US President Harry Truman had already proclaimed a major policy deception when authorising the deployment of US forces to defend fascism in Greece, what became known as the

²² Douglas Valentine (see note 16). The similarities become apparent when the counter-insurgency in Korea is examined.

Moreover, there was considerable knowledge-transfer among officers in Asia and especially in the counter-terror unit(s) of the Agency.

²³ Another important aspect of US interest in Korea was the industrial base the Japanese had built in the North as well as the country's tungsten reserves – tungsten being a strategic metal for the steel and munitions sectors. Korea is estimated to have the world's sixth largest tungsten deposits. Rhee's principal US advisor was OSS/CIA officer M. Preston Goodfellow. In a letter from Goodfellow to Rhee dated 10 September 1954, Goodfellow wrote, 'I hear that a German group has made a proposal to buy the entire Korean tungsten output at a price above world markets. Of course such an offer would be a snare and a delusion. If the Germans had the entire Korean output sewed up they would fix the world price and of course, if necessary, that could be pushed below Korean mining costs...' At <<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/119364>>.

²⁴ For reasons that have defied coherent explanation to this date, the Soviet Union did not interrupt its boycott of the UN Security Council (based on dispute as to the seating of the People's Republic of China) to respond to Truman's call for an emergency session. Hence it could not exercise a veto over the resolution adopted and essentially authorising the US-led invasion of Korea. See for detailed discussion Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War* (Vol. 1 1981/Vol. 2 1992).

Truman Doctrine. Now he was expanding the application of that doctrine to the suppression of independence struggles in Asia. The US invasion and devastation of Korea, including the slaughter of at least three million Koreans and the levelling of nearly every city in the country by means of aerial bombardment, would become a model for the 'invisible' corporate warfare waged against the world but denied at home. Of course the invasions and wholesale destruction of Korea, Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, were not invisible – except to the white population of the US which profited from this carnage just as it had been profiting, since its founding, from the conquest of North America and subjugation of Central America. Although the US slaughtered over six million people in its invasions of Korea and Vietnam together, these campaigns are called part of the 'Cold War'. The US was almost forced to abandon the Korean peninsula where it remains today in a state of ceasefire with the Korea it tried to destroy.

After being forced to compromise in Korea – a considerable psychological blow for white supremacy – the US began a successful season of imperial expansion: *inter alia* returning Iran to the control of the oil cartel and Guatemala to United Fruit. Nationalist movements in Ghana and Congo were subdued.²⁵ With the exception of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, retained as colonial offshore enterprises, the US regime successfully replaced its colonial administration either with statehood status or installation of a nominally independent client regime. Thus, despite setbacks on the Asian mainland, the US continued to expand its archipelago of military-industrial outposts throughout the Western hemisphere and the Pacific. To maintain the pressure on the Soviet Union, a constant series of atomic weapons tests was conducted. At the same time these weapons were deemed well suited for obliterating any darker skinned armies that might challenge US hegemony. Korea had shown that not only

²⁵ There was one major blemish in an otherwise successful record of what is now innocuously called 'regime change' – Cuba. In 1959, Fidel Castro defeated the US-backed Battista dictatorship. However, the scope of Cuba's revolution would not become apparent to the US until the end of 1960.

could Asians defeat racist 'white' armies in the field, it also revealed that the US simply did not have the reliable manpower to dominate Asia's large populations. 'Better dead than red' actually meant that US policy was to massacre Asian 'hordes' rather than risk that they become communist or socialist. The drivers behind the US atomic weapons programme, psychopaths like Edward Teller, were steeped in the tradition of the worthlessness of non-whites. And yet the US population could not be mobilised simply on the vague need to oppose communism – there had to be a powerful fantasy of fear.

Fear is induced by anticipation of pain or loss. The 'Cold War' myth therefore needed both an image of something perceived as valuable enough to oppose its loss and painful enough to prevent its occurrence. A division of labour emerged in the two wings of the US ruling party. The liberal wing devoted its energy to creating and maintaining the myth of what could be lost while the traditional wing (erroneously called 'conservative') became devoted to creating and maintaining the expectation of pain. Liberal 'Cold War' practice therefore emphasised all the 'blessings' of America: consumerism, entrepreneurialism, hedonistic political institutions, mass entertainment and the 'civil rights' that supposedly guaranteed them. The traditional wing – not surprisingly strongest in the former slave states of the South – focussed on the violent threat. Just as South Carolina's slaveholders contrived the most draconian measures to control their slaves – out of sheer terror that the black majority, if given the chance, would repay whites with the viciousness inherent in chattel slavery – the 'traditional' Cold Warriors demanded judicial, extra-judicial and terroristic means be applied to prevent latent revolutionaries from overthrowing the US regime.

Classical interpretation of the 'Cold War' also includes this fundamental misunderstanding of what 'liberal' or 'conservative' means. Although the term 'Cold War consensus' has been used often, the term has rarely been substantively explained – except in deceptive ways. The 'Cold War'

consensus did not emerge because of a threat by the Soviet Union or even the declared risks of the nuclear arms race. The 'Cold War' consensus was the tacit but often explicit agreement that US corporate expansion and the extension of the archipelago of empire required discipline of the domestic population and marketing of the USA abroad so as to distract from the real wars being waged worldwide – and the fact that all these wars were being waged by the US regime or its vassals. When criticised for all the injustices and crimes committed by the clergy, Pope Pius XII insisted that the Church be judged by its high principles and not by its actions. This is the underlying precept of the whole concept of the 'Cold War' – to create an edifice of abstract principles that appear so unassailable, that no action however vile can be deemed to impugn it.

