## 1

#### Advantage One: “The first lesson a revolutionary must learn is that ~~he is a doomed man.~~ they are a doomed person. Sometimes if you want to get rid of the gun, you have to pick the gun up. My fear was not of death itself, but a death without meaning” – Huey P. Newton

#### The US and its sovereignty is predicated on an asymmetrical and segregated death world. Empire must constantly wage low-grade counterinsurgency against its own population – a paradoxical situation that depends on the people it murders in order to gain its legitimacy.

#### Protracted police violence has produced people living in death “Ilhan Omar, Aiyana Pressley, Maxine Waters all receiving death threats, Trump dog whistling white supremacist, 3 Lynching’s in the last 5 years, the deaths of Ahmad Arbury, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd all reveal the fragility of the US’s desperate attempt to preserve the elasticity of the structure.

Gurley, 1/18/21

**(Gabrielle Gurley, America Editor for The Prospect, The Prospect, “This, Too, Is America”,** <https://prospect.org/politics/this-too-is-america/>**, accessed 2/6/21, twc)**

After seven long days of how-did-this-happen-here recriminations, Donald J. Trump entered the history books as the only president to be impeached twice, the worst president in American history, and the only one to incite an attempted coup. In the House of Representatives, boos rained down on Rep. Cori Bush of Missouri, a victim of police abuse, sexual violence, and more, after she called for rooting out white supremacy starting with the white supremacist-in-chief. When Bush learned that Republican members of Congress may have given tours to the rioters, she warned the threat was already inside. None of that mattered to Republican House members. Neither did the nooses, the Confederate flags, the zip ties, bear spray, pepper spray, and pipe bombs. Nor did white insurrectionists calling Black police “nigger,” vows to spread the mayhem to all 50 states, and having National Guard troops bivouacked in and around the Capitol. Only ten of their number voted for sanctions. The rest of the House Republicans bloviated about unity and coming together in their all-too-predictable defenses of four indefensible years. As they speechified in the Chamber, not far away in the executive mansion, the object of their undying loyalty watched TV, raged at the traitors—beginning with his vice president—who’d deserted him, and ranted about an election he did not win, much as Shakespeare’s Richard III cursed those who’d run out on him and the fickleness of blind loyalty. On January 6th, our Second Civil War began with an insurrection the likes of which haven’t been seen since the last war on American soil. That white members of Congress indulge those who want to bring about a Trump dictatorship is chilling, but not a revelation to anyone paying attention. And African Americans are always paying attention, because our lives and livelihoods depend on it. Why aren’t African Americans surprised? Four hundred years of experience has induced a certain skepticism about American exceptionalism, that special brand of democratic idealism, tied with a red, white, and blue bow with stars and stripes and packaged for export to the unsuspecting in faraway places. On January 6th, the rest of the world got to experience in real time the vicious and uncivilized strain of white America that Black Americans know in their bones. Navigating white anger is a skill set passed down since the time that Blacks were loaded up on ships like so much cord wood and dragged off to be sold like chattel. For hundreds of years, survival for Black Americans has meant learning to decode the signs of impatience, hostility, and threat from white people. It remains to this day a life-or-death calculation. That anyone who holds the reins of power, political, commercial, or economic, failed to see this moment coming is a testimony to both their hubris and ignorance of history. On the eve of the 20th century, as the vestiges of Reconstruction petered out, white mobs clad in red descended on the town of Wilmington, North Carolina, to drive out the whites and Blacks who’d been elected to office in a biracial coalition. Dozens of Black people were killed and many others fled into the surrounding wilderness to escape. There is a straight line from Wilmington to Washington, D.C. Whites who are shocked by what happened last week fail to grasp the deep-seated white resentment against the very existence of Black people. The victories for equality in the 1860s and 1960s aren’t something for many whites to celebrate but to eradicate. White supremacy had flourished in the shadows for decades, but fear of a Black president unleashed it. And now a faction gleefully brandishing the symbols of people who fought and lost a civil war generations ago in the cause of preserving and extending slavery is strong enough to use force to back a would-be tyrant who lost an election. Donald J. Trump is the fullest expression of white supremacy’s authoritarian impulses. He has renewed and now passed on America’s distinct legacy of race hatred and white supremacy. In the 2016 campaign, he exhibited for all to see the racism, the conniving, the obsession with punitive policing, and the complete lack of interest in the nation’s actual challenges—health care, infrastructure, and climate—save as rhetorical devices. He was on to something and played to the cheap seats. He had a recipe for civil unrest, for “American carnage,” and presented it as president on January 20, 2017. Particularly in the last year of his term, he found plenty of willing followers ready to spread hatred—laced with COVID-19 for good measure. If carnage was a measure of presidential success, he would be the most successful chief executive and chaos agent in American history. Black people expected the insurrection that crept up on the rest of America. White pride is the banner that was paraded through the Capitol, hoisted on a flagpole, draped over shoulders, worn as a talisman and used as a weapon. That weapon is still hanging in the air, poised to sever America from democracy. Every transgression that Donald Trump commits has brought that threat closer. He has plenty of time left as president, and beyond, to command and commit mayhem. In her short impeachment speech, Rep. Maxine Waters of California said that Trump could start a civil war. She was mistaken. It's already under way.

#### More so, American geopolitics does not know its own end, it bleeds mutates and reforms in order to mystify its terminal velocity towards annihilation. The limitless nature of US violence ensures a biopolitical regime that enacts terror through a nihilistic obsession with life over death.

#### The global US alliance emerges then from symbolic blood oaths that demand insidious colonialism, slavery and war. Mutual defense treaties require constant sacrifices on behalf of the geopolitical tradition.

**Grove 2013** (Jarius, “The Blood of Geopolitics”)//ajoseph

**Blood may seems like either an obvious or peculiar character for a book about things in International Relations**. **Certainly IR’s geopolitical tradition marched through** the Rhineland **of the 19th century tracking blood and soil through the circuitous pathways** **of geographers like Alexander von Humboldt and nationalist historians like Leopold von Ranke until their triumphant unification in Schmitt’s triad of land, state, and people. Blood as identity and national or tribal continuity draw lines of enmity that constitute the political of international politics**. **Blood is a major player in the nation-state and world of nation-states and has been for at least as long as something like geopolitics has existed**. Certainly blood politics is not restricted to Europe’s heartland; it was **a defining feature of the gigantic emerging federal power across the ocean as well. After all there is no object of American jurisprudence and legislative history more infamous than the single drop of black African blood**. The one-drop rule refers to Virginia’s antebellum hypodescent laws which codified a long standing mythology of blood and blood difference that hopscotched from biblical interpretation to phrenology to Nazi anthropology and back to American eugenics. The 1924 Racial Integrity Act and the subsequent eugenic policies restricting miscegenation and institutionalizing compulsory sterilization that continued late into the 1970s demonstrates the formative and pervasive horror of sanguine logic. As this story unfolds it is clear **that this metaphoric** blood was not the blood of circulation, oxygenation, and coagulation but **an imaginary blood--sacred and profane--for the provincial world of human affairs.** The real blood of platelets, hemoglobin, and lymphocytes has no use for this sordid history and in fact resists its own signification through its insistent indifference to racial difference**.** **The metaphorical droplet of blood** is no match for the pipeline of plasma **that ran through Hawaii then Europe and Northern Africa and then returned to the Pacific during WWII and continues to support global military operations**. **This actual blood alters the course of conflicts, undermines long held beliefs about racial evolution and continually countermands the exuberant will-to-control of 20th century science**. **Blood finds its material footing at precisely the moment biopolitics emerges as an organizing principle of global total war**. **The ecology of the global U.S. alliance system from World War II through the Cold War and beyond is not solely based on the civic republican ideals that were said to bind the Allies against the Axis. More than ideology holds the U.S. and its European and Asian allies together. In addition to treaties of mutual defense are the practical treaties of blood exchange.1 The symbolic pacts of loyalty are sealed with very real blood oaths that call upon vast infrastructures for the movement, preservation**, **and acquisition of blood products and even whole live blood for the so called “walking blood banks**.**”2 Despite being the most overrun metaphoric dumping ground for intensive human drama and divisiveness this chapter affirms blood as a real thing that has a place and a role in the formation and creative advance of the international-cum-global. Human blood is both fugitive and indifferent as well as formative and insistent. The materiality of blood resists both the provincialism of human manufactured racial difference and the hubris of a scientific mastery that believes itself capable of control via the breaking down of heterogeneous assemblages into their fundamental or component parts. The former greatly disadvantaged the Nazis during the second world war and the latter requires that in many cases the U.S. military is only able to use 1.5 percent of its forward deployed blood products before they rot on the shelf.3 The great breakthroughs of blood pressure supports such as the protein albumin and other blood products demonstrate the ubiquity and indifference of blood. However the failure of such methods also performs the limits and failures to master blood and just how insufficient parts are for the sustaining of life. Blood is differentially generic and insistently univocal in its heterogeneity. To put it another way, blood is an assemblage that defies essence or formula while being predictable and consistent. The complexity of blood is to be found in it being an assemblage of objects such as proteins, lipids, cells, water, and minerals. Further complicating matters the object blood is also refracted through a series of technical and somatic connections that range from proximate to global. A natural history of the adoption of abstractable blood and blood products as** a key component of modern warfare and its extraordinary waste under the guise of military readiness is meant to be more than a set of hot facts about the excesses and failures of global empire**. I find blood and its peculiar resistance to mastery and signification quietly heroic and worthy of its own exploration. Rather than playing some passive role in the ascendency of science as the lingua franca of the biopolitical state of affairs, blood** sluggishly nags at the very grounds of war. **Blood nobly refuses to submit entirely to humanity’s petty squabbles. To try and capture blood’s virtue, I will sketch out the emergence of the U.S. Armed Services Blood Program. Further, I will detail the role militarized blood procurement played in steering blood from a medium of medical intervention to a national strategic resources with all of its attendant and troubled global networks of acquisition, flow, and policing such that blood and blood products became a global commodity. On the way to the state of current practice we will take a few necessary detours through Nazi Germany’s failed blood program and the demands for and success of the American-led Blood for Britain program despite its resonances with the racial logic of the Third Reich. . What I have in mind by object and assemblage is not much more than the common sense definition but there are a few attributes of these concepts that are not as common to sense. In casual conversation an object is a thing. So far so good. However commonly things are grammatically and causally subordinated to subjects or in some cases first causes like gods. So there are two necessary subtractions necessary before proceeding. First everything is an object. And when I say object, I do not mean to imply the opposite of a subject. Instead I simply mean those actual things that perdure or hold together against the grain of a universe that is winding down. Objects as science fiction writer Stanislaw Lem calls them are “islets of decreasing entropy” in a sea of noise.4 Bennett has similarly championed objects by channeling Spinoza’s concept of conatus to describe the will or tendency of all things to hold on to existence.5 The second subtraction is somehow more invisible to our language and description. Objects are not passive receptacles or mechanical pieces in a Rube Goldberg device of subjective agency and causality. Objects have powers, capacities, and attributes that make them formative and collaborative. Nothing gets done without a crowded room of things working in relation with each other. Objects are real and continue to be even when we are not looking. Trees fall in the forest and make a sound even when human do not hear them or more importantly do not have the idea of hearing them. Objects are real and formative and continue to be so independent of human perception and cognition of them. So there is not a divided world of formative conscious things (humans) and inert useable things (objects). Humans like all other things in this story of blood, race, and conflict equally have a role but not a lead role. All things are constrained and enabled by capacities and relations and so are ontologically equal. Put succinctly by computer programmer and alien object advocate Bogost “anything is thing enough to party.”6 Assemblages are heterogeneous collections of objects whose relationships are differentially intense. As the intensity and organization of the collectionor herd of objects changes so does the expressive effect of the assemblage even if the population of things remains the same. Things do not dissolve into an assemblage but neither can one have an atomistic explanation of an assemblage: “a strange irreductionist situation in which an object is reducible neither to its parts nor to its whole.”7 Morton illustrates this seemingly contradictory position with the example of a coral reef. Such a complex thing is made up of coral, fish, sea anemones, sharks, dead coral, ocean water, microorganisms, sediment, sunshine etc. However no one thing, even coral, embodies or is the essence of the reef. Neither does the absence of any one of these things deny the assemblage of a coral reef. Think of artificial reefs made of concrete or ship wrecks rather than dead coral but are nonetheless teaming with life. An old tire or ubiquitous plastic bag that is seemingly out of place but does not somehow eliminate what it is to be a coral reef. Despite an indefinite set of possible additions or subtractions Morton points out we still have little trouble distinguishing a coral reef from a parking lot.8 Similarly to Morton’s coral reef example, we can discern the difference between whole blood, plasma, red blood cells, hemoglobin, lipids, white blood cells, etc. Following Morton this discernment is neither merely epistemological nor a subordinate relationship between part and whole. Despite the innovation of a technique called blood fractionation to discern and describe the parts of blood’s distinct functions the reassembly does not neatly add up to the collective we call blood. In fact, the body responds much better to fresh whole blood as compared to the defrosted cocktails of the reassembled parts. In the case of blood, the body responds differently to whole blood versus plasma versus the volume creating protein albumin versus the oxygen carrying red blood cell or the protein hemoglobin that bonds with oxygen so that the red blood cell can hold on to oxygen. Also, blood does not quite seem to not be blood simply because of a low occurrence of one of these components. We do not say immunosuppressed individuals do not bleed simply because the fluid in their veins is missing substantial numbers of white blood cells. As will be seen in the fits and starts of fractionation research, the responses of the body to concentrated forms of blood components are whole responses they are not part of a response that adds up to the whole assemblage blood. Thus the difference between blood and plasma or plasma and albumin is a real difference that is experienced by our body as much as it is known or captured by our concepts, even though blood contains both plasma and plasma contains albumin amongst many other proteins. I am saying that things can be different things depending on their relationship and that such difference are neither predictable nor fully knowable even retrospectively. However, for a moment before dismissing such an outlandishly claim for its logical contradiction, consider that it may not be the description that is contradictory or illogical but reality itself. In which case, why should we expect the world to live up to our standards of what we wish that it was such that our logic could be neatly operative. What we are confronting is the difficult and irresolvable tension between atomism, form, and movement. Unfortunately none of it exists at the instant or as we would like it. We cannot catch the becoming of objects or their collaboration as assemblages in the act so to speak. Instead, we fumble around as provocatively as possible, in hopes of learning something from the world. This is what I think is meant by an object oriented thinking. Raced Matters It shall hereafter be unlawful for any white person in this State to marry any save a white person, or a person with no other admixture of blood than white and American Indian.9 At the turn of the 20th century blood was suffuse with meaning. European and American humans in particular invested in their crimson fluid the legacy and essence of their civilizational difference. It is this concept of blood that is meant by phrases that equate tribalism or race wars such as blood feuds, blood rivalries, blood lines, blood is thicker than water, difference are in the blood. Blood was and often is a synecdoche for race and so differences of** blood are not merely differences they provided the distinctions for superior and inferior inheritance that is **meant to justify or at least give grounds for war, colonialism and slavery**, and the subsequent radioactive fallout of racism

