

Make The World A NATO Protectorate

Hillary Clinton's Prescription

By [Rick Rozoff](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Global Research, February 01, 2010

[Stop NATO](#) 31 January 2010

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was busy in London and Paris last week advancing the new Euro-Atlantic agenda for the world.

As the top foreign policy official of what her commander-in-chief Barack Obama touted as being the world's sole military superpower on December 10, she is no ordinary foreign minister. Her position is rather some composite of several ones from previous historical epochs: Viceroy, proconsul, imperial nuncio.

When a U.S. secretary of state speaks the world pays heed. Any nation that doesn't will suffer the consequences of that inattention, that disrespect toward the imperatrix mundi.

On January 27 she was in London for a conference on Yemen and the following day she attended the International Conference on Afghanistan in the same city.

Also on the 28th she and two-thirds of her NATO quad counterparts, British Foreign Secretary David Miliband and French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner (along with EU High Representative Catherine Ashton), pronounced a joint verdict on the state of democracy in Nigeria, Britain's former colonial possession.

Afterwards she crossed the English channel and delivered an address called Remarks on the Future of European Security at L'Ecole Militaire in Paris on January 29. That presentation was the most substantive component of her three-day European junket and the only one that dealt mainly with the continent itself, her previous comments relating to what are viewed by the United States and its Western European NATO partners as backwards, "ungovernable" international badlands. That is, the rest of the world.

While in Paris, Clinton held a joint press conference with her counterpart Kouchner and said, "we...discussed the results of the London meetings on Yemen and Afghanistan. We have a lot of work ahead of us. We appreciate greatly the support that France has given in developing a European police force mission to support NATO in its effort to train police.

"We will be consulting even more closely. Our work in Africa is particularly important. I applaud France for resuming diplomatic relations with Rwanda, and I also appreciate greatly the work that Bernard and the government here is doing in Guinea and in other African countries." [1]

Rwanda and Guinea (Conakry) are former French colonies.

Two days before she made a similar joint appearance in London with British Foreign

Secretary David Miliband and Yemeni Foreign Minister Abu Bakr Abdullah al-Qirbi. Yemen is a former British colony. The conference on that country held on January 27 also included the Foreign Minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Prince Saud Al-Faisal, but not Secretary General Amr Moussa or any other representative of the 22-member Arab League.

Having the foreign minister of the unpopular government in Yemen that the U.S. is waging a covert – and not so covert – war to defend against mass opposition in both the north and south of the nation and the foreign minister of the nation that is bombing villages and killing hundreds of civilians in the north was sufficient for the Barack Obama and Gordon Brown governments. A war on the Arabian peninsula whose three major belligerents are the Yemeni government, Saudi Arabia and the U.S. is not viewed by Washington and London as a matter that 20 other Arab nations need to be consulted about.

Clinton delivered comments on the occasion that were exactly what were required to obscure the real state of affairs in Yemen in furtherance of her nation's military campaign there: "The United States is intensifying security and development efforts with Yemen. We are encouraged by the Government of Yemen's recent efforts to take action against al-Qaida and against other extremist groups. They have been relentlessly pursuing the terrorists who threaten not only Yemen but the Gulf region and far beyond, here to London and to our country in the United States." [2]

Bombing Shia civilians in the country's north and resorting to the preferred "diplomatic" intervention of the last four American secretaries of state – cruise missiles – in the south in the name of protecting London from Osama bin Laden is yet another illustration of how a nation behaves when it doesn't have a formal diplomatic corps.

In the same breath she added "The Yemeni people deserve the opportunity to determine their own future," when there was nothing further from her mind.

She acknowledged that "a longstanding protest movement continues" in the south and that fighting in the north "has left many thousands dead and more than 200,000 displaced" – without in any manner alluding to Saudi armed assaults in the north and U.S. cruise missile attacks in the south – but her focus remained firmly on "extremists who incite violence and inflict harm." American bombs and missiles, of course, are nonviolent and harmless in the Secretary's us-versus-them view of statecraft.