A 'new cold war' ?

This question is actually ludicrous. First of all, the 'old Cold War' – properly understood – never ended. The 'Cold War' has been a war waged by the US regime since 1945 to enforce the imperial scheme contrived between 1917 and 1944 but which could not be implemented as long as Great Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands still had any substantial control over their empires. 1945 gave the US ruling elite what they thought was the ultimate weapon to impose their will on the rest of the world – with the concessions made by the European competition which was now hopelessly indebted to the US banks and seriously weakened militarily so as to be unable to defend their colonial control against the indigenous populations.

The 'Cold War' was also modelled in NSC 68 that mandated a massive armaments industry to heavily arm the US to assert and defend its corporations' claims to a

disproportionate amount of the world's wealth.²⁶ As the report indicates: 'Even if there were no Soviet Union we would face the great problem of the free society, accentuated many fold in this industrial age, of reconciling order, security, the need for participation, with the requirements of freedom. We would face the fact that in a shrinking world the absence of order among nations is becoming less and less tolerable.'²⁷ It has been the logical extension of Manifest Destiny, the particularly US term for imperialism.

It has been assumed – at least by those who ask the foregoing ludicrous question – that the 'Cold War' ended, the date usually being set around 1989 with the opening of borders between the US-occupied Federal Republic of

²⁶ NSC 68 – *National Security Council Report 68*, (1950, Top Secret) was declassified in February 1975. However as noted on page 10 *et seq.*, the objectives represent a consistent development of those formulated in 1948 (NSC 20/4). 'These objectives contemplate Soviet acceptance of the specific and limited conditions requisite to an international environment in which free institutions can flourish, and in which the Russian peoples will have a new chance to work out their destiny.' Soviet capabilities are assessed in contrast to the vaster potential of the US, 'in contrast to us, the Soviet world can do more with less. It has a lower standard of living, its economy requires less to keep it functioning and its military machine operates effectively with less elaborate equipment and organisation.' The report anticipates an economic downturn as well as insufficient military expenditure, recommending measures to increase the latter throughout the 'West'. 'Such increased power could be provided in a shorter period (to less than two to three years) in a declared period of emergency or in wartime through a full-out national effort....A large measure of sacrifice and discipline will be demanded of the American people. They will be asked to give up some of the benefits which they have come to associate with their freedoms. Nothing could be more important than that they fully understand the reasons for this.' The report lists among recommended measures: 'substantial increase in military expenditures and military assistance programmes....intensification of affirmative and timely measures and operations by covert means in the fields of economic warfare, and political and psychological warfare with a view to fomenting and supporting unrest and revolt in selected strategic satellite countries, development of internal security and civilian defence programs, improvement and intensification of intelligence activities, reduction of federal expenditures for purposes other than defence and foreign assistance, if necessary by the deferment of certain desirable programs, increased taxes...'

²⁷ NSC 68, p. 34

Germany and the German Democratic Republic, established in the Soviet zone of occupation. Of course more dogmatic types date the end of the 'Cold War' with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. Then the official enemy ceased to exist as a state.

However, as argued above, the 'Cold War' did not originate because of the Soviet Union and any presumed competition between the US and USSR. The 'Cold War' was in and of itself a war waged unilaterally by the US regime. It was conceived and has been perpetuated as the political strategy of US corporations in their quest for world domination – what they call euphemistically ever-expanding markets. On the contrary, the official policy and praxis of the Soviet Union since Stalin had been literally anti-imperialist to the point of refusing by and large to support foreign revolutionary movements. Instead Stalin advocated 'socialism in one country' – the Soviet Union.

The US from its very inception has claimed to expand its system: slavery and theft of indigenous land, plus unrestricted exploitation of labour and natural resources for private profit. It was augmented by the long-standing (if only recently declassified) policy of the US regime to initiate attack against the Soviet Union, massively with nuclear weapons. Only the visible and convincing success of the Soviet Union in establishing near parity in nuclear capability forced the US to refrain from pursuing its traditional mass annihilation strategy.²⁸

It is not necessary to ask if there will be a new cold war, since the 'Cold War' is still being waged and the deception

28 With a little bit of training in deciphering the language of national security, especially the atomic bomb dialect, the official documentary history of US strategic nuclear policy produced by Sandia National Laboratories at <<https://archive.org/details/U.s.StrategicNuclearPolicy>> and recently declassified, makes it quite clear that the US regime has enjoyed nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union from the beginning to this day. The serious plans for first strike and second-strike survival are discussed by people who have been formulating atomic war policy from the beginning. Most of the people interviewed imply more concern for survival after the USSR has retaliated.....*Dr. Strangelove* was no exaggeration.

inherent in the regular reiteration of this question in the media is proof that it is still being won among the whites of this world.

Dr T P Wilkinson writes, teaches History and English, directs theatre and coaches cricket in Heinrich Heine's birthplace, Düsseldorf. He is also the author of Church Clothes, Land, Mission and the End of Apartheid in South Africa (Maisonneuve Press, 2003).