## 2

#### Advantage Two: It is better to oppose the forces that would drive me to self-murder than to endure them. You can only die once, so do not die a thousand times worrying about it.

#### Alliances come into being as the US and the USSR are engaged not just in a cold nuclear battle but also a hot ideological one. In response to the Pan Africanist who were trying to theorize a continental socialism, in order to combat neo-imperialism the US took a two pronged approach:

#### First, the CIA, British MI6, and other NATO countries assassinated political leaders, and Second they convinced revolutionaries they could have a seat at the international table by gifting economic and social benefits, then installing puppet regimes in order to support AFRICOM, economic models through the IMF and World Bank by supporting the narrative that South Africa, Kenya and Nigeria’s economy were growing despite wealth still being owned by European powers.

#### Black people become dependent on western benevolence, but also a western conceptual arsenal to explain the value to their life. The primacy of soverignty, nation hood and economic growth are used to register colonialism, and neocolonialism which reconsolidates counterinsurgency.

#### White people’s alliances are a distraction that contributes to counterrevolutionary forces. We reject all U.S alliance commitments. Scapegoating black people for having a focus on whiteness victim blames them for white inflicted trauma. They are why the US murdered Ghadaffi, murdered Nkrumah, murdered Lumumba and its why they murdered Sankara, because they all were trying to detatch the entire continent from the global economic and ideological infrastructure that secured their dispossession.

**Campbell & Murrey 2014** (“Culture-centric pre-emptive counterinsurgency and US Africa Command: assessing the role of the US social sciences in US military engagements in Africa. Third World Quarterly, 35(8), 1457–1475. doi:10.1080/01436597.2014.946262) //ajoseph