Clinton didn't miss an opportunity to dress down her nation's client Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh – "This must be a partnership if it is to have a successful outcome" – for his failure to adequately "protect human rights, advance gender equity, build democratic institutions and the rule of law." The U.S. may extend its Afghanistan-Pakistan war into the Arabian Peninsula and the Horn of Africa [3] in nominal support of the Yemeni head of state and his Somali counterpart President Sheikh Sharif Sheikh Ahmed, but they and their like – Afghanistan's Hamid Karzai and Pakistan's Asif Ali Zardari – should not for a minute forget who is in charge and who makes the rules.

The secretary of state had nothing to say about the condition of human rights, gender equality and so forth in Saudi Arabia and America's other military vassals in the Persian Gulf. Medieval monarchies and hereditary autocracies that host American military bases, buy billions of dollars of advanced weapons from Raytheon, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman and are home to the U.S. 5th Fleet are not subjected to homilies on human rights and "democratic institutions."

On the day of the London conference on Afghanistan Clinton, flanked by the foreign ministers of Africa's two former major colonial masters, Britain's David Miliband and France's Bernard Kouchner, also delivered a lecture to the government of Nigeria, ordering it to address "electoral reform, post-amnesty programs in the Niger Delta, economic development, inter-faith discord and transparency." [4]

At the January 28 International Conference on Afghanistan, attended by the foreign ministers of all 28 NATO member states and dozens of NATO partnership underlings with troops in the South Asian war zone – the "international community" as the West defines it – Clinton complemented the Pentagon's allies and satraps:

"I think that what we have seen is a global challenge that is being met with a global response. I especially thank the countries that have committed additional troops, leading with our host country, the United Kingdom, but including Italy, Germany, Romania." [5]

She will need yet more troops in the near future for a far larger conflict than those the U.S. and NATO are currently involved with in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia if the following comments contribute to the results they appear to intend:

"I also had a chance to discuss Iran's refusal to engage with the international community on its nuclear program. They continue to violate IAEA and Security Council requirements.

"The revelation of Iran's secret nuclear facility at Qom has raised further questions about Iran's intentions. And in response to these questions, the Iranian Government has provided a continuous stream of threats to intensify its violation of international nuclear norms. Iran's approach leaves us with little choice but to work with our partners to apply greater pressure...."

Washington and its main NATO partners Britain, France and Germany along with miscellaneous allies around the world – "rogue" nuclear powers India, Israel and Pakistan among them (who know who to align with and purchase arms from) – dictate the terms on matters ranging from the proper holding of elections to which nation can develop a civilian nuclear power program. Any country outside the "Euro-Atlantic" and "international" communities faces censure, threats, "greater pressure" and ultimately military attack.

The U.S. has a population of 300 million and the European Union of 500 million, combined well under one-eighth that of the world. Yet the two, whose military wing is NATO, hold "international conferences" on Asia, the Middle East and other parts of the world and presume to deliver ultimatums to all other nations.

To cite a recent example, the New York Times reported that "Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton warned China on [January 29] that it would face economic insecurity and diplomatic isolation if it did not sign on to tough new sanctions against Iran for its nuclear program, seeking to raise the pressure on Beijing to fall in line with an American-led campaign." [6] On the same day "The Obama administration notified Congress on Friday of its plans to proceed with five arms sales transactions with Taiwan worth a total of \$6.4 billion. The arms deals include 60 Black Hawk helicopters, Patriot interceptor missiles, advanced Harpoon missiles that can be used against land or ship targets and two refurbished minesweepers." [7]

Clinton has joined in the U.S. chorus of hectoring of China since she took up her current post

last year, in May even raising the specter of Chinese penetration of Latin America.

China is not Afghanistan or Yemen. It is not even Iran. The last generation's foreign policy hubris and megalomania of the West, epitomized by its wars in Southeast Europe and South Asia and the Middle East, may be headed into far more dangerous territory.

Grandiosity, arrogance and perceived impunity blind those afflicted with them, whether individuals or nations.

No clearer example exists than Secretary Clinton's remarks in Paris on January 29.

