

The Prospect of Martial Law: “Transformation” and the Beginning of Global Resistance

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, August 31, 2005

[uruknet](#) 31 August 2005

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

The changes that are taking place within the military under the deceptive name of “transformation” have nothing to do with national defense or preparedness for terrorist attack. Rather, the military is being converted into a taxpayer subsidized security apparatus for multinational corporations that will seize foreign resources through force of arms and then crush the indigenous elements that resist US aggression. On the home front, the changes are equally dramatic. “Transformation” is a conspicuous attempt to weaken traditional defenses provided by the National Guard so that the Pentagon can insert itself into domestic affairs and establish an ongoing military presence within the United States. Donald Rumsfeld has already suggested that the military will play a greater role in dealing with the aftereffects of any future attack. There’s no doubt that he will honor that commitment.

The media has predictably echoed the government line that transformation is simply intended to revamp the military for the wars of the next century. They have highlighted the effects of base closures on local economies and unemployment. They have also emphasized the Pentagon’s intention to create smaller, more agile military units that can be quickly deployed anywhere around the world in less than 48 hours. But, the media have scrupulously avoided any analysis of the objectives in these changes or discussion of Rumsfeld’s attacks on homeland security. Rumsfeld has already savaged the National Guard; 40% of who are now serving in Iraq. That means, that the American people are 40% “less safe” in the event of terrorist attack no matter how one chooses to look at it. Instead of strengthening the damaged Guard, Rumsfeld is executing a plan that will wreak havoc on domestic preparedness and expose the American public to even greater risk. For example, “Rumsfeld called for 30 Air Guard units scattered around many states to lose their aircraft and flying missions.” (Liz Sidot; Ass Press 8-27-05) How can the states be expected to conduct routine patrols or reconnaissance missions if their planes have been seized by Washington?

In Pennsylvania Rumsfeld tried to “dissolve the Pennsylvania Air National Guard division without the Governor’s authority”. (Ass Press) The move was a conspicuous attempt to undermine homeland defenses and put more power under the direct control of the Defense Dept. Rumsfeld also tried to “transfer” all 15 “Pacific Northwest and Oregon National Guard fighter jets that patrolled Seattle’s skies after 9-11”; leaving the region with no protection from aerial assault. (Northwest’s F-15’s Should Stay Put” Seattle PI staff, 8-27-05) Consider the risk to a “target-rich” area like the Pacific Northwest, with its industry, harbors and nuclear power plants, if it was stripped of its first line of defense? Rumsfeld’s behavior has been the same everywhere across the country. He is determined to undermine the National Guard and limit the states’ ability to protect themselves against attack. His intention is to

smash America's internal defenses, which are under control of the states' governors, and introduce the military into homeland security. It is a clear attempt to centralize authority and further militarize the country. By weakening America's defenses, Rumsfeld has paved the way for deploying troops and aircraft within the country and setting the precedent for a permanent military presence within the nation. It is one giant step towards direct military rule.

There is no other conceivable reason for weakening national defense during a period when there is an increased likelihood of a terrorist incident. Terrorism, of course, will provide the rationale for these changes, but the strategy is already well under way. Rumsfeld is simply moving towards a form of governance that he has supported throughout his career. Just months ago he was advising the governments of South America to resume using the military in domestic policing activities to undermine the Leftist political movements that are feeding and educating their people. Rumsfeld's plan for the American people is basically no different.

Are we talking about the prospect of martial law?

We only need to look at developments in England to know what Americans will be facing after the next terrorist attack. Even the unpopular Tony Blair has managed to manipulate the tragedy for personal political advantage and push for extreme regressive legislation that suspends habeas corpus, due process and the presumption of innocence. Blair has assumed the right to deport terror suspects, suspend free speech and shoot to kill. Unsurprisingly, Blair has concealed his despotic behavior behind a public relations smokescreen that is intended to make his actions look like they are spontaneous. But, they're not any more spontaneous than the 356 page Patriot Act was a spur-of-the-moment reaction to 9-11. The Prime Minister's "The rules of the game have changed" speech; was a carefully scripted declaration of martial law for Muslims. The American people can expect similar edicts from Washington following the next terrorist attack at home. Transformation and Foreign Policy

The foreign policy implications of "transformation" are equally ominous. When the military is adapted to the narrow interests of elites it becomes little more than a resource-acquisition tool; a bloody-weapon to be used by private industry. We can see the effects of this in both Iraq and Afghanistan, where the military has seized dwindling resources and is providing security for the corporations that are exploiting that wealth. It's nothing more than massive "protections-racket" designed to legitimize theft.

The US military is the face of the modern war-machine; a highly-technological, finely-tuned instrument designed for aggressive warfare. The Pentagon is no longer expecting to fight large territorial conflicts, but instead is developing a fighting force to "preemptively" attack those nationalist or revolutionary forces that may disrupt global commerce. When Bush says, "We will confront emerging threats before they fully materialize;" he is simply articulating his intention to initiate hostilities according to his own arbitrary inclinations. As Abu Ghraib and Falluja prove, the administration's decisions are not affected by either moral considerations or the rule of law; it's merely a matter of whether superior firepower will achieve their stated objectives. . The Cost of Global War

One official from the World Bank estimated that the US will spend in excess of \$900 Billion per year to maintain the global military presence that the Bush administration has in mind; nearly double the current Pentagon budget. This is probably accurate. The New World Order

requires a gluttonous, iron-fisted military to maintain its supremacy and to preserve the existing economic paradigm. The only real threat to this system is the “transformation” of consciousness that is sweeping across the world. It is a rising tide that has stopped the American juggernaut in Iraq and Afghanistan. Rumsfeld’s “transformed” military is hopelessly bogged down in the Sunni Triangle and he’s barely two years into his New American Century. Imagine what will happen when global resistance really begins to appear?

Copyright © Mike Whitney

The original source of this article is [uruknet](#)
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), [uruknet](#), 2005

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

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