This article was downloaded by: [Heriot-Watt University] On: 28 December 2014, At: 18:55 Publisher: Routledge Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK Click for updates Third World Quarterly Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ctwq20 Culture-centric pre-emptive counterinsurgency and US Africa Command: assessing the role of the US social sciences in US military engagements in Africa Horace Campbella & Amber Murreyb a Department of Political Science, Syracuse University, New York, USA b School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford, UK Published online: 03 Oct 2014. To cite this article: Horace Campbell & Amber Murrey (2014) Culture-centric pre-emptive counterinsurgency and US Africa Command: assessing the role of the US social sciences in US military engagements in Africa, Third World Quarterly, 35:8, 1457-1475, DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2014.946262 To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2014.946262 PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the “Content”) contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content. This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at http://www.tandfonline.com/page/termsand-conditions Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 Culture-centric pre-emptive counterinsurgency and US Africa Command: assessing the role of the US social sciences in US military engagements in Africa Horace Campbella and Amber Murreyb \* a Department of Political Science, Syracuse University, New York, USA; b School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford, UK **The twenty-first century has seen a continued evolution of the US military’s strategic interest in socio-cultural knowledge of (potential) adversaries for counterinsurgency strategies**. This paper explores the implications of the reinvigorated and expanding (post-9/11) relationship between social science research and US military strategy, assessing the implications of US Africa Command strategies for preventive counterinsurgency. Preventative counterinsurgency measures are ‘Phase Zero’ or ‘contingency’ operations that seek to prevent possible outcomes, namely threats to ‘security’ in Africa. The research initiatives of US Africa Command illustrate a culturecentric approach to this strategy, which seeks to draw from detailed socio-cultural knowledge in the prevention of possible populist or popular uprisings**. *Recent such uprisings, resistance actions and strikes in the continent illustrate a problematic tendency to interpret various forms of populist resistance as ‘terrorist’ actions****, thereby* ***condoning the bolstering of*** African national military capacity. The article considers the implications of these culture-centric **counterinsurgency strategies as a means of anticipating and repressing the variety of mobilisations** encapsulated within the ‘terrorism’ catchall. We conclude by urging social scientists to reject and disconnect from US Africa Command’s missions and knowledge acquisition efforts in Africa. Keywords: US Africa Command; military funding; culture-centric warfare; counterinsurgency; alternative social science \*Corresponding author. Email: amber.murrey-ndewa@jesus.ox.ac.uk © 2014 Southseries Inc., www.thirdworldquarterly.com Third World Quarterly, 2014 Vol. 35, No. 8, 1457–1475, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2014.946262 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 Introduction The debate on the criminality of the US invasion and occupation of Iraq in the wider international community presents an alternative intellectual framework through which to understand the past efforts of the US national security establishment – ***the network of US military branches, defence contractors, politicians, think-tanks, arms manufacturers and other elements referred to as the ‘armaments industry’ – to mobilise social science knowledge for the advancement of military goals*.** Despite large quantities of information from multiple sources that expose hundreds of unreported incidents of civilian casualties, large-scale detentions of prisoners without trial in CIA ‘black sites’ (secret prisons) and ‘black ops’ Special Forces target assassinations by the US military establishment, **there has been no retreat from the intellectual and ideological starting points that influenced the decisions to go to war** against the peoples of Iraq.1 From leaked State Department cables it is apparent US government officials knew that international laws were violated throughout the US mission in Iraq.2 The illegality of the war has been compounded by the adventurist and masculinist frameworks that inform the military project, which have resulted in hubristic errors that have been criticised by military specialists.3 Despite the failures of militarised social science projects in Vietnam, Iraq and the colonial antecedents, the national security establishment continues to implement a revised brand of culture-centric counterinsurgency worldwide, including in Africa. A main point of departure for the operational role of the USA Africa Command (US Africom or Africom, which is responsible for US military operations and military relations with all African nations excluding Egypt since its establishment in October of 2008) has been the push for increased social science research on the continent of Africa at its Intelligence and Knowledge Development Social Science Research Center (SSRC) located in Stuttgart, Germany. An Africom Congressional Research Report explains that command personnel ‘conduct civilian– military operations throughout East Africa as part of an effort to “win hearts and minds” [such as] digging wells and building and repairing schools, hospitals, and roads’. 4 Colonel Dean Bland, the former head of Africom’s Intelligence and Knowledge Development SSRC, in an interview with John Vandiver for an online article in Stars and Stripes, insisted that expanding cultural and socio-political knowledge is essential for the strategic military goals of Africom. He explained: ‘Examining the relationship between geography and environment, culture and politics, and how these factors can come together to create [potential] instability is a new approach to intelligence-gathering’. 5 In the midst of the quagmire in Iraq there were divisions within the US military establishment concerning approaches to intelligence gathering and the future of irregular warfare (or counterinsurgency, COIN). It was in this context that David Petraeus worked with a team of likeminded counterinsurgency strategists at the US Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, KA to write the 2006 Counterinsurgency Field Manual. 6 The Manual reiterated the urgency of cultural intelligence gathering identified by Colonel Bland: ‘Every action, including use of force, must be wrapped in a bodyguard of information’. 7 Counterinsurgency strategy and tactics are informed by culturally rich data (including psychology, religion, tradition, language and history) obtained by social science researchers through social network analysis, surveys, interviews and ethnography. 1458 H. Campbell and A. Murrey Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 Social science research is conducted by Socio-Cultural Advisory Teams (SCRATs) to ‘expand…the knowledge base’, ie information on African culture, politics, religion, sexuality and economy, for Africom strategic movements on the continent.8 The multi-pronged approaches of the command include (1) moves to increase the securitisation of the continent by bolstering African national military capabilities through military aid, military-to-military training and the creation of logistics networks; (2) highly publicised US-led military– humanitarian projects as symbols of American goodwill; and (3) an intensification of socio-cultural knowledge acquisition for US military purposes.9 Each **of these directives draws heavily from preventative counterinsurgency doctrine developed by colonial powers to suppress anti-colonial resistance.**10 The intensity of Africom missions in Africa is not likely to decrease in the near future: the USA has roughly 5000 troops stationed across the continent;11 according to General David M Rodriguez, the current Commander of Africom, in 2013 the Command carried out ‘55 operations, 10 exercises and 481 security cooperation activities’. 12 In early May 2014 US President Barack Obama reached a 10-year security agreement for the continuation of the US military base, Camp Lemonnier (which houses special forces and a launching point for drones), with Djiboutian President Ismali Omar Guelleh. Of course, 5000 troops on a continent of 1.1 billion people is a drop in the bucket.13 In the current political and economic context the US government cannot risk stationing more US personnel abroad. The catastrophic experiences of the US military in Somalia in 1993, alongside popular American discontent with US imperialistic counterinsurgency occupations (most recently Iraq and Afghanistan) would produce a political backlash at home, making such a military endeavour unfeasible. Indeed, **the *USA does not deploy massive US military personnel in Africa because it is actively supporting African militaries in the controlling, occupying and killing of Africans. By arming and training African militaries – with the go-ahead of African presidents – the USA seeks to avoid criticisms of neo-imperialism, racism and colonial intervention.*** At the same time the domestic recruitment of non-white and non-US-born military personnel is integral to the securitisation machine by helping to obscure the racialised violence of US military missions across the globe. Within this framework the US security establishment seeks expertise from social scientists to advance US interests without having to maintain sizable (and politically costly) contingencies on the ground. The current thrust of the Africom mission to obtain cultural data on African people is part of the ‘Phase Zero’ of ‘full-spectrum dominance’. The 2000 Department of Defense (DOD) Joint Vision 2020 called for ‘full-spectrum dominance’: the domination of surface land, sub-surface sea, air, space, the electromagnetic spectrum and information systems. With total socio-cultural and political knowledge of the potential enemy before s/he becomes an enemy, potential future instabilities are suppressed before they begin. However, the constant search for risk, insecurity and harbours of terrorism becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy. At the same **time the discourse of instability has become a tool employed by unpopular and dictatorial leaders to gain access to US military-to-military aid, which fuels the continued militarisation of the continent.**14 The most recent example of this counterinsurgency discourse-sharing is Chad’s Third World Quarterly 1459 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 President Idriss Deby’s declaration at a news conference in Paris on 17 May 2014 that, ‘there is determination [between the governments of Chad, Cameroon, Nigeria, Benin and France] to tackle this situation head on…to launch a war, a total war on Boko Haram’. 15 The participation of US social science researchers in military knowledge acquisition projects further entangles the US-based university and social science disciplines within the maintenance of an economic system founded upon imperial domination and sustained through force. Discipline-specific engagements with the various roles of academics within military activities have been differentially conducted, including in the literature on anthropologists within the Army’s Human Terrain Systems;16 the discussions on military-funded geographical research and the mapping of indigenous communities, specifically the militaryfunded Bowman Expedition;17 and in critiques of the presence and expertise of US psychologists in the torture chambers of Iraq and Afghanistan.18 There has been sustained debate within factions of US anthropology, as illustrated by the efforts within the Association of Concerned Anthropologists and a special committee of the American Anthropological Association (AAA), CEAUSSIC, to engage with the ethical concerns around the involvement of anthropologists in Human Terrain Systems.19 On the other hand, the Association of American Geographers (AAG) has responded with a ‘studied indifference’ that indicates a deeper inability to have critical conversations about the military–geography nexus.20 The American Psychological Association (APS) – according to Stephen Soldz, Brad Olson, Steven Reisner, Jean Maria Arrigo and Bryant Welch of the Coalition for an Ethical Psychology – has responded with ‘strategic helplessness’ to disclosures of participation of psychologists in ‘enhanced interrogation’ techniques.21 To date cross-discipline engagements with the role of US social science researchers in US military projects post-9/11 have remained limited, with Piya Chatterjee and Sunaina Maira’s 2014 edited volume, The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent a refreshing exception.22 As researchers remain focused on the role of their particular discipline in US military projects, we risk losing sight of the larger systemic reach of the US military into US social science projects in general. Social science research of the type currently being commissioned by Africom sets the framework for ‘human terrain’ mapping, which dictates US policy response to and mitigation of various forms of social protest on the African continent. The interest in directing the developments and trends of social science research in Africa is not limited to US-based researchers, as recent Africomsponsored conferences in Dar es Salaam, Arusha and Garmish illustrate.23 Informing and influencing social science work has been an integral component of US strategic planning in Africa for at least half a century. During the period of decolonisation US foundations spent massively to train African students and to influence the direction of social science research in Africa. Following the release of Nelson Mandela in 1990 USAID, the US National Endowment for Democracy and other donor agencies spent over $1 billion to influence the direction of social science research in post-apartheid South Africa.24 The line of thinking, according to the director of a German foundation in South Africa, was that, if ‘you can influence the rules of the game, you don’t have to play’. 25 1460 H. Campbell and A. Murrey Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 We begin our analysis with the recognition that there are many complexly intersecting political, economic and social pressures exerted on scholars to specialise in particular kinds of knowledge production. Our concern here is with those knowledges perceived of as valuable to the US national security establishment and the use of such knowledge to refine and inform intelligence missions on the African continent. In a political paradigm where military action – including repressive military action – is justified through the discourse of (inter) national security, social science research funded and supported by the US national security establishment is integral to the prevention and repression of movements, developments and networks that threaten US economic and political dominance. Militarisation and the political economy of empire The militarisation of the US social sciences in Africa is conducted in the context of both the history of social science involvement in imperial projects and the frameworks of liberalisation and privatisation, which serve to legitimatise external control over African economies. The post-World War II development of the US imperial state was dependent upon its self-appointed unique capacity to act as a global policing power. **The urgency of this policing mechanism was informed by the need to maintain its currency hegemony over the reserves of all the other countries in the world**.26 **At the end of the World War II factions within the USA propagated a triumphant liberalism to shore up the ideology of capitalism internationally.