To demonstrate the worldview of those she represents – that the United States and Europe are the incontestable metropolises and rulers by right of the planet – early in her address Clinton said “I appreciate the opportunity to discuss a matter of great consequence to the United States, France, and every country on this continent and far beyond the borders: the future of European security.” [8]

That is, the U.S. arrogates to itself the prerogative of not only speaking with authority on the security of a continent 3,500 miles away but intervening around the world in its alleged defense.

Flattering her hosts, she further said: “As founding members of the NATO Alliance, our countries have worked side by side for decades to build a strong and secure Europe and to defend and promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. And I am delighted that we are working even more closely now that France is fully participating in NATO's integrated command structure. I thank President Sarkozy for his leadership and look forward to benefiting from the counsel of our French colleagues as together we chart NATO's future.”

Regarding the phrase “to defend and promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law,” evocative of almost identical terms used two days earlier in reference to Yemen, Clinton's Paris speech was fairly overflowing with similar language.

The words recently have been tarnished and debased so thoroughly by the use they have frequently served – justifying war – that they are at risk of deteriorating into not so much noble as suspect abstractions.

Worse yet, they are incantations employed to praise oneself for uniquely possessing them and to castigate others who don't. [“Our work extends beyond Europe as well....European and American voices speak as one to denounce the gross violations of human rights in Iran.” But not in Saudi Arabia, Western Sahara, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, post-“independence” Kosovo, Estonia and Latvia, etc.]

Clinton's speech contained these terms and phrases in the following sequence:

democracy, human rights, and the rule of law

unity, partnership, and peace

global progress

reconciliation, cooperation, and community

security and our prosperity

importance of liberty and freedom

peace and security

development, democracy, and human rights

human potential

democratic institutions and the rule of law

progress and stability

democracy and stability

accountable, effective governments

economic and democratic development

expanding opportunity

development and greater stability

defend and promote human rights

peace and opportunity and prosperity

defending and advancing our values in the world

a Europe transformed, secure, democratic, unified and prosperous

The last is a variant of A Europe Whole And Free [9] first employed by President George H.W. Bush in 1989 to inaugurate his putative new world order.

As will be seen by further excerpts from her address (as well as its location and context), Clinton's use of the above expressions was, as noted, both self-congratulatory and in contradistinction to the implied lack of what they pertain to in the world outside of the Euro-Atlantic community and its approved allies elsewhere.

Again taking up the theme of Western superiority and the need for the Euro-Atlantic precedent to be enforced on others, she said "European security is, not only to the individual nations, but to the world. It is, after all, more than a collection of countries linked by history and geography. It is a model for the transformative power of reconciliation, cooperation, and community."

However, "much important work remains unfinished. The transition to democracy is incomplete in parts of Europe and Eurasia." The subjugation of Europe's eastern "hinterlands" will be explored later in relation to her comments on the European Union's Eastern Partnership and related matters.

"The transatlantic partnership has been both a cornerstone of global security and a powerful force for global progress.

“NATO is revising its Strategic Concept to prepare for the alliance’s summit at the end of this year here at (inaudible). I know there’s a lot of thinking going on about strategic threats and how to meet them. Next week, at the Munich Security Conference, leaders from across the continent will address urgent security and foreign policy challenges.

“The United States, too, has also been studying ways to strengthen European security and, therefore our own security, and to extend it to foster security on a global scale.”

To elite trans-Atlantic policy makers the above paragraphs’ meaning is indisputable: The use of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization military bloc – the true foundation of the “transatlantic partnership” – in waging war in and effectively colonizing the Balkans and in expanding into Eastern Europe, incorporating twelve new nations including former Warsaw Pact members and Soviet republics, is the worldwide paradigm for the West in the 21st century.

That mechanism, using Europe as NATO’s springboard for geopolitical aggrandizement in the east and the south, is being applied at the moment against larger adversaries than the bloc has tackled before now:

“European security remains an anchor of U.S. foreign and security policy. A strong Europe is critical to our security and our prosperity. Much of what we hope to accomplish globally depends on working together with Europe....And so we are working with European allies and partners to help bring stability to Afghanistan and try to take on the dangers posed by Iran’s nuclear ambition.”