** Subsequent to the devaluation of the dollar in 1971 (as the country embarked on an adoption of what Barry Eichengreen terms its ‘Exorbitant Privilege’ by maintaining an international reserve currency without the requisite economic foundations),27 **a new ideological offensive was launched under the banner of neoliberalism.** Through a process of political engineering the revolving door between Wall Street, the US Treasury and the IMF ensured that US policy makers grasped the centrality of the role of the dollar in international politics. In the speculative orgy inspired by the process of arbitrage and bubble-blowing, specialised financial operators brought together, in the words of Peter Gowan, ‘the maximum amount of information about conditions across all markets; [this type of speculative finance] also demands the capacity to mobilize huge funds to throw into any particular arbitrage play, in order to shift market dynamics in the speculator’s favour.’ 28 Indeed, documents leaked by Edward Snowden reveal the scope of operations engaged in by the US National Security Agency (NSA) to bring together the ‘maximum amount of information about conditions across all markets’. 29 Samir Amin characterises this intellectual and ideological emphasis as a ‘Liberal Virus’ characterised by ‘Permanent War and the Americanization of the World’. 30 He argues that **the military management of the international system requires permanent wars and instability.31 The foundational assertion of US liberalism (and its newer face, neoliberalism) is that social effectiveness and wellbeing are equal to economic efficiency**. Economic efficiency, according to liberal theory, is dependent on the profitability of capital. **By interpreting and defining ‘progress’ in purely economic terms, economics comes to determine and**, Amin Third World Quarterly 1461 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 argues, **govern the political. In this way of thinking a democracy operates to the exclusive service of the economy and of capital**. Never mind that the implementation of neoliberal policies requires the noted absence of democratic participation, especially among working people as labour rights are systematically repressed. **Unregulated markets in African countries have permitted and sustained authoritarian political environments in which workers do not have the right to organise**. **Privatisation and the centralisation of power has resulted in massive environmental destruction by oil companies, unregulated plunder of forest resources, the decline of subsistence positions, rising inflation and high unemployment. The well-being, livelihoods and even the lives of people become expenditures on the pathway to social progress and structural transformation. Predatory economic practices in African countries are shrouded in the discourse of development, modernisation and free trade, which advocate the continuation of international economic exploitation in the name of market deregulation**.32 The implementation of ***neoliberal policies since the 1980s has led to an increase in social inequalities and a resulting increase in the coercive nature of American imperial practices***.33 This is reflected in the increase in securitisation and militarisation in US foreign policy since the 1990s.34 US military operations are informed by a political–economic framework that promotes the propagation and protection of finance capital at the dictates of US imperial interests. Imperialist designs, articulated through foreign policy and military engagement, ‘are always dynamic and ever changing’ but what remains constant is their ‘sole objective of making the world safe for capital’. 35 **Global capital accumulation requires that foreign markets remain open to the interests of capital and that national governments enable foreign capital investment.**36 At the top of former Commander Carter Ham’s list of **the roles of US Africom is ‘protecting the security of the global economic system’**. 37 Similarly, the US Defense Strategic Guidance for 2012 states: ‘We seek the security of our Nation, allies and partners. We seek the prosperity that flows from an open and free international economic system’. 38 In this paradigm US ‘national security’ is often conflated with the push for continued US economic dominance abroad, as has been the case in reasoning for the establishment of Africom: economic competition, primarily with China. In a period that has witnessed the intensified - though uneven and complex – penetration of African countries by India, China, Brazil, Turkey, Japan and the EU, US military engagement in Africa is legitimated by conceptualisations within the USA of Africa as a space for foreign capital, exploitation and investment.39 US economic and security interests are intricately linked and words like ‘security’ and ‘stability’ refer to the relative stability of a government to create an investment climate that suits the needs of international capital.40 Security refers to the maintenance of socio-political circumstances stable enough to permit market exchange and capital accumulation. **Security does not require democracy, freedom or liberty, as is evidenced by US military-to-military training and support of plutocratic and authoritarian regimes, including those in Chad, Burkina Faso, Uganda, Rwanda and elsewhere.** Calls within the DOD for ‘peacekeeping’ and ‘securitisation’ operations have often meant the mobilisation of the USA to establish collaborator regimes capable of ensuring US corporate 1462 H. Campbell and A. Murrey Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 interests.41 **History has shown that stability, security and ‘open economic markets’ have often ‘require[d] the active destabilisation of countries refusing to “complement” US markets’** 42 **and the employment of the discourse of security for non-military ends, including the opening of foreign markets**, has been widely criticised.43 US military operations are not conducted with the well-being of the people at the fore in mind, as **US military recruitment materials imply; of crucial interest is squashing those movements that would challenge the sectional interests of the US faction of global capital.** At the same time US military operations have moved into a ‘Phase Zero’ operation strategy in which enemies are potential enemies to ‘security’ and possible purveyors of ‘insecurity’. A number of scholars have addressed the Orwellian intersections between discourses of threat, risk and futurity in US international policy in a paradigm where nations rarely engage in open or direct warfare with other nations. Labels for the enemy become increasingly vague and porous, as warfare transitions into ‘full-spectrum’ military dominance for the purposes of economic world dominance. The definition of opponent is ‘necessarily vague and shifting’, 44 because the opponent is a possible opponent who might emerge within the context of social and political dissatisfaction produced by the inequality of global capitalism. The flawed and inflammatory discourse of terrorism is a key component of US post-9/11 practices of social, economic and political domination, where even a disenfranchised public with legitimate cause for protest is perceived as a threat to security.45 As Amy Kallander points out, **when the people rose up against former president Zine El Abdine Ben Ali in Tunisia, he used counterterrorism discourse to claim that those who were against neoliberal ideologies were terrorists of the Tunisian State.**46 **This is reflective of a larger trend among heads of state to castigate mobilised publics, even peaceful ones, as threats to security**. **In this paradigm efforts to develop self-reliance and societal or communal control over resources are conceived of as security threats to transnational enterprises, sometimes provoking intervention efforts by the USA**. One effect of this has been **the castigation of countries of the global South as places of permanent potential uprisings.** Disparate sections of the US national security apparatus – from naval professors to congressional reports – reflect similar **understandings of African spaces as potential terrorist safe-havens**. In standard military jargon **populations of the global South are constructed as perpetually on the verge of possible uprising, conflict or terrorist activity; they re referred to alternately as ‘rogue states’, ‘failing states’, ‘safe havens for terrorists’, ‘pre-terrorists’, ‘would-be insurgents’ and ‘proto-insurgents’**. 47 A US Naval War College professor argues that nations in the global South – what he calls the ‘non-integrating Gap’ – are ‘incubat[ors for] **the next generation of global terrorists’ and that the ‘entire Gap [must be engaged with] …as a strategic threat environment’.** 48 **There is no escape from the potential terrorist threat**: how does one go about disproving a potential? Harry Verhoeven criticises the self-fulfilling prophesy of **the construction of ‘terrorist threats’ and ‘failed state’ discourses in Somalia, where the effect of US military action was more violence and instability**.49 **This, in turn, fuelled more military intervention**. US Africa Command receives strategic guidance from the National Security Strategy, the Defense Strategic Guidance, the National Military Strategy, the Third World Quarterly 1463 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 Presidential Policy Directive for Political and Economic Reform in the Middle East and North Africa and the United States Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa; it receives funding from the US Congress in various capacities, including the use of dual authorities and funding departments.50 The US military is not monolithic, nor does military doctrine align unanimously with that of the DOD, the White House or Congress. There are intense differences within the administration, manifested for example in the Obama administration foreshadowing the need for the ‘war on terror’ to come to an end in 2013. The explicit militarisation of Africa touted by the administration of former US president George W Bush has been replaced by a more sophisticated rendition of integrating diplomacy, development and defence under President Obama. In pursuit of this new brand of militarism, Obama did not make the same loud claims about ‘terrorism’ as did his predecessors in his 2013 Africa Tour; indeed, during the tour, he refrained from addressing US Africa Command at all. US military personnel are themselves often ill-treated within an unequal economic system that pushes working class men and women towards employment in the military. At the same time the US intelligence community is increasingly looking to ‘diversify’ its recruitment pool as it establishes domestic training activities and centres in universities and areas with large numbers of minority youth (such as a ‘Spy Camp’ programme for 15- and 19-year-old high school students in Washington, DC).51 Certainly empire works in nefarious, complex and heterogeneous ways. In this regard it would be simplistic to imagine that there is consensus within the US military. However, the preventative counterinsurgency of Phase Zero operations of Africom engage with the majority of Africans as potential enemies and, through knowledge collection projects and human terrain mapping, **Africom seeks to suppress or derail any threat, including popular mobilisations, that might threaten US economic hegemony.** Full-spectrum domination and culture-centric counterinsurgency The obscurity of the discourse on insecurity and terrorism, along with the intimate relationship between militarism and capital accumulation, have serious connotations for social science researchers involved in military efforts to expand intelligence, such as for Africom. In full-spectrum domination the emphasis is on military readiness, prevention and the employment of strategic cultural knowledge to destroy the enemy before s/he comes into being. The push for ever-more preventive interventions is based on the notion that the most effective way to win is to prevent, on your terms, the enemy from ever becoming an enemy. This can only occur through precise, accurate and intimate knowledge of the potential enemy’s culture, socio-politics and psychology: in effect, only by totally dominating every aspect of the potential enemy’s being. Hence, the US military doctrine of ‘full-spectrum domination’. In full-spectrum dominance the aim is ‘to control the very force of becoming [a terrorist and all that is conflated within the rubric of ‘security threat’, including revolutionaries] by shaping an “environment” of [supposedly potential] insurgent formation. The promise of environmental control is that an enemy can be beaten before s/he has even become an enemy.’ 52 The June 2011 Congressional report on US Africa Command reads, ‘Defense strategy is now 1464 H. Campbell and A. Murrey Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 evolving to look at conflict prevention, or “Phase Zero”’: an attempt to engage with ‘threats at their inception’. The acquisition and synthesis of cultural knowledge creates the basis for the ‘information superiority’ that allows for ‘dominant maneuver[s]’, ‘precision engagement’, ‘focused logistics’ and ‘full dimensional projection[s]’ that are key to its Joint Vision 2020 of pre-emptive counterinsurgency.53 These approaches are not novel. Military strategists have long been interested in understanding an enemy’s society and culture as a means of anticipating and controlling military engagements; this has been especially true in the case of asymmetrical warfare. They harken back to the work of the military officers engaged in the efforts to suppress anti-colonial movements in the 1950s in Africa and Asia. The pre-emptive counterinsurgency style is what French military scholar David Galula called ‘cold revolutionary war’, 54 and what British counterinsurgency scholar Frank Kitson referred to as the ‘preparatory period’ before anti-colonial movements even began to organise.55 **Contemporary US counterinsurgents and officials at the US Africa Command have adopted similar notions of anticipation and preparation so that ‘the defining conflict of American international relations…[has gone from] engaging and containing opponents to ensuring there cannot possibly be any opponents’.** 56 The first task of full-spectrum Phase Zero operations is the systematic collection and employment of (potential) enemy intelligence. In an article for Proceedings in 2004 Major General Robert H Scales Jr, US Army (Retired), wrote of Operation Iraqi Freedom, ‘Consensus seems to be building among [returned soldiers] that this conflict was fought brilliantly at the technological level but inadequately at the human level. The human element seems to underlie virtually all the functional shortcomings chronicled in official reports and media stories.’ 57 These remarks underscore a shift that has occurred in US military engagement since late 2003: a ‘culture-centric warfare’ in which the knowledge of an enemy’s social and cultural behaviour, beliefs, motivations and methodologies is viewed as increasingly essential to determining military strategy.58 Pentagon officials, government representatives and pundits have embraced this culturally insightful form of US counterinsurgency, one that is concerned with ‘mapping’ and controlling ‘human terrain’ through nuanced cultural knowledge. ‘Human terrain’ refers to strategically mapping the features and dimensions of human groups for the purposes of determining the nature of military engagements.59 Roberto González (2009) traces the roots of this language to a report from the US House on Un-American Activities Committee, in which the Black Panther Party was believed to ‘possess the ability to seize and retain the initiative through a superior control of the human terrain’. 60 Human mapping incorporates another counterrevolutionary principal proposed by Galula: the population is both a battlefield and a weapon.61 A second aspect of Phase Zero operations is **the ‘capacity building of allies’, or actions taken to bolster popular opinion in favour of US policy through psy-ops (modern psychological warfare) and propaganda campaigns**.62 Galula identifies **one strategic concern of counterinsurgency as the ability to ‘find the favorable minority**, [and, particularly during the ‘Phase Zero’ or ‘cold revolution’ operations] **to organize it in order to mobilize the population against the insurgent minority’.** 63 Likewise, Kitson devoted a chapter in his book, Third World Quarterly 1465 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 Low-Intensity Warfare, to the analysis of the preparatory period before the development of an insurgency group. During this preparatory period **the ruling party carefully plans and coordinates ‘an efficient intelligence organization’ capable of ‘psychological operations’ in order to ‘organize the populations’ in support of the regime in power.**64 **US military strategists continue to draw from these ideas through practices of ‘winning the hearts and minds’**. In The Insurgents, Fred Kaplan describes the role played by the social scientists who graduated from the Department of Social Science at West Point, the prestigious US military academy, in further entrenching the relationship between the US military and US academies. **After the failure of US counterinsurgency in Vietnam, Colonel Huba Wass de Czege – who served two tours as an infantry officer in Vietnam and who was primarily responsible for the military strategy that preceded Full Spectrum Operations (known as AirLand Battle) – worked to integrate top military brass (ie officers) with Ivy League institutions.** The ostensible reason was **to train and shape top US officer ‘judgement’**. In The Generals: American Military Command from World War II to Today, Tom Ricks devotes an entire chapter to what he termed ‘Teaching Judgement’, ie how to influence the judgement of US military officers. According to this understanding of the history of the US military, before Vietnam the military depended on hardware and sophisticated equipment but did not know how to think. **De Czege set out to teach officers ‘how to think’ as opposed to ‘only what to think about war.’ 65 For de Czege there was an intellectual gap in the military’s understanding of how to go to war. Linking up with top universities, he thought, would allow the military to tap into the thinking capabilities of the US university system**; it would also ensure that all senior officers would have at least a masters degree from the top-ranked universities. To these ends, de Czege founded and directed the School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS). To be eligible to enter SAMS, officers have to go through social science training in Ivy League universities such as Stanford or Princeton. After going through these top-ranked universities, **the senior officers learn the counterinsurgency doctrines of Galula and Kitson and it was anticipated that the graduates would have a tremendous impact on the military by 2000. Indeed, SAMS became the networking base for the new COIN and social science thinking and General Schwarzkopf brought in 82 graduates from SAMS for the first Gulf War, while General Tommy Franks mobilised other SAMS experts for the US invasion of Iraq in 2003**.66 Retired US General David Petraeus, the former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and former Commander of US Forces Afghanistan was similarly convinced that there should be close integration between the military and the academy. As a senior officer Petraeus earned a Masters of Public Administration (MPA) (in 1985) and a PhD degree in International Relations (in 1987) from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. He later served as Assistant Professor of International Relations at the United States Military Academy and completed a fellowship at Georgetown University. Petraeus later completed the COIN manual at the US Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, KA. David John Kilcullen, David Petraeus, John Nagl, Kavlev Sepp, Steven Metz and Eliot Cohen have since joined the pantheon of unsuccessful counterinsurgency specialists in the 1466 H. Campbell and A. Murrey Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 West (including Galula and Kitson), who failed in an earlier generation to halt self-determination projects in formerly colonised societies.67 In 2003 Pentagon officials and the former Secretary of State, Donald Rumsfeld, laid out a contemporary brand of psychological warfare operations (‘psy-ops’) under the rubric of an Information Operations Roadmap. The roadmap identifies effective psy-ops as that those that ‘directly influence [foreign] decision-making’. 68 The Information Operations Roadmap is one component of ‘full spectrum dominance’, which entails psychological warfare, special operations, electronic warfare (EW or ‘fight the net’, which is warfare on internet production) and involvement in foreign journalism, **for the purposes of mobilising a ‘favourable minority’ to speak on behalf of US national interests. The processes categorically outlined in the psy-ops document require a sophisticated level of intellectual competence, mobilising the US social sciences for information collection and on-the-ground support within the rubric of US Africom psy-ops.** The role of social science in full-spectrum domination Research conducted at the behest of militaries on African peoples and societies has been destructive for African people and communities throughout history.69 During the Cold War the DOD commissioned studies to sustain what Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky call ‘manufacturing consent’ or the propaganda model.70 Mark Solovey calls this relationship the ‘politics, patronage and social science nexus’. 71 According to this model, **public support for social, political and economic policies is systematically constructed through a propaganda media machine. In the failed attempt to ensure US technological dominance during the Cold War, the DOD racked up massive expenditures in the social sciences.** Richard C Lewontin calls the period of the Cold War a ‘golden age for professors’, as DOD funding saw university budgets increase twentyfold in constant dollars between 1946 and 1991.72 These DOD monies were also allocated to research in Africa and to leading research centres in the USA.73 Government funding was augmented by private organisations such as the Rockefeller Foundation and by European governments, which also invested in social science research projects in Africa. Although the scope of DOD funding for social science research during the period was extraordinary, it is often next to impossible to identify the exact details of studies funded. **Not only are records of DOD-funded projects unavailable to the public, but the CIA deliberately leaked ‘disinformation’ for the purposes of camouflaging its actions.**74 Feminists**, PanAfricanists and peace scholars have been at the forefront in promoting an interdisciplinary social science work that seeks an alternative to genocidal politics and economics.** In his book on the domains of matriarchy and patriarchy Cheikh Anta Diop writes of an anthropology with possible emancipatory implications.75 This anthropology explores the legacies of matriarchy to combat masculinisation, militarism and violence in Africa. A distinction is made between the anthropology of masculinisation, militarism and violence and the anthropology of new family forms and the emancipation of women.76 The relationship between exploitation, masculinity, violence and imperial domination have been taken up by feminist social scientists, whose scholarship has challenged male-centred realist conceptions of militarism, violence and ‘security’. 77 Third World Quarterly 1467 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 It is clear from the statements of top officers and the annual reports of US Africa Command that social science research and ‘intelligence superiority’ is a dominant concern of the mission in Africa. To fill this research gap the US military, the Department of Education and the Department of State call upon US academics to conduct field research on a variety of cultural and socio-political subjects. DOD employs an understanding of culture as the unifying range of activities, ideas, beliefs and traditions among a group of people, which is transmitted and reinforced by members of that group. Our analysis draws from Amilcar Cabral’s conceptualisation of culture within the context of liberation. Cabral, an intellectual and freedom fighter, wrote on the importance of maintaining cultural identity for human emancipation and liberation movements: ‘the value of culture as an element of resistance to foreign domination lies in the fact that culture is the vigorous manifestation, on the ideological or idealist level, of the material and historical reality of the society that is dominated or to be dominated’. 78 Culture is an essential element of life and of community; as such, it plays a critical role in self-determination.79 Knowledge of another group can facilitate crosscultural understanding or it can be used to control, manipulate and exploit. **The focus within Africom on ‘intelligence superiority’ is an illustration of efforts to know a population in order to anticipate and circumvent the potential development of (a wide range of) potential instabilities to market security. US military funding of social science research is not particular to Africa: it is also central to military endeavour in the Middle East as well as in Central and South America. The funding takes particular forms in African nations and carries specific political consequences, particularly considering competing capitalists interests, which fuel large-scale accumulation by dispossession**. There were 32 different research projects commissioned by Africom for 2011. A review of the research topics, compiled by the Directorate for Outreach of Africa Command and conducted by students at senior US professional military education institutions, reveals that research interests include (1) determining African perceptions and receptions to US Africa Command and the US military; (2) competition for Rare Earth Elements;80 and (3) military-to-military support for African governments.81 Additional subjects include studies on African governance, African militaries and the characteristics of West and Northern African terrorist activities. Africom funded a study in 2011, for example, that looked at combatant sexual violence in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The study is problematic for its avoidance of a historical context and for its lack of acknowledgement of the culture of sexual violence inherent in militarism, including (even particularly) in the US military.82 From the assertions during a presentation at the headquarters of US Africa Command in Stuttgart given by two of the lead researchers, Dr Lynn Lawry and Dr Michele Wagner, it is apparent that material from the study will inform Africom engagements with sexual violence treatment seminars for African military personnel. However, it is unclear what forms these interventions will take and how they will avoid re-traumatising sexual abuse survivors**. Sexual violence as a component of warfare in the DRC has been widely researched and publicised before the commissioning of this project by Africom; it would seem that some research projects are most probably publicity campaigns to bolster Africom’s image as a humanitarian agency.** 1468 H. Campbell and A. Murrey Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December **2014 By considering the doctrine of pre-emptive counterinsurgency, the US military’s interest in culture-centric counterinsurgency, and the establishment of Africom with its focus on knowledge superiority, the US security establishment seeks to create an American-friendly climate through a combination of psy-ops and propaganda**. One article, which is drawn from research commissioned by Africom, examines 11 African countries for convergent structural conditions, catalysts and triggers that might prove to be ‘potential fissures and stressors that might lead in the coming decade to significant social dislocation or political instability’. 83 The purpose of the report is to predict scenarios that ‘might converge to create the conditions for instability’. 84 The report’s authors position their findings within the context of ‘African Awakenings’ or the uprisings and popular political mobilisations across Africa that began in late December 2010 and continued through 2011. They write that, ‘the upheavals in North Africa since the beginning of 2011 underline the dangers of ignoring these core grievances’. 85 The emergence of powerful pro-people movements in Africa has considerable consequences for transnational capitalist interests, which have been able to accumulate enormous capital through mechanisms of dispossession. In the framework of Africom African popular uprisings against authoritarian regimes are merged into the discourse of perpetual threat, chaos and instability, becoming yet another factor contributing to the perceived instability of the continent. These uprisings against authoritarianism – from Burkina Faso to South Africa to Tunisia to Cameroon – indicate the need for social science to assist the peoples of Africa in the processes of social empowerment and the attainment of a better quality of life. In response to the democratic movements in Tunisia and Egypt the US government was alternately hesitant and undecided in supporting the voice of the people, illustrating the fact that US foreign policy is more concerned with maintaining the status quo than with working on behalf of the human and economic rights of people around the world. Indeed, General Ham writes of the shift in strategic role of Africom during this period, ‘the dynamic security environments that followed the Arab Awakening have increased requirements for crisis response capabilities’. 86 There continues to be an ideological disconnect between the foundational discourse of American democracy – liberty, justice and the right to self-governance – and US geopolitical strategy and interests, as popular mobilisations and uprisings, including peaceful ones, contribute to the US security establishment’s calls for an everincreasing crisis response. Conclusion **In March 2011 NATO started Operation Odyssey Dawn to ‘protect’ civilians in Libya as part of multinational military operations under the auspices of the UN Security Council Resolution 1973.87 This included Tomahawk cruise missile attacks and eventually led to the extrajudicial killing of Colonel Muammar Gaddafi. The US-orchestrated ‘no fly zone’ in Libya was a means to co-opt the movement. ‘In Libya, the military intervention, supposedly to assist revolution, was used to corral and control the revolutionary process, ultimately making it militarily, economically and ideologically a vassal of the Western powers’.** 88 A cursory review of the USA’s varied engagements with and responses to the Third World Quarterly 1469 Downloaded by [Heriot-Watt University] at 18:55 28 December 2014 ‘African Awakenings’ of 2010 and 2011 illustrate the need for detailed, sitespecific knowledge to dictate the US response and then publicise that response to the international community. The State Department’s response to political uprisings in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Bahrain, for example, while markedly different, indicate that the primary concern was not the plights of nationals of the country in question. In fact, **in the case of the NATO-led intervention in Libya, the destruction of society provided the cover for US intelligence agencies to use eastern Libya as a base for the recruitment of Jihadists to fight in Syria.** **The same government that was supposedly waging a war on terror was mobilising Jihadists in Libya and manipulating the instability there to spread insecurity and warfare from Mali to Aleppo.**