“We have repeatedly called on Russia to honor the terms of its ceasefire agreement with Georgia, and we refuse to recognize Russia’s claims of independence for Abkhazia and South Ossetia. More broadly, we object to any spheres of influence claimed in Europe in which one country seeks to control another’s future. Our security depends upon nations being able to choose their own destiny.”

The final sentence is galling beyond endurance, coming as it does from the foreign policy chief of a nation with hundreds of thousands of troops in Afghanistan and Iraq and which with its NATO allies waged war against Yugoslavia and tore the nation apart.

The one preceding it is equally absurd, as Clinton repeatedly insists on the right of the U.S. to be not only a major player on the European continent but the main arbiter of military, security, political, energy and other policies there while denouncing Russia – it didn’t need to be named – for alleged designs to establish a “sphere of influence” in neighboring states.

“Security in Europe must be indivisible. For too long, the public discourse around Europe’s security has been fixed on geographical and political divides. Some have looked at the continent even now and seen Western and Eastern Europe, old and new Europe, NATO and non-NATO Europe, EU and non-EU Europe. The reality is that there are not many Europes; there is only one Europe. And it is a Europe that includes the United States as its partner....We are closer than ever to achieving the goal that has inspired European and American leaders and citizens – not only a Europe transformed, secure, democratic, unified and prosperous, but a Euro-Atlantic alliance that is greater than the sum of its parts....”

For decades, indeed since the end of World War II, American leaders have been “inspired” by a vision of a Europe transformed and unified – under NATO military command and a

European Union serving as the civilian, and increasingly military, complement to the Alliance.

“NATO must and will remain open to any country that aspires to become a member and can meet the requirements of membership,” even Ukraine where the overwhelming majority of its citizens oppose being pulled into the military bloc. [“We stand with the people of Ukraine as they choose their next elected president in the coming week, an important step in Ukraine’s journey toward democracy, stability, and integration into Europe. And we are devoting ourselves to efforts to resolve enduring conflicts, including in the Caucasus and on Cyprus.”]

And should a nation be incorporated into the bloc even against the will of its people, then the U.S. “will maintain an unwavering commitment to the pledge enshrined in Article 5 of the NATO treaty that an attack on one is an attack on all. When France and our other NATO allies invoked Article 5 in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11th, 2001, it was a proclamation to the world that our promise to each other was not rhetorical, but real....And for that, I thank you. And I assure you and all members of NATO that our commitment to Europe’s defense is equally strong.

“As proof of that commitment, we will continue to station American troops in Europe, both to deter attacks and respond quickly if any occur. We are working with our allies to ensure that NATO has the plans it needs for responding to new and evolving contingencies. We are engaged in productive discussions with our European allies about building a new missile defense architecture....”

Washington is uncompromisingly bent on expanding NATO even further along Russia’s borders – Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Finland – despite misgivings among some NATO allies in Europe, and will use the Alliance’s Article 5 war clause to “protect” those new outposts. It will also drag all of Europe into its worldwide interceptor missile system.

And not against military threats – there is no military threat to any European nation – but against a veritable plethora of phantom pretexts, including so-called cyber and energy security, both of which are subterfuges for the U.S. to intervene against Russia. A host of other ploys for NATO intervention were added, many from NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen’s 17-point list of last year [10]: Iran’s nuclear program, “confronting North Korea’s defiance of its international obligations,” “tackling non-traditional threats such as pandemic disease, cyber warfare, and the trafficking of children” and the “need to be doing even more, such as in missile defense, counternarcotics, and Afghanistan.” Anything and everything is grist to the U.S.’s and NATO’s mill.

As Clinton put it, “In the 21st century, the spirit of collective defense must also include non-traditional threats. We believe NATO’s new Strategic Concept must address these new threats. Energy security is a particularly pressing priority. Countries vulnerable to energy cut-offs face not only economic consequences but strategic risks as well. And I welcome the recent establishment of the U.S.-EU Energy Council, and we are determined to support Europe in its efforts to diversify its energy supplies.”

Diversifying energy supplies is a code phrase for driving Russia and keeping Iran out of oil and natural gas deliveries to Europe. If the tables were turned the U.S. would view – and treat – such a policy as an act of war.

The global expansion of the American agenda in Europe was indicated further in Clinton's remarks that "This partnership is about so much more than strengthening our security. At its core, it is about defending and advancing our values in the world. I think it is particularly critical today that we not only defend those values in the world. I think it is particularly critical today that we not only defend those values, but promote them; that we are not only on defense, but on offense."

And placing the current world situation in historical perspective, she said: "We are continuing the enterprise that we began at the end of the Cold War to expand the zone of democracy and stability. We have worked together this year to complete the effort we started in the 1990s to help bring peace and stability to the Balkans. And we are working closely with the EU to support the six countries that the EU engages through its Eastern Partnership initiative."

The Eastern Partnership is a U.S.-backed European Union program to pull six of twelve former Soviet republics that formed the Commonwealth of Independent States into the Western orbit: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. [11] Armenia and Belarus are members with Russia of the Collective Security Treaty Organization, a potential counterbalance to NATO's drive into the former Soviet Union. Along with Serbia and Cyprus, those nations represent the last obstacles to NATO, and behind it the U.S., securing control of all of Europe.

Clinton also had the audacity to raise the issues of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE), the first almost two months beyond its December 5 expiration and the other, in its adapted form, not ratified by a single member state of NATO, which – led by the U.S. – is exploiting its suspension for military buildups in new Eastern European nations.

"Two years ago, Russia suspended the implementation of the CFE Treaty, while the United States and our allies continue to do so. The Russia-Georgia war in 2008 was not only a tragedy but has created a further obstacle to moving forward...." The U.S. and NATO have justified their non-ratification of the Adapted Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty by demanding that Russia withdraw a small handful of peacekeepers it maintains in post-conflict zones in Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transdniestria. Had those forces been withdrawn earlier under Western pressure, Georgia's invasion of South Ossetia in 2008, coordinated with an attack on Abkhazia, might have proven successful for its American-trained army.

Part of Clinton's self-serving interpretation of the CFE Treaty is "the right of host countries to consent to stationing foreign troops in their territory." That is, U.S. and NATO and decidedly not Russia troops. There can be no spheres of influence in former Soviet space – except the West's.

Her understanding of an autonomous Europe not "besieged" by Russia and Iran – and North Korea – includes not only stationing American troops on its soil but also nuclear weapons, hundreds of which are still housed in NATO bases in several European countries. "President Obama declared the long-term goal of a world without nuclear weapons. As long as these weapons exist, the United States will maintain a safe, secure, and effective arsenal to deter any adversary, and we will guarantee that defense to our allies.

"[W]e are conducting a comprehensive Nuclear Posture Review to chart a new course that

strengthens deterrence and reassurance for the United States and our allies....” Clinton didn’t indicate which European nations have requested to be placed under the Pentagon’s nuclear shield.

After her presentation Clinton answered questions from the audience at the French Military Academy.

Her extemporaneous comments were even more revealing than her prepared text.

They included:

“When it comes to NATO, I think that greater integration on the European continent provides even more opportunity for the level of cooperation to increase.

“But I think, given the complexity of the world today, closer cooperation and more complementarity between the EU and NATO is in all of our interests to try to forge common policies – economic and development and political and legal on the one hand in the EU, and principally security on the other hand in NATO. But as I said in my remarks, they are no longer separated. It’s hard to say that security is only about what it was when NATO was formed, and the EU has no role to play in security issues.”

NATO’s new Strategic Concept lays particular emphasis on the advancement – indeed the culmination – of U.S.-EU-NATO global military integration. [12]

Regarding the implementation of that project, Clinton stipulated the issue of energy wars. “[I]t would be the EU’s responsibility to create policies that would provide more independence and protections from intimidation when it comes to energy markets from member nations. But I can also see how in certain cases respecting energy, there may be a role for NATO as well.”