#### Neocolonialism guarantees the promotion of US strategic and economic interest even absent direct claims on the sovereignty of space. US anti-imperialist agenda is another genre of American democracy that emboldens the settler colonial formation.

**Hong 2020** (Christine, “A Violent Peace Race, U.S. Militarism and Cultures of Democratization in Cold War Asia And The Pacific”) //ajoseph

Throughout the Cold War, multiculturalism would furnish U.S. interventionist war with its liberal veneer. The brute geopolitics of U.S. militarism and antihumanism of its post-1945 war machine would be superficially belied by **the U.S. military’s biopolitical inclusivity. Vital to the recuperation of U.S. militarism in Asia and the Pacific—its occupations, base expansions, counterinsurgencies, nuclearization, and wars—as liberalizing racial opportunity was the deployment of desegregated forces to the region, the “humanitarian” baby-lifts of Asian and mixed-race war orphans consequent to U.S. interventions in Korea and Vietnam, the citizenship gateway for Asian GI brides, the forging of “mutual defense” alliances with Asians and Pacific Islanders “liberated” from Japanese rule, and the promise of economic aid for coalition allies.** Strategically motivated, this securitized enlargement of the terms of humanity did not translate into meaningful avenues of political participation. Insofar as integration into U.S. military empire meant heightened exposure to death even as it held out the prospect of selective induction to the side of life, it fostered risk-based multiculturalism and subimperial dependency. Indeed, with the dawning of the Cold War**, the U.S. concentration camp, the bombed-out cityscapes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the frontlines of U.S. wars of aggression in Asia, and the U.S. military uniform would be coded as sites of democratic opportunity for racialized subjects**. If the Cold War in Asia and the Pacific catalyzed advances in civil rights for some, this perceived progress obscured the violence of a U.S.-sponsored agenda of freedom through militarization. The expansion of civil rights in a newly desegregated U.S. military, and the assertion of those rights over and against the human rights of occupied peoples, further obscured structural linkages and entanglements between differently subjugated populations. Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. 12 Introduction This book offers a twinned genealogical account of U.S. war and police power, on the one hand, and postwar multiculturalism, on the other, that originates in an untold tale of midcentury U.S. fascism. It employs a comparative methodology that at moments dwells on and dilates junctures of political solidarity and alliances during the Cold War among black Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Asians yet principally seeks to shed necessary light on how the U.S. warfare state fostered interdependency in a covert framework of counterinsurgency. I attend to the convergence, at times indistinguishability, of U.S. territorial geopolitics and racial biopolitics within post-1945 U.S. military-empire in Asia and the Pacific. These are this book’s structuring terms of comparison. Read as indices of semisovereignty, these **dynamics of absorption and inclusion cannot be theorized outside patterns of indigenous dispossession, racial exploitation, and militarized neutralization.** **They enable an account not only of the strategic blurring of racial lines against the backdrop of U.S. wars and nuclear violence in Asia and the Pacific but also of the overlap between the United States as both military-imperial and settler-colonial formation**. Where I highlight racial entanglement, collusion, and critique, I argue for their contextualization as “wars within wars” (Ellison). Thus, rather than take desegregation, assimilation, and racial mobility as untroubling signs of domestic racial progress, this study examines their geostrategic utility. In the early twentieth century W. E. B. Du Bois famously predicted that the color line would be the defining problem of the century. As this book demonstrates, **the blurring of the color line would prove central to the hegemonic operations of U.S. militarism in Cold War Asia and the Pacific**. Asia for Americans In Asia and the Pacific, where, as Lenin forecasted, the **rival imperialisms of Japan and the United States would not peacefully coexist in some “ultra-imperialist” alliance but would eventuate in brutal war, American white supremacist ideologies and Jim Crow practices would be challenged by Japan’s canny articulation of its own imperialist aspirations in color-line slogans that highlighted the contradictions of U.S. claims to democracy.**38 Beyond the pan-Asianism of its oft-cited catchphrases, “The Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere,” “Two Nations as One,” or “Asia for the Asiatics,” **Japan pitched the global legitimacy of its military-imperial enterprise in racially egalitarian mottos—like “Black, Yellow, Red, and Brown”—that appealed to the nonwhite world for solidarity.**39 In this Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. Introduction 13 regard World War II in the Pacific theater was less a race war between an Asian people and (white) Americans who perceived each other through the distortions of stereotypes, as John Dower has notably argued, than a pitched battle in which the flexibility of warring ideologies around race was put to the test. Although vanquished, Japan emerged arguably unrivaled in this arena. **What Japan powerfully modeled—and where it left the United States in the dust—was its capacity, as a fascistic military-imperial power, to embrace the ideology of multiculturalism as central to its Pax Japonica vision of regional rule**. As historian Takashi Fujitani has argued, the transformation of the United States and Japan into total-war states during World War II meant that neither could “afford to ignore even [their] most abjected populations.”40 Although Fujitani’s focus does not extend into the postwar period, his insight into the opportunism of the “inclusionary racism” (384) of both U.S. and Japanese war machines sheds crucial light on the total-war origins of the racially incorporative logic of postwar U.S. militarism. In particular, how **the United States legitimized its presence as the reigning power in the Pacific in the wake of Japan’s defeat—hurriedly abandoning its commitment to Jim Crow in its military ranks—entails inquiring into its former foe’s self-fashioning as the “champion of the darker races.”41 To understand the U.S. war machine’s shifting racial politics, in other words, we must examine its deterritorializing absorption of the governing logic of the vanquished.** In the heat of World War II, Pearl S. Buck reported to the U.S. public that “Japan . . . is declaring in the Philippines, in China, in India, Malaya, and even Russia that there is no basis for hope that colored peoples can expect any justice” from the United States: “Every lynching, every race riot gives joy to Japan. The discriminations of the American army and navy and the air forces against colored soldiers and sailors, the exclusion of colored labor in our defense industries and trade unions, all our social discriminations, are of greatest aid today to our enemy in Asia, Japan. ‘Look at America,’ Japan is saying to millions of ears. ‘Will white Americans give you equality?’ ”42 According to historian Ernest Allen, Japanese propaganda went even further: it offered assurances to black Americans in the South that they would be “beneficiaries of a more democratic social order within the United States via the intervention of the Japanese imperial army.”43 The first order of business, following a Japanese invasion, would be the “redistribution of southern farmland” (43). The draw of the Pax Japonica to black Americans in the South therefore resided, at least in part, in its supposed commitment to making good on the unfinished business of radical Reconstruction.44 Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. 14 Introduction **Although Japan’s appeal to black Americans necessarily disavowed the racism of its brutal colonial policies toward its Asian and Pacific Islander neighbors, its capacity to exploit discourses of racial unity in ways unavailable to both the United States and Nazi Germany might alert us to how fascist and imperialist ideologies around race, specifically in the Pacific theater, were elastic in their articulation**. By calling attention to the overt racism of the United States toward its Asian enemy as well as its formal Jim Crow policies, **Japanese military empire, though racist and lethal in practice, vivified an ideological mode of regional rule—fascist, imperialist, and multicultural—that held instructive value for its successor. Still sinister in fascist threat but more ideologically supple in its adoption of a color-line stance against white imperialism, Japanese war propaganda rhetorically heralded an era of racial egalitarianism**. For black Americans in the 1940s, as George Lipsitz notes, “the Japanese were not just any outsiders. . . . They were people of color with their own independent nation, a force capable of challenging Euro-American imperialism on its own terms, and possible allies against the oppressive power of white supremacy.”45 American jingoism demonizing the Japanese enemy in a time of Jim Crow, including by translating the Japanese into a well-worn antiblack idiom, was thus unsettled by the seductive power of Japan’s multicultural ideology. Nazi race hatred might have resonated as chillingly familiar to black Americans, but Japanese propaganda deploying multiracial banners invited symbolic identification without eliciting structural critique. This was thus a potent fascistic appeal, coded as transnational racial solidarity. Seeking to alert black Americans to the dangers of Japanese color-line propaganda, the Harlem section of the American Communist Party warned: “Imperialism knows no color.”46 In an unpublished editorial for the Negro Quarterly, a wartime journal he coedited with black communist Angelo Herndon, Ellison noted that “one of the greatest ironies of the war . . . has been [Japan’s] seizing even the psychologucal [sic] instrument of [the] power of imperialism and using it against the Western nations, thus bring[ing] color psychology through a complete circle.”47 Subimperial Modernity Engineered out of the spoils of World War II in the Pacific theater, U.S. military empire in Asia and the Pacific, as a system of “domination without annexation,” would again—as journalist George Marion noted in 1948—“wait on war” to rationalize its expansion and consolidation.48 U.S. victory in the region, which the United States treated as “an exclusively American theatre of operations,” Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. Introduction 15 established the foundations of its system of bases in the Pacific, a vast militarized archipelago stretching westward from California and Alaska to Hawai‘i, Okinawa, and South Korea, and southward from East Asia to Singapore, Guam, the Marshall Islands, and Australia.49 A mere five years after World War II, the United States seized the occasion of the Korean War to fortify its military posture into a permanent regional infrastructure. **By the time the Korean War came to a draw, the United States had massively expanded its military-imperial footprint by acquiring basing rights in Taiwan and adding or developing bases in South Korea and Japan—**all told, a 40 percent increase of its total overseas military bases.50 During the Cold War, U.S. wars against China, North Korea, and North Vietnam would demonstrate the U.S. garrison state’s counterrevolutionary function, with regional U.S. bases serving as “a dagger . . . aimed at the underbelly of its socialist neighbors.”**51 The political economy of Cold War U.S. military imperialism in Asia and the Pacific has demanded critical analysis—and an explanatory language—beyond that of existing paradigms**. As Walden Bello has stated of the postwar Pax Americana regime, it was “in the Asia-Pacific . . . that **Washington launched its first experiments in neocolonial control—the sponsorship of formally independent but subservient regimes that could be counted on to promote US strategic and economic interests.”**52 (7). Other theorists of U.S. neocolonialism—or what has variously been dubbed “imperialism without colonies,” “invisible empire,” “leasehold empire,” and “informal empire”—have observed **the critical role of U.S. militarism within an imperial system capable of domination, even absent formal claims on the sovereignty of postcolonial states.53 Complicating classic center-periphery models, Cold War U.S. military empire, as a “multi-ringed defense system” structured to encircle socialist nations, must moreover be understood against** what Matthias Luce, in his account of “sub-imperialism,” has described as **the “integrationist tendency of world capitalism**” following World War II.54 **By cultivating Third World oligarchies, and in so doing recuperating regional wartime collaborators with Imperial Japan, U.S. military empire fostered a system of dependent capitalism, or “sub-imperialism,” in which a spectrum of subordinate “nations [were] shaped into the sphere of influence that serve[d] the sub-imperialist country’s capital reproduction**” (Luce, “Sub-imperialism,” 31–32). Aimed at actively rolling back socialism, **the U.S. alignment with manipulable dictatorships gave rise to what critics have called “client fascism” or “subfascism**.”55 Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. 16 Introduction **Insofar as the unequal, coercive geopolitical dynamics of military occupation, subimperial incorporation, and mutual defense alignment were framed as regional pathways to development, they must be theorized in conjunction with the biopolitical dynamics of desegregation, assimilation, and racial mobility that have typically been construed as equalizing social measures vital to democratic progress in the United States**. Both modes of integration were central to securing U.S. dominion in Cold War Asia and the Pacific. In an era when civil rights reforms blurred the domestic color line, **the promise of progress specific to the transpacific Pax Americana, its very democratic veneer, resided in the multiethnic, multinational participation of U.S. regional allies in a series of U.S. interventions** in the region. Promoting a distinctively militarized form of Cold War internationalism, the United States, under the UN banner, prosecuted an asymmetrical war of aggression in Korea with the support of twenty other nations—in essence, a “subcontracting of counterinsurgency.”56 In the ensuing decade, under the rubric of Lyndon B. Johnson’s “More Flags” program, troops from South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, and South Vietnam, now refashioned as “Free World countries,” trained with U.S. forces in Okinawa and served in both aid and combat capacities in Vietnam.57 As critics noted, this **reliance on Third Country Military Forces, or “rented troops,” was a “benighted American attempt to internationalize the war as a cover for U.S. intervention.”**58 Yet the U.S. military, too, conceded that the campaign to seek “Free World” or “third-country” support was aimed at “eras[ing] the conception that the Vietnam War was purely an American undertaking supported only by non-Asians.”59 “Asians,” the 1975 U.S. Army study Allied Participation in Vietnam reasoned, “were well qualified to understand and communicate with the Vietnamese people” without being “the target of anti-European feelings that were a legacy of the colonial period” (81–82). Moreover, “every Korean soldier sent to South Vietnam”—with more than three hundred thousand South Koreans mobilized— saved the United States from “sending an American or other allied soldier” (145) into battle, plus commanded far lower pay.60 Although the United States maintained operational control over these forces, this study argued that the display of South Korean volunteerism was vital to the “More Flags” initiative’s success. To parry charges of flunkeyism, South Koreans were compelled to demonstrate that “they were freely assisting the United States” (135). As Allied Participation in Vietnam delicately underscored, however, it was “understood that although [U.S.] directives to Korean units would be in the form of requests they would Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. Introduction 17 be honored as orders” (134, emphasis added).61 Unsurprisingly, in the verdict of the 1967 International War Crimes Tribunal on Vietnam, a quasi-legal people’s forum that examined the U.S. war through the lens of international humanitarian law, South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand, far from lauded for sending Asian soldiers as brothers in arms, were named as accomplices to U.S. aggression. At a tribunal hearing, Donald Duncan, a former Army Special Forces soldier, testified that U.S. recourse to Asian mercenaries was aimed at deflecting culpability: “We were continuously told ‘You don’t have to kill them yourself—let your indigenous counterpart do that.’ ”62 As Justice Lelio Basso summarized: “In its aggression the US has been able to procure a vast and numerous array of accomplices, helpers and followers who have given a ready hand. Practically every country in the Orient has been somewhat induced into this accomplice role.”63 **Democratization’s inextricability from U.S. militarism is the uneasy legacy of native-proxy reliance so central to multilateral regional military collaboration** in the U.S. war in Vietnam—or Nixon’s doctrine of “using Asian boys to fight Asian boys” (Kuzmarov, Modernizing Repression, 21). **The lesson for those in the ambit of U.S. military empire was plain: access to postwar modernity could be had at a price—complicity with the U.S. war machine**. In uneven ways across the region, **U.S. military imperialism thereby fostered economic recuperation via interventionist wars that served as militarized substitutes** for the Marshall Plan.64 **Perversely framed as modernizing opportunities**, **the Korean War was essential to postwar Japan’s economic recovery and the Vietnam War likewise critical to South Korea’s compressed development under military dictator Park Chung-hee. Unsurprisingly marginalized in these “democracy-building” efforts was reckoning with histories of colonial violence—whether Japanese, European, or American**. The goal was the restructuring of the region as a free-market zone. Economic reconstruction through military force thus displaced the pursuit of decolonizing justice while circumventing local processes of democratic self-determination. In an era of global anticolonial struggles, **the Pax Americana offered a transpacific, multinational, ethnically inclusive conception of securitized humanity, a defensive construction of “bonds forged in blood” that posited militarized development as a foil to notions of sovereignty or self-determination based on the people. In the region where the United States unleashed atomic bombs against civilian populations and waged catastrophic anticommunist wars of intervention, U.S. militarism would be ideologically pitched as the basis for national recovery along purportedly democratic lines**. Thus, relative to Japan, the bomb meant Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. 18 Introduction not only peace but also capitalist futurity. Examples outside this progressive teleology—hibakusha (“bomb-impacted person,” or survivors of the Nagasaki and Hiroshima atomic bombs), irradiated Marshallese refugees, disabled civilians, separated family members, war orphans, militarized prostitutes and their mixed-race offspring, Agent Orange–exposed Vietnamese peasants and their descendants, long-term unconverted political prisoners in South Korea—fell within a permissible margin of human ruin or what Hosu Kim and Grace Cho refer to as the “biopolitical excess” of collateral damage.65 Dependent on its production of war materiel for the United States in the Korean and Vietnam theaters, Japan’s economic rehabilitation broadcast a clear message to the region: modernity, democracy, and peace were all possible but only through complicity with U.S. war and police power. Unadjudicated and unredressed, the atomic bombings thus established a paradigm of U.S. impunity that cleared the way for its devastating wars in Korea and Vietnam, as well as the sixty-seven nuclear tests it carried out from 1946 to 1958 in the Marshall Islands that, in magnitude, equaled 1.7 Hiroshimas and Nagasakis per day. In post-1945 Asia and the Pacific, U.S. militarism would accordingly be framed as a means to a future, despite the fact that its chief products were mass death and ecocide. It would be promoted as a stabilizer of democracy and the basis of capitalist prosperity rather than a crisis-generating architecture responsible for regional repression and instability. In the 1980s Roland Simbulan dared state the obvious by describing U.S. military outposts in the Philippines as “the bases of our insecurity.”66 To no small degree, **the counterrevolutionary function of U.S. bases was by design, their purpose to bolster counterrevolutionary conditions** **in host countries**. Unthinkable outside U.S. military backing, governments like the Marcos regime were thereby empowered to wage internal war against revolutionary democracy movements. We might recall that by late 1943, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, forecasting Japan’s defeat, developed a blueprint at Roosevelt’s request in which postwar U.S. bases figured as essential infrastructure for a U.S.- dominated multilateral repressive apparatus in the Pacific—an “International Police Force.” U.S. unilateralism conditioned this Pax Americana vision for the region. As historian Kimie Hara points out, although initially the major Allied powers, “the US, UK, Russia and China[,] were expected to assume world-wide responsibilities for security, the military did not have confidence in future international cooperation.”67 Unsurprisingly, this police force would undertake devastating anticommunist “police actions” in the region. Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. Introduction 19 Encircling China and putting the Soviet Union on notice throughout the Cold War, **the U.S. garrison state enabled the projection of U.S. war and police power within Asia and the Pacific; indeed, it continues to do so to this day. By militarizing the constabularies of allied nations and client regimes and modernizing their technologies of repression, the United States trained them to wage war against their own people and to take part in regional U.S. interventionist wars**.68 **If “liberated” from Japanese colonial rule via U.S. intervention at the end of World War II, Okinawa, the Philippines, South Korea, and Guam were conscripted as launching pads for the U.S. war in Southeast Asia.** In real terms the project of regional democratization thus meant the active suppression and repression of democracy. As antibase and people’s democracy activists have for decades sought to bring into view, democracy, far from gifted by the United States, has in fact risen from below in Asian and Pacific Islander nations**.** Theirs has been a ceaseless battle within the formidable grid of U.S. military imperialism. Rule without Law **As an extraterritorial expansion of the United States through overseas military bases and an imperial extension of its sovereignty through the boundary-blurring logic of national security, the Pax Americana reconfigured Asia and the Pacific as a geostrategic arena neither wholly external nor recognizably internal to the United States. Crucial to the ideology of American freedom yet outside U.S. territorial bounds, this region was a crucible for democratization as an imposed political project of the United States**, realized at the barrel of a gun. Here, we might retrieve Karl Liebknecht’s classic critique of militarism’s antidemocratic nature—namely, that the “deciding factor in every social relation of power is, in the last resort, the superiority of physical force.”69 Predicated not on law but on the tyranny of force, U.S. military empire in the region gave rise to securitized conceptions of humanity whose racial logic this book—with its inquiry into racial soldiering, wartime mass detention, racial counterintelligence, collaboration, subimperialism, human radiation experiments, and military mascotry—scrutinizes. It assembles a composite transpacific archive of U.S. war and militarism, placing into conversation a range of principally Cold War texts and objects that bear the deformative imprint of U.S. counterrevolutionary violence in Asia and the Pacific but that for reasons of national location, ethnic literary tradition, genre or medium, or narrowly conceived historic era have typically been interpreted apart. This archive includes Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. 20 Introduction minor war writings by major black writers, hibakusha accounts of the U.S. atomic bombing of Hiroshima, Nisei visual renderings of the American concentration camp, fictional reworkings of the occupation of Japan, black radical human rights petitions, GI photographs from the Korean theater, novels about Filipino guerrilla resistance to U.S. military rule, proceedings from anti-imperialist people’s tribunals, Okinawan antibase discourse, and Marshallese critiques of U.S. human radiation experiments. Yet insofar as they were shadowed by U.S. military force, I read these cultural and political materials alongside a spectrum of U.S. government documents—congressional transcripts, national security directives, occupation edicts, military counterintelligence logs, army desegregation orders, policy blueprints, racial counterintelligence reports, and FBI case files. Extending across national borders and unfettered by genre, the cultural archive of the Pax Americana in Asia and the Pacific demands, I contend, a flexible geopolitical reading practice that critically mirrors the supranational penetration of U.S. war and police power beyond and within U.S. territorial bounds as well as in sites not typically understood as arenas of war. It has a place within an undertheorized body of post-1945 cultural production—a politically equivocal body of cultural expression that we might call art or literature of democratization. The compositional elements of this corpus of writing, visual art, film, and performance—namely, race within militarized form—uneasily recall the mass ornaments of fascist aesthetics yet with a difference in emphasis and perspective. In contrast to the subordination of the human to militarized form in fascist aesthetics, the zooming in on racialized humanity in settings thoroughly conditioned by asymmetrical U.S. force enables disavowal of war’s deterritorializing violence in the art of democratization. By backgrounding the conditions of invasive force that grant visibility to a spectrum of racially abject figures—Jim Crow soldier, camp inmate, cannon fodder, war trash, radiation test subject—**the art of democratization lends itself to interpretive practices that minimize the structures in which precarious humanity was captured in the first place. It thereby permits liberalizing even humanitarian readings and progressive conclusions that mystify the nature of U.S. militarism as, above all, a modality of mass destruction.** In this geopolitical corpus **war figures as the enabling condition of democracy and the basis of capitalist futurity. In its suggestion of democratic possibility within the confines of militarized unfreedom, of life possibility in the shattering bounds of the target or the war machine, this cultural archive of U.S. military empire** recalls Ellison’s phrase “democracy within the teeth of fascism.” Hong, C. (2020). A violent peace : Race, u. s. militarism, and cultures of democratization in cold war asia and the pacific. ProQuest Ebook Central <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com> Created from wfu on 2020-09-12 12:27:11. Copyright © 2020. Stanford University Press. All rights reserved. Introduction 21 Indeed, art of democratization **demands interpretation within a genealogy of American “democracy**” that black leftists, as earlier argued, critiqued as U.S. fascism. Far from securing for race its rights, U.S. wars abroad—as figures such as William Patterson, Ralph Ellison, James Baldwin, and others maintained—were corollaries for invisible wars against the “enemy” at home. In its engagement with Cold War U.S. militarism, this book thus retrieves the explanatory power of the suppressed legacy of U.S. fascism. In contrast to postatrocity aesthetics that assume a decisive historical break from the genocidal histories that spawned them, the art of democratization—although marked as postwar—never arrives at the time of liberation, much less democracy. In this regard it must be contrasted to the body of Holocaust art and letters that Theodor Adorno called “lyric poetry after Auschwitz” and Elie Wiesel described as “literature of testimony.”70 If the staggering human ruin consequent to Nazism gave rise to a cultural archive positing a clear postwar rupture, both aesthetically and politically, from fascism, the Pax Americana cultural archive in Asia and the Pacific entails grappling with shadowy geopolitical transition and troubling continuity**. This corpus of double-fronted counterinsurgent war calls for contextualization within a geopolitical context informed by the stark absence or failure of official mechanisms of justice and the suspension of decolonization. Although somewhat formalized in unequal bilateral instruments—for example, status of forces agreements, visiting forces agreements, mutual defense treaties—that have given legal veneer to U.S. extraterritoriality, Cold War U.S. militarism is characterized less by rule of law than by rule without law. Crises in sovereignty thus define the art and literature of U.S. military empire in Asia and the Pacific, giving rise to an emergent anti-imperialist human rights idiom. The Pax Americana would, in this regard, prove vital to the creation of a Janus-faced—human/international and civil/domestic—rights regime.**

## 3

#### Advantage Three: Any unarmed people are slaves or are subject to slavery at any given moment.

#### Debate and the world depend on rival truth claims - it mirrors the world in that, the speakers use whatever material to support a claim in the absence of perfect knowledge which is foundational to structures of American society.

#### Legal and political systems grounded in the belief that justice or policy emerges from the clash of opposing ideas judged by natural observers is accentuated when post war, West Point created a normative framework for competitive debate that excluded black colleges. They created it to open lines of communication between military and civilian elites to provide an intellectual training ground that could produce technocrats for post war ideological domination.

#### Debate is an arm of state power as an arena of cultural and educational exchange – counterrevolutionary debates depend on the security of US hegemony and the operation and expansion of the military industrial complex - so the purpose of the topic and debates then become how to secure the military political and economic hegemony of the United States -

#### In 2012 at Wake white people freaking out about the creation of Resistance Group talking about it as if it were slaves plotting on the plantation.

#### This all speaks to how debate is an attempt to monopolize the terrain, to answer how can one control or regain control of locale, in this case, what is the locus of argumentation.

**Evans, 20** (Ignacio Evans, MA in Communications at WFU, “STRICTLY FOR NIGGAS: NIGGAS MOVIN’ AROUND TO PEEP THE FOOT WERQ OF BLACK VOICE AND HUMANISM”, pg 39 – 42)//von

In the larger debate community, nigga liquidation is what moves the narrative of progress in time just as it becomes the force which shapes the experiences of any [black person] nigga debating or every nigga living. It is how the narrative of debate has moved since before before with black life being germane to everything the white debaters debated about with or without niggas. Niggas’ liquidation of self and other niggas to gain access to competitive success is what moves niggas and potential niggas alike in and outside debate. The norms and policies of the debate community’s nigga liquidation over time has changed the possible experience of niggas over time (Dillard-Knox, 2014; Reid Brinkley, The harsh realities of "acting black": How African-American policy debaters negotiate representation through racial performance and style, 2008; Reid-Brinkley, Ghetto Kids Gone Good: Race, Representation, and Authority in the Scripting of InnerCity Youths in the Urban Debate League, 2012; Peterson, 2014). Meaning, black debaters of previous generations have set the price of niggas in debate. So, in that way, all black critics/debaters/coaches have set the price for the next generation. The next generation then pays the cost for their potential niggaishness. They are rendered knowable through the experiences civil society has had with black flesh based in previous generations. This process of liquidation is then filtered through the desirability of the kinds of nigga extract that time permitted. For example, the practice of coaching debate for most coaches is one that is of at will employment, for Black coaches this means either they have to subject themselves to the capitulation of the desires of the whitely civil debate community if they want any employment let alone the best employment. Which is to say, Black employment in the debate community, just as elsewhere, is made available based civil desires that are spoken and unspoken to and amongst niggas. Thus, it is niggas inspeaking to and amongst niggas (niggatry) is what provides the time and space of possibility for niggas to apply to, get, and keep employment. Black debaters’ condition is conditioned by and bound by registers of potential and utility. Black coaches, directors, debaters are alike in so far as they too are trapped by the Reasons of the world. Whether that is striving for Black survival (i.e. the urge to live another day in the land of the enslaved and colonized) or to advance a pro-black agenda in an anti-black world, nigga liquidation will always be done by Black bodies and the world alike. Niggatry is to have a sense of time and flesh in the face of liquidation. It is as Gillespie put it: “The end of the World begins once we recognize that a [Nigga] sentence is a death sentence, and learn to weaponize it” (Gillespie, On the Prospect of Weaponized Death, 2017, p. 6). The movie “The Great Debaters” (Winfrey, Black,, Forte, & Roth, 2007) gave the world insight into just how magical them debate negroes can be. From ex-slaves giving slave narratives that inspires today’s nigga fiction to Hotep X continuing the performative tradition of being niggaish in the most competitive parts of college policy debate during his time, niggas have been doing what niggas have been, since have been doing until not. But niggas these days seem like they will never stop Sankofa-ing, reaching back to reach forward to bring presence to the time of niggas, so much so these niggas be on nigga time (Temple, 2010). These debate niggas had their own awards ceremony during a debate tournament after niggas were told the civil one was cancelled because there was an anomality with the numbers. To be specific, it was said that the Reason that the awards ceremony did not happen because the top speakers and judges were rumored to be out of this world, hence Black scores and scorers were invalidated. If the white people actual had celebrated this awards ceremony it would have been the first time at a National debate Tournament that Black women would have won first place and second speakers but did not make it to the elimination rounds. This is why black judges, coaches, and debaters alike came together to honor the actions and time spent of niggas [black people] in the middle of the lobby at the tournament hotel. The niggatry of these niggas and more made time and space for niggas to be niggas in an anti-black world. These debate niggas through niggatry made niggas appear in places where they should not be and would not be. Here, niggatry bent time so that niggas could be niggas for a moment while at a debate tournament without the assumed recognition of the civil. Keeping that same energy, this another debate nigga had time traveled to the future to avoid anti-black queer violence. With the care of niggas, this nigga even sent selfies with other niggas back to the present as proof that niggas can make it to particular futures if Black flesh in the present takes seriously the nature of antiblackness while niggaly caring ourselves from moment to moment. Nigga [Black care] care is a praxis of mutual indebtedness that is an ethic of care for niggas as is. Nigga care is the dark matter that gave presence to time(s) where niggas took the hearts, minds, and fears of the critics to zero gravity only to read the non-niggas for filth while still securing a bag (Reid-Brinkley, unpublished manuscript). These niggas even R.U.N (it’s a pro-am debate tournament) at least once a year to figure out who is the ultimate Badass with the most effective lil-reason in debate. This Bad ass may have to twerk, argue , lie, cheat, finesse, sit there, flame your shit, hold a dog, fix food, entertain children , be in a trap house, do it for the vine, wear track suits, or anything else niggas do, did, or will do to walk away with the title of the ultimate Badass. Niggas said they feel like the Bad ass is that moment for debate niggas at the end of a high stakes and stressful season of putting own for a/the white institution, to do what niggas feel freedom to do. It is about self-representation, call outs, must see pairings and matches that acts as a moment of niggardom that is essential to what makes us unique to this activity writ large and rekindles some of what is lost when we putting on for others (non-niggas).12 As we speak, those niggas[fellas] are winning race wars, learning while black, and living while Black all while still having hope only in themselves as nigga [black] care (Warren, Black Nihilism and the Politics of Hope, 2015, p. 16; Warren, Black Care, 2016)

#### We demand the:

#### ---termination of all alliance commitments around the world.

#### ---removal of all US military and pseudo-military personnel.

#### ---elimination of all transfers of arms.

#### ---elimination of all military spending.

#### ---defund all police.

**Lipsitz 2004** (G, “Abolition democracy and global justice. Comparative American Studies An International Journal, 2(3), 271–286. doi:10.1177/1477570004047906) ajoseph

If abolition democracy emblematizes the emancipatory tradition within American Studies, the idea of collective and linked struggles for change without aiming for control over any one state expresses the uniquely generative stance within transnational social movements and transnational scholarship. Articulated in the form of a manifesto in John Holloway’s Change the World Without Taking Power, this sensibility has taken on activist form in the work of the EZLN in Mexico, the Gabriela Network in the Philippines, and the Okinawan Women Act Against Military Violence in that Japanese prefecture (Holloway, 2002). These movements make demands on the state and recognize the specificity of national histories, cultures and politics, but their aspirations and activities cannot be contained with any single national context. The activities of the Okinawan Women Act Against Military Violence (OWAAMV) demonstrate the importance of a transnational perspective that goes beyond the history, culture, and politics of any single nation state (Fukumura and Matsuoka, 2002). Coming from a country that has been serially colonized since the 17th century and occupied militarily by both the USA and Japan, OWAAMV activists cannot solve their problems within a single national context. Disadvantaged by colonial status, race, and gender, they cannot turn to national liberation, anti-racism or 274 Comparative American Studies 2(3) 02 lipsitz (ds) 12/8/04 1:16 pm Page 274 Downloaded by [University of Saskatchewan Library] at 03:03 03 April 2016 feminism as their sole context for struggle. Coming from a small island with a limited population in a corner of the world far removed from metropolitan centers of power, they must forge alliances with outsiders based on political affinities and identifications, rather than counting on the solidarities of sameness that sustain most social movements. As eyewitnesses to brutal combat on the island in 1945 that killed more than 130,000 Okinawan civilians (one-third of the local population) and tens of thousands of Japanese and US military personnel, they find it impossible to celebrate organized violence and masculinist militarism (Hein and Selden, 2003: 13). As women confronted with the pervasive presence of commercial sex establishments, sex tourism and rapes of civilian women and girls by military personnel, they see gender as a central axis of power and struggle. The complicated history that brought the OWAAMV into existence, and which vexes them in so many ways, has produced new ways of being and new ways of knowing that contain enormous generative power for scholars in Ethnic Studies and American Studies. They do not seek to make their nation militarily superior to others. Instead, they argue that massive preparation for war increases rather than decreases the likelihood of violence. Moreover, they argue that military spending creates security for states and financial institutions but not for people. They charge that expenditures on war serve to contain and control people like themselves who oppose the global economic system, who challenge neoliberal policies designed to privatize state assets, lower barriers to trade and limit the power of local entities to regulate the environment. Perhaps most important, they call for a new definition of ‘security’, one that places the security of women, children and ordinary people before the security of the state and financial institutions. They ‘queer’ the nation – not because they take an explicit position on the rights of gays and lesbians, but because they interrupt and contest the narrative of patriarchal protection upon which the nation-state so often rests. By necessity, the OWAAMV go beyond the categories and cognitive mappings of area studies. They are citizens of Japan, but also victims of Japanese and US colonialism. On most issues, they feel more in solidarity with the indigenous Sovereignty Movement in Hawai’i or the Gabriela network mobilizing against sex tourism and sex work near military bases *than they do with their fellow citizens of Japan*. The nature of US imperialism forces them to seek alliances with pacifists and feminists in the USA, with Puerto Rican activists fighting against US military exercises on the island of Vieques, and with the Okinawans transported to Bolivia during the Cold War era when the Japanese and US governments relocated them in that South American nation so their land could be appropriated for military uses. They feel solidarity with witnesses to war and empire everywhere, recognizing that the things that have happened in their part of the Pacific cannot be contained within any one ‘area’ of study. Lipsitz ● Abolition democracy and global justice 275 02 lipsitz (ds) 12/8/04 1:16 pm Page 275 Downloaded by [University of Saskatchewan Library] at 03:03 03 April 2016 Transnational organizing of mobilizations for change, without directly seeking to take state power, speak directly to the new circuits and networks of power emerging from new forms of production, consumption, communication and repression. They often display brilliant ingenuity in fashioning seemingly unlikely short-term alliances, affinities and identifications with people across class, gender, race and national lines. Yet this very tactical dexterity makes it difficult to turn temporary victories into long-term institutional changes. Strategies that manifest the mobility and dynamism required for challenging transnational corporations and financial institutions often lack the concentrated power needed to challenge the enduring power of the state and its control over the prisons, armies and police agencies deployed in support of private power everywhere. Even more important, flexible, fluid and dynamic coalitions often lack both the organic solidarity and the connecting ideology that make movements successful. Groups engaged in this kind of struggle can become unexpected allies in each other’s struggles, but they can also easily be manipulated into fighting against each other if they do not develop a systemic analysis of global power. Scholars can be pitted against each other as easily as aggrieved communities can. In an era of carefully orchestrated challenges to public education, scholarly independence and critical thinking, it is likely in the near future that every department, discipline and field will be encouraged to defend its own worth by belittling others, to compete for scarce and declining resources by inflating its own achievements at the expense of others. A losing proposition in politics, this ‘race to the bottom’ would be even more disastrous for scholarship because it encourages parochialism and defensive localism at precisely the moment when we most need dialogue, generosity and cosmopolitanism. It is important in this context to identify and learn from scholarly works that offer models of principled and productive synthesis between American Studies and Area Studies. Fortunately, both well established classics and promising new work in both American Studies and Area Studies contain this generative potential. The scholarly works of W.E.B. Du Bois and Walter Rodney provide especially useful and generative models from the past, while recent studies by Melani McAlister, Lise Waxer, Roderick Ferguson and Clyde Woods pose bold and exciting challenges in the present (Ferguson, 2004; McAlister, 2001; Waxer, 2002; Woods, 1998). As early as the 1930s, W.E.B. Du Bois clearly recognized the connections that linked the struggle for abolition democracy at home to the emergence of US imperialism abroad. Du Bois describes the great loss suffered by the US nation and the world as a result of the betrayal of Radical Reconstruction policies in the years immediately after the Civil War. By withdrawing federal troops from the South and failing to enforce the letter and spirit of the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution, the US government deprived freed slaves of the full emancipation they had helped secure for themselves. African Americans remained nominally 276 Comparative American Studies 2(3) 02 lipsitz (ds) 12/8/04 1:16 pm Page 276 Downloaded by [University of Saskatchewan Library] at 03:03 03 April 2016 free, but the restoration to power of the white southern planter class and their allies led to the consolidation of an openly and explicitly white supremacist tyranny that deprived African Americans of political power, civil rights, the ability to bargain about the costs and conditions of their labor, as well as of opportunities for land ownership and asset accumulation. But by betraying the Negro, Du Bois noted, white Americans betrayed themselves as well, because they destroyed the most democratic and egalitarian force in their national politics, while strengthening the power of the most elitist, plutocratic and undemocratic elements in their country. Government spending for military procurement during the Civil War created the infrastructure for an industrializing America. Savage and brutal warfare and its attendant health consequences (epidemics, malnutrition, diversion of health care resources to the military) left more than 600,000 dead in a nation of some 30 million people, but the simultaneous growth of the state and the national economy during the conflict also set the stage for the exploitation and inequality of a mature industrial society. Du Bois viewed Radical Reconstruction as ‘the finest effort to achieve democracy for the working millions which this world had ever seen’, and when it failed, any hope for genuine democracy in the USA died as well (Du Bois, 1995; Sundquist, 1996). By disarming black people (literally by confiscating their firearms after military service and figuratively by withdrawing federal support for inter-racial governments that provided education, healthcare, and transportation to poor and working class people) the federal government constrained popular power and tipped the scales in favor of the planter elite in the South and the financiers and manufacturers in the North. Yet Du Bois did not confine the damage done by the victory of ‘the South’ through the betrayal of Radical Reconstruction to the US nationstate. ‘The South is not interested in freedom for dark India. It has no sympathy with the oppressed of Africa or Asia’, he argued (Du Bois, 1995: 704). Writing at a time when global total war had already begun, even though the USA did not formally enter into the hostilities for another six years, Du Bois clearly believed in a causal link between the outcome of the 1861–5 war and the outbreak of war in Ethiopia and Manchuria in the 1930s. He saw that the USA was on the wrong side in the emerging anti-colonial struggle that would play such an important role in global politics in the years ahead. ‘We ought to emphasize this lesson of the past,’ he wrote in respect to the immorality and economic irrationality of the slave system, because of ‘the face of new slavery established elsewhere in the world under other names and guises’ (Du Bois, in Sundquist, 1996: 441). The entire world paid a price for the defeat of Radical Reconstruction in Du Bois’s view, because ‘Imperialism, the exploitation of colored labor throughout the world, thrives upon the approval of the United States, and the United States gives that approval because of the South’ (Du Bois, 1995: 706). At Lipsitz ● Abolition democracy and global justice 277 02 lipsitz (ds) 12/8/04 1:16 pm Page 277 Downloaded by [University of Saskatchewan Library] at 03:03 03 April 2016 the conclusion of a lengthy treatise about events in the USA between 1860 and 1880, Du Bois directs his readers’ attention to the world of 1935. His penultimate paragraph reads: Immediately in Africa, a black back runs red with the blood of the lash; in India, a brown girl is raped; in China, a coolie starves; in Alabama, seven darkies are more than lynched; while in London, the white limbs of a prostitute are hung with jewels and silk. Flames of jealous murder sweep the earth, while brains of little children smear the hills. (p. 728) Du Bois was prophetic about the ways in which the impending total world war and its aftermath would revolve around questions of colonial rivalries, anti-colonial liberation movements and the links between colonialism, class oppression and racism in the imperial countries. The triumph of white supremacy within the continental USA served as a building block for imperialism abroad, and conversely the racial dimensions of the imperialist project subsequently strengthened white supremacy at home. Du Bois argued that the fight against white supremacy required an international as well as a national frame, and we see around us today the ineluctable  wisdom of that position.