When asked about what in recent years has been referred to as Global NATO “extending the boundaries of NATO to non-Western countries, emerging powers like Brazil, India, other democracies that might fulfill their criteria,” Clinton advocated a series of expanding partnerships in addition to the Partnership for Peace, Adriatic Charter, Mediterranean Dialogue, Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, Contact Country, Trilateral Afghanistan-Pakistan-NATO Military Commission and others that take in over a third of the nations in the world:

“How do we cooperate across geographic distance with countries in other hemispheres, different geopolitical challenges? And there is a modern living example of that with the NATO ISAF commitment in Afghanistan.

“In many ways, it’s quite remarkable, the success of this alliance. Yesterday at the London conference on Afghanistan, as you know, the United States, under President Obama, has agreed to put 30,000 more troops in Afghanistan. And member nations, NATO and ISAF – the international partners – have come up with a total of 9,000 more troops....NATO is leading the way, but NATO has to determine in what ways it can cooperate with others. I think that the world that we face of failing states, non-state actors, networks of terrorists, rogue regimes – North Korea being a prime example – really test the international community. And it’s a test we have to pass. Now, there are some who say this is too complicated, it is out of area, it is not our responsibility. But given the nature of the threats we face, I don’t think that’s an adequate response.

“[C]yber security breaches, concerted attacks on networks and countries, are likely to cross borders. We have to know how to defend against them and we have to enlist nations who are likeminded to work with. Similarly, with energy problems, attacks on pipelines, attacks on container ships, attacks on electric grids will have consequences far beyond boundaries. And it won’t just be NATO nations. NATO nations border non-NATO nations.”

A small consortium of Western nations, two in North America and 26 in Europe – though most of the latter are nothing more than slavishly subservient junior partners – has appointed itself, for its own interests, the arbiter of world affairs in all matters from judging the political legitimacy of governments to who receives energy supplies from whom to the most urgent question of all, when and against whom wars can be launched. [13]

Clinton’s speech in Paris has signaled her country’s intention to formalize and extend that role throughout the world in the 21st century.

Notes

- 1) <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/136280.htm>
- 2) <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/135930.htm>
- 3) U.S., NATO Expand Afghan War To Horn Of Africa And Indian Ocean
Stop NATO, January 8, 2010
<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/01/08/u-s-nato-expand-afghan-war-to-horn-of-africa-and-indian-ocean-2>
- 4) <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/136151.htm>
- 5) <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/136159.htm>
- 6) New York Times, January 29, 2010
- 7) New York Times, January 30, 2010
- 8) <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/136273.htm>
- 9) Berlin Wall: From Europe Whole And Free To New World Order
Stop NATO, November 9, 2009
<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2009/11/09/berlin-wall-from-europe-whole-and-free-to-new-world-order>
- 10) Berlin Wall: From Europe Whole And Free To New World Order
Stop NATO, November 9, 2009
<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2009/11/09/berlin-wall-from-europe-whole-and-free-to-new-world-order>
- 11) Eastern Partnership: The West’s Final Assault On the Former Soviet Union
Stop NATO, February 13, 2009
<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2009/08/26/eastern-partnership-the-wests-final-assault-on-the-former-soviet-union>
- 12) EU, NATO, US: 21st Century Alliance For Global Domination
Stop NATO, February 19, 2009
<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2009/08/26/eu-nato-us-21st-century-alliance-for-global-domination>
- 13) EU, NATO, US: 21st Century Alliance For Global Domination
Stop NATO, February 19, 2009
<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2009/08/26/eu-nato-us-21st-century-alliance-for-global-domination>

[ination](#)

Stop NATO

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/stopnato>

Blog site:

<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/>

To subscribe, send an e-mail to:

rwrozoff@yahoo.com

or

stopnato-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

Daily digest option available.

The original source of this article is [Stop NATO](#)

Copyright © [Rick Rozoff](#), [Stop NATO](#), 2010

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Rick Rozoff](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca