

Globalization and Empire

*Peter IADICOLA**

ABSTRACT

This paper describes how the forces of the United States Empire are key elements in describing the most recent process of globalization. Empires have always been the key actors in the waves of globalization throughout history. The Empire of the United States of America is not an exception to this history. Military, economic, cultural, and political integration and control from an imperial center are key elements in understanding the forces of globalization in the past and today. This paper describes these forces of globalization as they pertain to the largest and most powerful empire in world history.

Keywords: Globalization, U.S. Empire, military, economic, cultural, and political

* Indiana University – Purdue University

Globalization, Grobalization, Glocalization, or Globaloney and Imperialism

The term globalization has many meanings. Ellwood (Ellwood, 2001) notes that the concept can be described as a vacuum because it sucks up all meanings. Giddens describes globalization as the process of cultural, political, and economic integration of nation states throughout the globe or world (Giddens, 2000). Those who are examining how these global forces are mediated or interpreted have developed the term “glocalization” that is defined as “the interpretation of the global and the local resulting in unique outcomes in different geographic areas. Ritzer prefers the term grobalization because it focuses on the “imperialistic ambitions of nations, corporations, and the like and their desire, indeed, need, to impose themselves on various geographic areas” (Ritzer, 2004: 73). He claims that these two concepts (glocalization and grobalization) represent competing visions of the contemporary world.

Although, globalization refers to an integration of social systems, it is important to note that these forces for integration are directed and the forces for globalization are not equally dispersed across the globe, but rather are directed from a center (Wallerstein, 2003; Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001). Today, the United States is in the commanding position of the center of a global empire. It has the greatest power among nation states in determining the nature of this political, cultural, and economic integration. It also has the greatest power over international organizations that are creating the rules that are a force for directing the nature of this integration and diffusion. It is not that those outside the center, especially those in the periphery, cannot influence the outcome, however, they are rarely in position to create and enforce these rules that govern the integration, they principally react to them. At one time the nature of this integration was referred to as westernization, or it was even more disguised under the term development or modernization. Today, along with the New World Order announced by the first Bush administration with the collapse of its chief imperial competitor and the end of the “cold war”, we now have the most recent chapter in globalization.

Petras and Veltmeyer note that counter to the concept of globalization is the notion of imperialism, which attempts to contextualize the flows, locating them in a setting of unequal power among conflicting states, classes, and markets. In this context, globalization is in part a product of the power of empires as a result conquest and trade and immigration creating patterns of cultural diffusion. And as empires are fundamentally a class project, so is globalization. Ellwood notes that globalization describes the integration of

the global economy that began in earnest with the launch of the European colonial era five centuries ago. But a key difference between these earlier periods of globalization has been that the process has accelerated over the past quarter century.

Historically, Petras and Veltmeyer note that the international flows of capital and commodity trade have taken place via three routes: through (1) imperialist and colonial conquest, (2) trade and investment among advanced capitalist countries and (3) exchanges among Third World countries. For Petras and Veltmeyer these flows of capital and trade are the essence of globalization. It represents the cultural, economic, and political integration or domination in accordance with an imperial model. The imperial-colonial flows of capital in the past led to unequal accumulation and divisions of labor in which economic diversification and industrialization in the imperial center was accompanied by specialization and vulnerability to raw material fluctuations in the colonized regions. The development of the periphery according to dependency theorists is determined for the most part by the center, although the degree of control, integration or penetration has varied over the course of imperial histories.

The second route of international flows, among advanced imperial centers, was “mutually compatible” in that foreign capital was regulated to complement internal capitalist development. This is the theory of comparative advantage that underlies the justification for the promotion of free trade worldwide that actually begins as the strategy of globalization of the British Empire during the Victorian period (Munkler, 2007). The third route towards globalization, through exchanges among Third World countries, is limited by the intrusion of imperial powers and the relationships of Third World economies with their imperial centers. Petras and Veltmeyer note that the main periods of intra-Third World exchanges occurred before these geographical entities were colonized and during the post-colonial industrializing phase. This is most recently occurring as there are attempts at economic integration throughout South America as a result of the “Bolivarian” strategy of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. China and India also provide examples of this cross peripheral and semi-peripheral integration in Asia and Africa. In both cases, this form of integration is a threat to the imperial center.

For Petras and Veltmeyer the prescription of globalization argues for the liberalization of national and global markets in the belief that free flows of trade, capital and information will produce the best outcome for growth and human welfare. Globalization is described by these same advocates as

inevitable. Petras and Veltmeyer note that the structure of international flows of income, investments, and royalty payments today does not correspond to any notion of an interdependent world that is mutually benefiting from these flows. In contrast, singular concentration and unidirectional flows towards imperial-based corporations dominates the process of globalization and this pattern of globalization is more easily explained by theories of imperialism. The authors note that not coincidentally, the same is true regarding military policy and intelligence operations. The flow of intervention is unidirectional, from the imperial center to the dominated countries. There is no mutual penetration of military commands, but only the extension of military missions from the imperial center to the dominated countries.

In legal terms, only the imperial countries raise claims of extraterritorial jurisdiction (the supremacy of their laws over the laws of other sovereign nations); the dominated countries in the periphery or semi-periphery invariably are the targets. As Thomas Friedman stated in a 1999 editorial, "For globalism to work, America can't be afraid to act like the almighty superpower that it is....The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist-McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the designer of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps (Friedman, 1999)."

Empire Concept and Globalization

Empires have had the greatest influence in determining the nature of the forces of globalization, they are the chief globalizers of the world. Throughout history it is clear that empires were the principle forces that determined the nature of integration of different societies in the world. One certainly can't deny the globalization that occurred during the reign of the Greek and Roman Empires, or during the last 500 years of the great European empires. Scholars have certainly not underestimated the globalizing forces of the Portuguese, Spanish, British, Russian, Dutch, French, and Belgian empires to name just some of the imperial systems that impacted the nature of development throughout the world. This is not to deny the globalizing significance of empires originating in the Middle East (for example the Ottoman and Persian) or empires originating from Asia (for example the Mongol, Chinese, or Japanese).

Today, the largest most powerful empire, The United States of American, is the principle architect of the forces of globalization in the latter half of the

20th and 21st century. The American imperial parent, the British Empire was one of the largest empires and forces for globalization prior to the 20th century. Although, it was said that the “Sun never set on the British Empire”, Ferguson, a British historian and celebrator of empire, notes that the U.S. Empire is much grander in power, scope, and control. It is a greater force for globalization than any other empires of the past (Ferguson, 2004). If we are to understand the process of globalization in today’s world, we must understand the nature of this most powerful empire, the rules that it is creating and enforcing that govern the nature of economic, political, and cultural exchanges.

The American Empire is hardly recent, what is recent is its global reach. Its roots were firmly established before the founding of the second republic, The United States of America (Van Alstyne, 1960; Williams, 2007). The colonies were hegemonic powers in their own right as they claimed territories well beyond their settlement areas. However when we speak of the Empire of the United States of America it is most accurate to define it as beginning with the founding of the second republic. Although, the term empire to describe the United States has long been denied by political officials, the corporate owned American media, and most of the academic community, this “Empire in Denial” as Ferguson refers to the United States was not always the case. During the first hundred years of imperial expansion, the imperial mission was clearly recognized to be central to the goals of US development and foreign policy. The founding fathers spoke of a glorious, enlightened empire that they were creating. As George Washington described it during his first administration on June 11, 1783, in a letter to John Hancock “The Foundation of our Empire was not laid in the gloomy age of Ignorance and Superstition, but at an Epoch when the rights of Mankind were better understood and more clearly defined, than at any former period,” (Van Alstyne, 1960). In another of his writings, he dreamed of a global empire “there will assuredly come a day, when this country will have some weight in the scale of Empires. . . . Altho’ I pretend to no peculiar information respecting commercial affairs, nor any foresight into the scenes of futurity; yet as the member of an infant empire . . . I cannot help turning my attention sometimes to this subject (Fitzpatrick, 1944).”

The first one hundred years of US empire building focused on coveting the territory and the resultant genocidal wars to displace and annex the lands of more than 400 separate societies that lived on the continental United States. This period also included a war of conquest which incorporated more than half of the newly independent country of Mexico. Thomas Jefferson described the strategy of imperial expansion in the creation of what he referred to as the “Empire of Liberty” during this early period of the

republic in a letter to Archibald Stewart in 1786, "Our confederacy must be viewed as the nest, from which all America, North and South, is to be peopled. We should take care too, not to think it for the interest of that great continent to press too soon on the Spaniards. Those countries cannot be in better hands. My fear is that they are too feeble to hold them till our population can be sufficiently advanced to gain it from them piece by piece (VanAlstyne, 1960: 81)." The strategy was to continually claim land and promote settlement in areas claimed by other imperial powers and by the indigenous population who were residing in the territory. Ferguson (2004) refers to this early period of expansionism as an empire by purchase. The problem with this designation is that those who were dependent upon the territory for their survival were not involved in the negotiation of the purchase. Instead the deals were struck with the European empires that claimed the territory but could hardly defend it from American incursion and native population response to the incursions. The first hundred years of empire building was a period in which the nation's leaders declared that it was the nation's "manifest destiny" to claim what became the continental United States as its own (Gardner, LaFeber, & McCormick, 1973; Weinberg, 1935). After the first hundred years of genocidal warfare the vast majority of the indigenous population was eliminated and the remainder were placed on reservations that were often far from their original homelands (Brown, 2001; Churchill, 1997).

During the second hundred years the empire established its hegemony over the Western Hemisphere (Pearce, 1982), defining its intention to do so with the Monroe Doctrine and with the War with Spain, and the consequential War in the Philippines, and the sponsored coup in Hawaii established military outposts for the empire's expansion into Asia. As Senator Beveridge of Indiana stated the purpose of the American imperial mission during this early period of worldwide expansionism, "American Factories are making more than the American People can use... Fate has written our policy . . The trade of the world must be ours. And we shall get it, as our Mother England has told us . . We will cover the ocean with our merchant marine. We will build a navy to the measure of our greatness. Great colonies, governing themselves, flying our flag, and trading with us, will grow about our ports of trade. Our institutions will follow .. And American law, American order, American civilization and the American flag will plant themselves on shores hitherto bloody and benighted by those agents of God henceforth made beautiful and bright (Pearce, 1982: 9)" Woodrow Wilson also justifying the expansion of the empire beyond the hemisphere wrote that "Since trade ignores national boundaries and the manufacturer insists on having the world as a market, the flag of his nation must follow him and the doors of the nation which are closed must be battered down . . . Colonies must be

obtained or planted, in order that no useful corner of the world may be overlooked or left unused (VanAlstyne, 1960: 201)."

It was the annexation of the Philippines and the Philippine War of popular resistance to conquest and occupation which dragged on for more than 10 years and led to the death of hundreds of thousands of citizens resisting or in today's vernacular were collateral damage, 16,000 Philippine troops, and more than 4,000 American soldiers that led in the creation or anti-imperial movement in the United States. Although not lasting long, most Anti-imperial leagues dissolved by the early 1920s, the movement's impact may have been removing the language of empire by imperialist leaders and the mass media promoting and guiding the development of the US Empire. The subsequent rhetoric of anti-imperialism that replaced the narrative of manifest destiny and expansionism was also an important ideological tool for the rationale of American imperial policies of the 20th century that required the opening of markets to US investment and trade in the colonies of the European empires of the early 20th century that were closed or restricted to this investment. The aftermath of the grand wars of empires for colonial redistribution of the twentieth century, World War I and II, resulted in the eventual formation of two imperial zones. The United States sphere of influence was the Western Hemisphere, Western Europe and Japan and those colonial areas of these former imperial powers that these powers could no longer control, that the United States could control either directly or indirectly. In the rhetoric of the Cold War this new imperial zone of the United States was to be called the Free World by the United States. It was free in that it would be that portion of the world that was to be free for U.S capital investment and for U.S. military control and when necessary covert or overt intervention when this control became threatened. It's only imperial rival at the time was the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic and spheres of control in Eastern Europe and portions of the Middle East and Asia.

The most recent chapter in development of the US Empire occurs with the breakup of this imperial competitor, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It is in this context that President George H. Bush defines a "New World Order," one that would provide the American Empire with unprecedented opportunities for expansion into many areas of the world that were previously closed off from political, economic and military penetration. It is described as the unipolar world, a world where there is one "superpower" or Empire that truly dominates the world. There has never been a moment in world history where there is such a concentration power and a force of empire to remake the world. As Hobsbawm describes the significance of this unipolar moment in history, "The great global empires that have been seen before, such as the Spanish in the 16th and 17th centuries, and notably the

British in the 19th and 20th centuries, bear little comparison with what we see today in the United States Empire. The present state of globalisation is unprecedented in its integration, its technology and its politics. . . . A key novelty of the US imperial project is that all other great powers and empires knew that they were not the only ones, and none aimed at global domination. None believed themselves invulnerable, even if they believed themselves to be central to the world--as China did, or the Roman Empire at its peak (Hobsbawm, 2003)."

Defining the term empire has its complexity as a result of the different forms that empires have taken throughout history. Empires have varied in terms of the nature of their rule over territories, direct or colonial and indirect by means of a comprador class, the method of extraction of resources, and the ideological justifications for its existence. Maier's definition captures some important elements of the modern empire. He defines empire as "a major actor in the international system based on the subordination of diverse national elites who, whether under compulsion or from shared convictions, accept the values of those who govern the dominant center or metropole (Maier, 2005: xii)." The idea that empire is consensual is an important part of Maier's definition of empire. He sees the American empire as in part an Empire by invitation. Of course, who is being invited is left unstated, yet it certainly is an important question and raises questions about who benefits and pays of cost of the inclusion in the empire. This is the class basis for empire, for empires are organized by and principally for those who own and control production, not by and for those who work it. And even in this case, not all members of the owning class within the conquered or incorporated nation will benefit from inclusion. And even those who become part of a comprador class, if not for conquest and the economic, political, and cultural penetration, I'm not sure how much shared conviction there would be. Nevertheless Maier does recognize the hierarchical nature of empires whereby a center establishes and enforces the rules of the system. As Munkler notes 'imperial boundaries do not divide political units possessing equal rights; instead they involve gradations of power and influence (Munkler, 2007: 5). " He states that empires have no neighbours which they recognize as equals, that is, possessing equal rights; with states, by contrast, this is the rule.

A related term, hegemon, is also important to distinguish. It is defined as the dominant power (super-power) that exerts its dominance through an acceptance by lesser powers of the economic and political arrangements that are designed to maintain order and control. The term hegemon is often used to describe a regional power's control over its limited area. However Tabb describes hegemony as one strategy of empire where there is a greater

reliance on establishing the rules of commerce (neo-liberalist) and engages in multilateralism (Tabb, 2004). The superpower creates the rules and abides by them most of the time. However, the prerogative of empire is the other strategy of unilateralism, where the empire can choose to ignore the rules and act independently. This is not the empire concept described by Hardt and Negri which they define as a “sovereignty that is beyond the nation state that is composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule (Hardt & Negri, 2000: vii).” There is no imperialist power in the Empire that they describe. They recognize that the United States does represent a privileged position in this new empire, but not as an imperial power, but as a result of its constitution which forms the inspiration for this new world Empire without imperialism. Thomas Jefferson also recognized the significance of the US constitution for the construction of empire. “I am persuaded no constitution was ever before as well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government (Williams, 2007: 55) However, Madison and Jefferson understood that along with the establishment of colonies or states that were largely self-governing in internal matters, it also provided for an executive authority that through its powers of trade and treaty negotiation and commander and chief of the military was in an excellent position to lead the growth of empire. Williams also notes Madison and Jefferson also understood that a policy of expansionism was also crucial to containing internal (class) conflicts. In a letter to Jefferson, Madison wrote “it may be said that the new Constitution is founded on different principles, and will have a different operation. I admit the difference to be material . . . This form of government, in order to effect its purpose, must operate within a small but an extensive sphere. Extend the sphere, and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens. . . (Williams, 2007: 46)” Although, Hardt & Negri recognize that the United States holds hegemony over the global use of force – “a superpower that can act alone, but prefers to act in collaboration with others under the umbrella of United Nations (Hardt & Negri, 2000: 309).” Rather, than a mythical empire based on a constitutional model of empire of the 19th century, one supposedly without imperialism, the empire that is the force for globalization today is like those of the past whose utmost concern is the maintenance of its power and influence in the interest of principally the dominant class positions and ruling elite within the empire. Although, a key feature of the American empire that distinguishes it from past empires is the absence of the central role of colonies within the empire

The colonial empire is often viewed as the principle form of empire and is often used as a way of denying the Empire of the United States of America.

Although, the United States colonies, or territories, are today only a relatively small part of the entire empire, this was not always the case and it is not unusual for empires as they develop to control most of its empire indirectly. The early part of American Empire's history was the acquisition through conquest and the transformation of these territories into states as to be part of the imperial homeland or center. However, as the empire continued to expand throughout the 20th century, indirect control became increasingly necessary and most efficient. Throughout history empires possessed colonial systems during their earliest stages but increasing became dependent on indirect rule as they expanded. This was the case with classical empires, such as Rome, the European empires of the 18 and 19th centuries, and it is certainly the basis of the current imperial system. The British Empire made this transition of most of their empire being ruled indirectly before its disintegration after the world wars in the 20th century. Most of the British Empire at its zenith was ruled indirectly through market controls and a comprador class that had allegiance and economic interest tied to the center. During the Victorian Era was the era of British promotion of the 'free market' as a strategy for promoting economic penetration by Britain. However where and when indirect methods failed there was also the ready use of direct control systems, the police and military, both the police and military of the dominated territory that is trained and armed by the imperial center and the military of the center, that is ready to intervene when these forces fail to prevent loosening of control.

Richard Haas while a member of the National Security Council and special assistant to President George H. Bush, currently State Department Policy Planning Director in 2000, in a paper initially titled for conference presentation "Imperial America" reiterated this strategy for American imperial rule. "To advocate an imperial foreign policy is to call for a foreign policy that attempts to organize the world along certain principles affecting relations between states and conditions within them. The U.S. role would resemble 19th century Great Britain . . . Coercion and the use of force would normally be a last resort; what was written by John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson about Britain a century and a half ago, that "The British policy followed the principle of extending control informally if possible and formally if necessary, could be applied to the American role at the start of the new century (Haas, 1999)." Magdoff (2003) discussed this strategy of indirect control of the United States in controlling most of the western world in the period after the Second World War. Others have discussed the imperial strategy in the American empire's extension throughout its hemisphere (Gardner, LaFeber, & McCormick, 1973; Grandin, 2006; Pearce, 1982).

Globalizing Forces of Empire

There are four essential elements to empire that describe the nature of the penetration of areas that are dominated as part of the empire. Each of these systems of penetration are dependent upon the other, thus imperial weaknesses often stem from the lack of strength of one system relative to the other. Each also describes an element of the globalization process, for as empires extend their reach they are integrating territories militarily, politically, culturally and economically as part of an imperial relationship with the center and therefore transforming these systems.

Military penetration and integration

The extension of military power has always been essential to all empires. As Thomas Friedman (1999) editorial chief of the New York Times describe the centrality of the U.S. military in globalization, “The most powerful agent pressuring other countries to open their markets for free trade and free investments is Uncle Sam, and America’s global armed forces keep these markets and sea lanes open for this era of globalization, just as the British navy did for the era of globalization in the nineteenth century.”

In an imperial system like the empire of the United States of America that is dependent on indirect control, the military plays an essential role in the maintenance of control. “The United States, as we have seen, has built a chain of military bases and staging areas around the globe, as a means of deploying air and naval forces to be used on a moment’s notice—all in the interest of maintaining its political and economic hegemony (Monthly Review, 2002).” The authors note that these bases play a greater role in imperial management and control than during a period of colonial empire as a result of the absence of formal political control. As a subcommittee of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee defined it in 1970; “Overseas bases, the presence of elements of United States armed forces, joint planning, joint exercises, or excessive military assistance programs...all but guarantee some involvement by the United States in the internal affairs of the host government (Monthly Review, 2002; Committee, 1970).”

Chalmers Johnson defines this military system of approximately 800 bases (down from more than 1700 during the Cold War) that are present in more than 60% of the nations of the world as the basis of the empire (Johnson, 2004). Johnson notes that the United States began like a traditional empire. “We occupied and colonized the North American continent and established military outposts, called forts-Fort Apache, Fort Leavenworth, Sutter’s Fort,

Fort Sam Houston, Fort Laramie, Fort Osage-from coast to coast. But in more modern times, unlike many other empires, we did not annex territories at all. Instead we took (or sometimes only leased) exclusive military zones within territories, creating not an empire of colonies but an empire of bases (Johnson, 2004: 23).” Although, the presence of military bases in the country is important, especially in areas where this form of control is not secure, Johnson is incorrect in claiming that it is the principle basis of empire ignoring the economic, political and cultural forms of penetration and control.

Today, there is no doubt that U.S. military forces dominate the land, sea, air, and space surrounding the globe. These military forces are organized worldwide in terms of theatres of operation or Unified Regional Commands that coordinate all overt and covert military forces throughout the world. The Commanders in Chief, now called Combatant Commanders, are responsible for developing and executing key foreign political and military strategies in the interest of the United States. In 2008, U.S. military spending was 48% of total world military spending. U.S. Military budget is almost 1/2 of total U.S. Federal Government discretionary spending (Proliferation, 2008). Control of the world and the space around it is the plan of the United States as defined by the National Security Doctrine of 2002 and the National Defense Strategy of 2005. The Space Command’s Vision for 2020 explained the importance of this military superiority, “although unlikely to be challenged by a global peer competitor, the United States will continue to be challenged regionally. The globalization of the world economy will also continue, with a widening between “haves” and “have-nots (Estes, 1997).” This requires according to the report that to maintain the dominance of the US, the US must maintain its supremacy in space weaponry and to integrate this system to the land and sea systems to maintain U.S. military global dominance and protection of US investments and interests.

This military domination also extends to the integration of foreign military forces into the imperial mission as seen in terms of the “mutual defense” treaties that the United States has with most of the world’s nations. These defense treaties not only give the United States authorization to invade if their control is threatened but also allows for the use of these military forces to be used as proxy forces for the extension and maintenance of control from the imperial center. The military training exercises, aid and sales programs which the United States is the dominant actor in the world furthers U.S. global interests and control. Furthermore the United States will often uses multinational forces such as NATO and the UN to maintain or extend this control. The war against the former Yugoslavia by NATO directed by the United States and the Gulf War are good examples of the use of these forces

to exert U.S. control and to establish a U.S. military presence. The failure of the United States to utilize NATO or UN forces, as in the case of the most recent war in Iraq, did not seriously hamper the United States use of force. The reliance on some of its junior partners, Britain, and the “coalition of the willing” allowed for a veil of legitimacy for the conquest. However, the persuasion of the United States with the granting aid or granting of political favors and threats for non-participation was quite transparent (Anderson, Bennis, & Cavanagh, 2003).

There is a globalizing impact of this military integration and control from the center. First of all, these foreign bases and facilities impact the communities in the 130 countries that they are located (Johnson, 2004). Certainly the residents of base communities throughout Europe, Asian and the Americas that have been host to U.S. military bases for more than 60 years can describe the impact that this has had on their community, much of it not altogether positive when we look at the impact on levels of crime and violence. Then of course there is the globalizing impact of conquest. Most recently the countries of Afghanistan and Iraq have experienced globalization as their country is conquered, controlled, and transformed to be receptive to the economic, political and cultural penetration orchestrated by the center. These military bases throughout the world are essential to protect the globalizing forces stemming from the center. Most important is the protection afforded the economic penetration and integration and the multinational corporations that are the principle vehicle for this penetration.

Economic Penetration and Integration

The principle vehicle for economic penetration and imperialist relations is the multinational corporation, beginning with the Dutch East India Company, British East India Company and the British and Dutch Banking houses of the 16th and 17th centuries to Chase Manhattan, Wal-Mart, McDonalds, General Motors, Nestles, Coca Cola, Ford, General Electric, IIT, Cargill, and Microsoft today, to name a few. The combined annual revenues of the biggest 200 corporations are greater than those of 182 nation-states that contain 80 per cent of the world’s population (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001). As President Woodrow Wilson stated in an address to the International Congress of Salesmanship in 1916, “go out and sell goods that will make the world more comfortable and more happy, and convert them to the principles of America (De Grazia, 2005: 3).” De Grazia notes about Wilson and his remarks, “here America’s most renowned foreign policy idealist was authorizing a global traffic in values as well as commodities. This traffic wouldn’t hesitate to disregard other nations’ sovereignty. Its goal

was to bring down the “barriers of taste” that were deemed to cause revulsion, distrust, and conflict as well as to pursue profits. Its ulterior aim was to promote America’s peaceful conquest of the world (De Grazia, 2005: 3)”

At the beginning of the millennium, approximately 48% of the 500 largest companies in the world were U.S. corporations, another 30% are from the Europe and another 10% are Japanese (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001). The percentage of that are U.S. corporations increases as we reduce the number to the largest 100, 50, and 25. Five of the top ten banks, six of the top ten pharmaceutical-biotech companies, four of the top ten telecommunications companies, seven of the top information technology companies, four of the top gas and oil companies, nine out of the top ten software companies, four of the top ten insurance companies, and nine of the top ten general retail companies are U.S. multinational corporations. Behind this concentration of corporate power is the concentration of power of individual capitalists. The world’s three richest individuals have more wealth than the combined GDP of the 48 poorest nations. As Roy notes, the combined wealth of the world’s billionaires in 2004 (587 “individuals and family units”), according to Forbes magazine, is \$1.9 trillion—more than the gross domestic product of the world’s 135 poorest countries combined (Roy, 2004). In the imperial center there is the highest concentration of millionaires and billionaires.

Mass consumption is the other important aspect of the economics of empires, especially in the imperial centers. The U.S. population consumes almost 5 times its per capita of the world’s most valued resources. In the center of the America’s empire, the stores are never closed, and the population is increasingly dying from diseases of over-consumption, obesity, heart disease and cancers from pollution. Furthermore, the spread of the American consumer culture that is so essential to American capitalism is a key feature of America’s Market Empire (De Grazia, 2005). This Americanization of consumer tastes is an essential element of the economic and cultural forces of globalization.

Not only is the center of the American Empire, the U.S. nation state, the largest consumer market in the world, but it is also the largest recipient of the world’s capital investment. The U.S. investment markets are the largest in the world. More investment capital enters the center of the American Empire than any other area of the world. U.S. corporations dominate the private equity, asset management, and global securities industries (Institute, 2006). Furthermore, central to an empire is its currency dominance in world trade. The U.S. dollar is the currency in which the world’s most precious

commodities are traded (for example, oil) and it is the reserve currency for most other domestic currencies in the world. This currency dominance allows the U.S. Treasury Department to finance the nation's huge current account deficits by issuing dollars. No capitalist or non-capitalist competitor has this privileged ability to finance its negative balances (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001). Perkins notes that our ability to print money means that as we continue to amount the largest debt in the world, many times the debt of developing countries, there is little concern that we can pay it since we control the flow of money and world trade requires dollars as the international currency (Perkins, 2004). Although, he notes that the increasing use of the euro in trade, especially in oil, can threaten the power of the United States economically.

The World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, all principally U.S. creations and in which the United States has the most influence, are key instruments in defining the nature of the economic penetration from the center. They establish the rules and the system of subsidies to facilitate this penetration and the extraction of resources and capital from the peripheral regions. The most recent strategy for this economic penetration is called the "Washington Consensus." It is the new version of capitalist liberalism or neo-liberalism that defines the nature of the economic character of globalization today.

The Washington Consensus strategy for globalization as specified during the Reagan Administration focused on increasing relative levels of surplus through a reduction of subsidies to workers (welfare), a reduction in enforcement of laws and regulations that increased costs for businesses, and an increase in military adventurism in both South and Central America, and the Middle East. The key elements were (1) free trade in the periphery, protectionism at imperial center, (2) freeing capital flows through financial market liberalization, currency convertibility, and maintenance of U.S. currency dominance as world's currency, (3) privatization - the transfer of assets from the public to the private sector, (4) ending the social contract (Fordhism) and reduction in subsidies to workers (welfare) and increase subsidies to capital and inverting the system of taxation to reduce taxes on corporations and capital, and increase taxes on workers, and (5) secure property rights including the protection of intellectual property rights. Implementation of the program was carried out from both United States (Reagan) and Great Britain (Thatcher) and continues today as central to U.S. globalization strategy.

Petras and Veltmeyer define “The New Imperial Order” as built on five pillars: “ (1) large, long-term interest payments on external debt, (2) massive transfers of profits derived from direct and portfolio investments, (3) buyouts and takeovers of lucrative public enterprises and financially troubled national enterprises, as well as direct investments in sweatshops, energy resources, and low-wage manufacturing and service industries, (4) collection of rents from royalty payments on a wide range of products, patents and cultural commodities, and (5) favorable current account balances based on the dominance of U.S. corporations and banks in the region through traditional market “familiarity” and historical ties.

The use of debt has always been a key strategy in promoting economic penetration and exerting political control. For the United States the debt strategy goes back to the earliest days of the U.S. Empire with the system of trading posts that served to indebt the indigenous population in order to claim their territory. President Washington tried to control the extortionist practices of the early trading post, but largely failed. Jefferson saw them as important strategy of taking the land of the Chickasaws and other tribes and moving them west of the Mississippi (Kennedy, 2003). It has also been an important strategy of the U.S. in controlling Mexico and Central America. Roosevelt’s Corollary declared the U.S. right to intervene militarily and control their trade if countries could not pay their debts (Pearce, 1982). Whether it is the debt that the indigenous incur from the local trading post that led to land confiscations or whether it is the debt that many African and Asian countries still have in place from their history of colonialism that is serviced by the Paris and London Clubs which are affiliated with the U.S. controlled IMF (Guissé, 2004) or whether it is the debt that has been such an important part of the most recent surge in imperial control beginning in the 1970s, it has been an important instrument of empires to acquire control of resources. This debt has allowed for a mechanism to force open markets, and to increase control over resources in the developing world.

In this most recent chapter, first in Latin America and then Africa and Asia, finance capital backed by the United States Government through the World Bank and International Monetary Fund promoted loans to subsidize the penetration of foreign capital. A significant percentage of these loans were for non-existent projects or projects that had little developmental benefit, yet they furthered the interest of capital and provided important leverage for further external economic control of the indebted nation. Perkins described his role as an “economic hitman” when he worked for an international consulting firm that the IMF and World Bank used to provide development projects for countries that were targeted for loans. Perkins defines the nature of these projects was that “they were intended to create large profits for the

contractors, and to make a handful of wealthy and influential families in the receiving countries very happy, while assuring the long-term financial dependence and therefore the political loyalty of governments around the world (Perkins, 2004: 18).” Included in these loans were investments in government officials who were paid for their services in bribes, kickbacks, and shares of ownership. Jubilee researchers found that almost a quarter of all Third World debt (about 500 billion) is the result of loans used to prop up dictators in some 25 different countries (Ellwood, 2001: 43). Nobel Prize winning economist Joseph Stiglitz (2002) describes how the IMF and other international development agencies sponsored by the United States and former European imperial powers function to place the interests of Wall Street first in the consideration of the development of poorer countries.

The flow of petro- dollars in U.S. dollars in U.S. banks found their way to the developing world. The loans were to pay for development projects that would serve to export resources and to open opportunity for foreign investment and ownership in developing country. When loans could not be repaid as happened in the early 1980s with Mexico, Argentina and Brazil first, a new plan to create further debt and changes in government policies to further open up resources for foreign control was put in place. James Baker (The Baker Plan) then Secretary of the Treasury had the IMF and World Bank provide additional funding however with conditions or “structural adjustments” that forced the opening of the markets in these indebted countries and cheapening resources as part of the implementation of the Washington Consensus Strategy.

These “structural adjustment programs” were also effective in increasing levels of debt as new loans were provided to prevent default. Currencies were devalued as part of the structural adjustment programs which served to make the resources including labor even cheaper, and to make the cost of repayment of loans even higher. State budgets were cut as part of these programs especially in those areas which served to subsidize the working class (health, education, welfare programs). Furthermore, they transformed the debt from a private debt to a public debt, resulting in saddling the poorest populations of the world with a debt that was many times their meager income. The developing world pays more than 375 billion dollars each year in debt service. This is estimated to be twenty times that amount of aid they receive (Hiatt, 2007). Hiatt notes that G8 debt relief programs cut less than 1% of the 3.2 trillion that is owed by developing countries.

Hiatt notes that another outcome of the debt crises was an increase in the transfer of capital from the developing world to the developed world,

especially the United States. As noted before an important aspect of empire are flows of capital as well as resources and products flowing to the imperial center. This was also part of the strategy of the structural adjustment programs, as the currencies of those countries were devalued, those with capital sort safe havens in banks that were offshore or in the most developed countries, especially the U.S. Furthermore, a result of the large amount of corruption of elites to secure the loans, this money also ended up outside of the “developing country.” The result was a decrease in domestic investment by wealthy citizens and reduction of the tax base needed to pay for the increasing debt.

Another features of the American Empire’s plan for globalization as it relates to economic penetration included freeing capital movement across borders, but maintaining restrictions on the movement of labor. This always disadvantages labor and has led to increasing illegal immigration in center countries and in particular in the United States as a result of the increasing levels of inequality that occur as uneven development is promoted to pit one region, one country, and one community against each other for the attraction of capital. Solimano estimates that the number of illegal immigrants during the 1990s has steadily increased from 3.3 million in 1992 to 5 million in 1996 into the United States (Solimano, 2001). The United States receives more immigrants than any other nation. Multinational corporations have increasingly subcontracted production of their product to capitalize on the cheapening of the cost of labor. Thousands of factories have opened in free trade zones in some of the world’s poorest countries, at the same time there is increasing influx of immigrants, mostly illegal, to the center of the empire to acquire the resources and opportunities that have flowed to the imperial center. Ellwood notes that “there are more than 800 Free Trade Zones operating from Malaysia and the Philippines to El Salvador, Mexico, and even socialist Cuba (Ellwood, 2001: 68).”

Immigration both legal and illegal serves an important role for empires. First there is a creaming process whereby the most talented segments of the population have access to legal migration. The United States immigration system is based on accepting immigrants who are more highly skilled. A recent concern raised by Microsoft and other high technology companies in the U.S. about the increased restrictions on immigration as a result of the operations of the Department of Homeland Security is that they were having problems recruiting high skilled labor into the country. The illegal migrants serve to force down labor costs in the center as these migrants experience a higher level of exploitation that is often illegal than the citizen population. This has been an important factor in reducing the wages of the unskilled and semiskilled workers in the United States and reducing levels of unionization

to historic lows of approximately twelve percent of the U.S. workforce. In return there are the remittances in the billions of dollars that are sent back to the families who are often living in poverty in the home country. Most of them part of the ever growing displaced rural population as these countries are forced to open their markets to subsidized U.S. agricultural products (corn and wheat). The Inter-American Bank estimates that over \$30 billion in remittances was sent from United States to Latin America during 2004 alone (Bank, Inter-American, 2005). In Mexico, the remittances are second only to oil revenue as a source of U.S. dollars. This is another aspect of the integration and dependency that defines the economic linkage between the center and the periphery.

The requirements of privatization that is also an important part of the structural adjustment agreements allows for further economic penetration from the center as U.S. based multinational corporations acquire favorable investments in these territories. Ellwood notes that between 1992 and 1997, the annual number of cross-border mergers and acquisitions doubled (Ellwood, 2001). High levels of merger and acquisitions were in the financial services, telecommunications, insurance, life sciences and media. More recently retail and fast food operations have expanded from the center. For example, in Mexico, Walmex (owned by Walmart) captured about a quarter of the retail market in 2004. In 2005 it was estimated that it will invest \$750 million, more than all its competitors combined, opening 70 new stores, according to Walmex spokesman Raul Arguelles (Bensinger, 2005). Today, Walmex is the biggest private employer in Mexico (McKinley, 2004). The number of McDonald's restaurants increased more than 400% in developing countries between 1991 and 1996 (Programme, 1998). In the year 2000 it was estimated that there were more than 15,000 restaurants in 117 countries (Schlosser, 2001). There are many other American franchises: Seven Eleven, Pizza Huts, Burger King, KFC, as well as increases in offices of American Banks and insurance companies, and various other U.S. corporations that are now engaged in a globalization strategy to penetrate and increasingly dominate foreign markets.

It is not just the U.S. based multinational corporations, the junior imperial partners and corporations based there are also invested in the same game. Renner reports that the rate of merger activity continued to increase through the 1990s, with a significant increase in cross border mergers where companies from the United States, Japan, and Europe were the buyers. With the push towards privatization of state owned industries and utilities and trade agreements that treat foreign ownership on par with domestic ownership, the largest corporations in the world are on shopping spree. Often times they are picking up the most valued foreign assets in both the

developed and developing world at bargain basement prices. Cross border mergers went from below 20 percent of the value of all mergers in the early 1980s to 33 percent by the end of the 1990s (Renner, 2000). Recent trends indicate that they have continued to increase as market entry barriers have been lifted and the rules regarding foreign ownership have been liberalized. It is likely that in those areas of the developing world that have high profit potential, large multinational corporations from the center of this world imperial system, especially the United States, will be present and these markets will become dominated by these larger more powerful economic actors.

Another factor that facilitates outside control and monopolization of the economies of developing countries by multinational corporations from the center is through trade agreements including the TRIMs (Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures) and TRIPs (Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights) agreements formed at the Uruguay GATT meetings in 1994. Both these measures block developing countries from using the same protectionist strategies such as protectionist tariffs, imitation and reverse engineering that the United States, the Western European nations, and the East Asia Tigers (Japan, South Korea, Republic of China and the Peoples Republic of China) have used to develop their industries and agriculture. What the TRIP and TRIM measures do is institutionalize the dominance of U.S., Western Europe and Japanese multinational corporations especially in high technology sectors of the economy.

In the TRIP Agreement, patent protection is extended for twenty years, increases the length of protection for semiconductors, institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents (Bello, 1999). This measure also gives corporations greater capacity to privatize and patent life forms, including plant and other genetic resources of less-industrialized nations and peoples. This is increasingly a problem as the development genetic engineered seeds are controlled by the U.S. based conglomerate, Monsanto, which controls 90% of the world market. The seeds are engineered to be resistant to diseases and agricultural pests, but the plants don't reproduce requiring farmers to purchase additional seeds from Monsanto. If the plants mix with domestic plants (hybrids) they are considered to be a violation of the patent.

TRIMs render illegal certain measures that countries, notably Southern Hemispheric nations, have employed to encourage TNCs to establish linkages with domestic firms. Many developing countries require a certain

portion of the inputs in production to be from domestically owned producers. This strategy serves to stimulate industrial development in related industries. Both these measures serve to block development strategies that were successful in the past for the developed world.

Furthermore, the strategy on the part of the United States and Europe to continue subsidizing their agricultural sector, especially for foreign sales and protectionism for the agriculture in their own markets, and the reverse for developing countries serves to subordinate development to the demands of the Western Europe, Japan and the largest most dominant actor, the United States. The breakdown in the WTO negotiations beginning in 2001 in Doha and the most recent round of negotiations in 2007 in Potsdam and the formation of the Group of 70 nations, principally from south of the equator, are signs of the increasing organized resistance of the developing world to the unfairness of the trade practices that has resulted in the U.S. and Europe controlling most of world trade. These are all important strategies of the United States and the former imperial powers to secure the market dominance for their own multinational corporations, a strategy that has led to increasing displacement in the agriculture sector and barrier to the development of the industrial sector of these economies dominated by the imperial center.

Cultural Penetration: Markets, Media, and Missionaries

Cultural penetration and control is essential for its role in empire building in transforming cultures to the consumer needs created in the marketplace by large multinational corporations. Again, one of the principle cultural forces of globalization and empire is the multinational corporations that penetrate the consumer markets. Schlosser describes the transformation of food and agriculture as a result of the penetration by McDonald's, Burger King, Pizza Hut, Wendy's, etc into foreign markets and its impact on health of the population (Schlosser, 2001). He notes that classes at McDonald's University where franchisees are trained are in twenty different languages. McDonald's targets children and families as key forces in the cultural transformation of these societies as they enter into the American sphere of influence. According to Schlosser, McDonald's is the favorite food among children in China along with Coca Cola. The number of McDonald's restaurants more than doubled in Australia in the 1990s. Today, McDonald's is the biggest private employer in Brazil. "A generation ago American embassies and oil companies were the most likely targets of overseas demonstrations against U.S. imperialism. Today fast food restaurants have assumed that symbolic role, with McDonald's a particular favorite (Schlosser, 2001: 244)."

Mass media is also a central force for the cultural transformation that we describe as globalization. Henry Luce, at the time editor of *Time Magazine*, described the New American Century and the central role of the United States in cultural promotion. He noted that "we must accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity, as the most powerful and vital nation in the world, to exert upon the world the full impact of our influence, for such purposes as we see fit, and by such means as we see fit . . . it now becomes our time to be the powerhouse from which ideas spread throughout the world (Luce, 1941: 23). Today seven out of the top ten world's largest media companies are U.S. corporations (AOL/Time Warner, General Electric, Viacom, Disney, Liberty Media Corporation, ATT Corporation, and News Corporation), two are European (Vivendi and Bertelsmann), and one is Japanese (Sony) and their reach is truly global (Nation, 2002). McChesney notes that the overwhelming majority of the world's film production as defined in terms of revenue, TV show production, cable channel ownership, cable and satellite system ownership, book publishing, magazine publishing and music production is provided by 50 companies, however the top nine firms thoroughly dominate many of these sectors (McChesney, 1997).

Herbert Schiller notes that Luce, at the time controller of one of the most powerful communication complexes in the United States (the *Time, Life, Fortune* magazine conglomerate) understood that 'the fusion of economic strength and information control, image making and public opinion formation was the new quintessence of power, international and domestic' (Schiller, 1969: 1). Schiller notes that during the Cold War, a United States Congressional Committee was established to consider the link between communication systems and foreign policy. The committee produced a paper called 'Winning the Cold War: the American Ideological Offensive', that argued that "to a significant degree, what America does will shape the emerging international communications system . . . to a very large degree, other countries will imitate our experience and will attach themselves to the institutions and systems we create. . . . Given our information technology and information resources, the USA clearly could be the hub of the world communication systems (Schiller, 1969: 9)."

Schiller contends that the linkage between media companies and the U.S. military although established earlier was strengthened during this period. This linkage has grown and continues today in the news reporting of America's wars of conquest, the most current in Iraq representing the most sophisticated techniques of media control for military purposes, throughout the world via CNN, Fox, ABC, NBC, CBS, Time, Newsweek, etc. As the Committee of Foreign Affairs concluded during the Cold War period, "certain foreign policy objectives can be best pursued by dealing directly

with the people of foreign countries, rather than with their governments. Through the use of modern instruments and technologies of communications, it is possible today to reach large and influential sections of national populations – to inform them, to influence their attitudes . . . to motivate them to particular courses of actions. These groups, in turn, are capable of exerting, noticeable, even decisive, pressure on their governments (Schiller, 1969: 12).”

Schiller argues that the contemporary situation exhibits two particular features of significance. In the first place, he argues, we see a significant move towards a situation in which information itself becomes a commodity for sale, and towards a position in which the communications and information industries serve as the dynamo of contemporary economic development. In this context, communication ceases to be a merely secondary adjunct, facilitating business, and communication itself becomes 'big business'. In this connection, he quotes the Director of the Pentagon's 'Information Processing and Techniques Office' who claimed that “the nation that dominates this information processing field will possess the keys to world leadership in the twenty-first century (Schiller, 1985: 250).” The second development to which Schiller calls attention to is the extent that this new 'heartland' of communication and information technology is itself now increasingly controlled by a very small number of powerful transnational corporations, which are based in the USA, but which operate, simultaneously in many different countries around the world, on a global scale.

Morley and Robins (1996) notes that the United States is the world's number one exporter of television programming. They note that while the United States imports 1 to 2% of its television broadcast output, it exports more television programs to the rest of the world than all other nations combined export. They further note that this pattern of dominance is even more so in the most crucial area of television programming, the prime-time fictional programming and news programming. The world news is largely supplied by a very small number of press and news agencies, all of which are Anglo-American, US media companies being the dominant source of the world's news. Morley and Robins claim that these agencies shape the international political agenda by the way in which they define values. They also note that the flow of world news is mainly one-way, Anglo-American video news agencies provide the core of broadcast television news. They conclude that it is difficult to exaggerate either the direct presence or the indirect influence of Anglo-American materials and styles on television news throughout the world.

LeFeber states that the “transnational corporations not only played a dominant role in creating and defining American popular culture, but they used that culture’s own seductiveness to influence the language, eating habits, clothes, and television watching of peoples around the earth (LeFeber, 2002: 19).” With the launching of the Direct Broadcast Satellites in the mid 1970s, American television, cinema, and American sports especially basketball has increasingly been directly broadcast in homes throughout the world. The problem of cultural imperialism became so great to the Canadians that by the mid-1990s the Canadian government required television and radio stations to broadcast a minimum amount of programming from Canadians themselves. Some 96 percent of films shown in Canada were foreign-made, the large majority from Hollywood. LeFeber also notes that in Canada four of five magazines sold were foreign, mostly American.” The Canadians have experienced the most direct dominance of the U.S. Global Empire. However, they are certainly not alone, The French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine declared in 1997, “The United States has assets not yet at the disposal of any other power. These assets included political influence, the supremacy of the dollar, control of communication networks, ‘dream factories’ [that is, Hollywood and television], new technologies, . . . The situation is virtually unprecedented (LeFeber, 2002: 20)”.

LeFeber states that the ABC network bought into one of Germany’s leading television stations. He describes how ABC’s ESPN, now controls one-third of Europe’s largest sports network, Eurosport. Furthermore, the NBC network in the United States took over the Superchannel, a cable operation that reached sixty million Europeans. He notes that one percent of prime-time American television are produced overseas. On the other hand, he claims that almost 80 percent of Europe’s television programs originate in the United States. LeFeber notes this is an impressive exercise in “soft power.” According to LeFeber, you can see the impact of this cultural penetration especially on the young. In 1990s, some 70 percent of Western Europeans ages eighteen to twenty-four spoke English. In 1998, all of Spain’s ten most popular movies were American; in Great Britain, Germany, and Italy nine came from Hollywood; and even in France seven were U.S. made (LeFeber, 2002). Morley and Robins claim that “with its capital and technology, American Communications companies have written the “grammar” of international television by creating its formats and concepts (Morley & Robins, 1996). Joseph Nye, former State Department Official, thought that soft power (American media and popular culture) “would make the twenty-first century the period of America’s greatest preeminence” (LeFeber, 2002: 156).”

It is not just television and cinema that is dominated by U.S. based multinational media corporations but of the fifteen largest advertising agencies in the world, thirteen were American (LaFeber, 2002). Jack Lang, the French Minister of Culture, stated that "United States culture, this "immense empire of profit," had become a financial and intellectual imperialism which no longer grabs territory, or rarely, but grabs consciousness, ways of thinking, ways of living (LeFeber, 2002: 110)." Kuise, in his work *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Amerricanization*, notes that "What is important is that it seems European eating habits have been modified by fast food introduced by McDonald's. The disappearance of thousands of cafes in Paris as well as the long family lunch amounts to significant social change. Wearing sneakers, no matter how they are advertized, represents a new informality in European dress and perhaps even behavior. Watching MTV, even if it has been customized for European consumption, suggests that European youth are receiving social and cultural messages as Americans do. And children's imaginations are changed by viewing American television and Hollywood movies (LeFeber, 2002: 141)."

Canadian historian Geoffrey Smith states that "in most global sport - so much of it's Americanized - we behold a new and insidious form of imperialism." This "imperialism" was especially insidious for its "absurd monetary stakes" and its attractiveness to millions around the globe. . . .Small wonder that as free-trading international capitalism threatens the existence of traditional political structures, sports products and [sports] prodigies take on huge importance (LeFeber, 2002: 142)." LaFeber notes that Ted Turner, Rupert Murdoch and Michael Eisner no longer thought in terms of just one product (as basketball) and one country (as the United States). They saw the whole world as their market, a market tied together by satellites. They then put together mammoth marketing machines that used basketball games to show advertising that sold their transnational corporation's books, movies and other television programs.

The last vehicle for cultural penetration and globalization that will be discussed is religious organizations from the imperial center who proselytize to the uncivilized or unenlightened. Historically, these have been very important mechanism of cultural penetration and control. Tinker (Tinker, 1993) describes the role of these missionaries in the conquest of North America by the European empires and the Empire of the United States during the 18 and 19th centuries. There is a saying that has been attributed to Africans and Native Americans that summarizes the role of religious missionaries in pacification, and the spread of empire. The Native American version is, "When the white man came, we had all the land and they had all the bibles, now, we have all the bibles, and they have all the

land.” The Roman Empire learned the importance of unifying its empire through establishing Christianity as its imperial religion in 380 AD. The European Empires, the Islamic Empires including the last of them, the Ottoman, and today’s American Empire export their religious systems’ version to areas under its influence. Today, U.S. based mission societies have the greatest number of missionaries in all inhabited continents of the world. In the most recent front in the American Empire, the Middle East, one half of the missionaries are from the United States (Giddens, 2006).

This proselytizing of U.S. missionaries has increasingly gone electronic utilizing the power of U.S. media throughout the world. Pat Robertson’s Christian Broadcasting Network which originated in Virginia airs religious programming in approximately 71 languages from Mandarin to Spanish and from Turkish to Welsh (Sourcewatch, 2007). The Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN) was the first Christian ministry to build and operate its own satellite in 1977. Today CBN is a multifaceted nonprofit organization that provides programming by cable, broadcast and satellite to approximately 180 countries.

In 1990, along with the United States government initiative on creating “civil societies” and transforming the economies of the New Independent States, formerly the USSR and the Warsaw Pact Nations, CBN International launched special projects in this same region of the world that included primetime specials and later their flagship program, the 700 Club, and Superbook, an animated series of Bible stories targeting children. Sourcewatch reports that the broadcasts were followed by 190 rallies throughout the region that resulted in the establishment of 190 churches. CBN’s Middle East Television station (METV) recently sold to another like-minded ministry, LeSea Broadcasting, broadcasts news, sports, family entertainment, and religious programming by satellite to a potential audience of 200 million people in 15 nations including Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt and Cyprus. Recently, CBN launched CBN WorldReach with a mission of converting 500 million people to Christianity using Gospel programming to targeted international audiences. According to the CBN webpage describing the program, “the primary strategy adopted by CBN WorldReach is the development of daily or weekly television programs on terrestrial TV stations in selected countries. Today, CBN WorldReach operates in more than 50 countries and has broadcasted evangelistic TV programs in 89 languages reaching more than 230 countries and territories (Network, 2008).”

Political Penetration and Integration

State imperial management of the penetration of military, economic, and cultural penetration is the last essential element of empire. A common myth about the nature of this most recent chapter in globalization is that the state becomes smaller and less powerful in response to the economic forces of globalization. This may be the case outside of the imperial center, where the state in the periphery becomes subservient to the imperial state, but in the center the U.S. state is expanding its power and control nationally and internationally. A former editor of the Wall Street Journal Max Boot stated it this way. "We are an attractive empire. . . Afghanistan and other trouble lands today cry out for the sort of enlightened administration once provided by self-confident Englishmen in johpurs and pith helmets (Johnson, 2004: 70). Or as conservative Time Magazine columnist, Krauthammer, states, "America is no mere international citizen. It is the dominant power in the world, more dominant than any since Rome. Accordingly, America is in a position to re-shape norms, alter expectations and create new realities. How? By unapologetic and implacable demonstrations of will (Krauthammer, 2001)."

The United States government plays a central role in the promotion of foreign investment and advantaging U.S. business's entry into foreign markets. The Agency for International Development, U.S. Trade Development Agency, Small Business Administration, Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture all have as the key element of their mission the promotion and subsidizing of investment and marketing outside the United States. The United States is the largest international economic aid donor in absolute dollar terms. It is important to note that most U.S. aid is tied to the purchase of products principally produced by American agribusinesses and US based multinational corporations or for infrastructural development to promote US based foreign investment. In 2004, the United States provided some form of foreign assistance to about 150 countries.

One example of the states' promotion of economic penetration is the Market Access Program of the Department of Agriculture that provides millions of dollars to organizations and firms such as Sunkist Growers, Sunsweet, Dole Foods, and Gallo Wines to help them enter new foreign markets. Another program, the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) of the Department Agriculture provided cash bonuses to firms to reward them for increasing exports on certain farm commodities. Shields notes that just three companies—Cargill, Continental Grain, and the French-owned Louis

Dreyfus—have received almost half of the bonuses since 1985 (Shields, 1997). According to the Department of Agriculture Factsheet the program “pays cash to exporters as bonuses, allowing them to sell U.S. agricultural products in targeted countries at prices below the exporter’s costs of acquiring them.” According to the factsheet, the program is designed to counter European Government’s subsidies to their agricultural produces on certain product in certain markets. Shields also notes that tax abatements play an important role in subsidizing foreign market penetration and expansion. If a US company establishes a foreign sales corporations (FSCs) in other countries or U.S. possessions, a portion of the income from foreign sales are exempt from U.S. taxes. Shields notes that exporters save \$1.5 billion annually by using this tax break. The U.S. Export-Import Bank also support U.S. transnational corporations (TNCs) by providing direct loans and loan guarantees for up to 85% of the export value of U.S. goods and services to foreign buyers.

OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, is an independent U.S. government agency whose mission is to mobilize and facilitate the participation of U. S. private capital in the economic development of less developed countries and areas, and countries in transition from nonmarket to market economies. OPIC’s services are available for new and expanding U.S. business enterprises in more than 150 countries worldwide. These services include the providing of low interest loans and insurance to facilitate economic penetration from the center. The mission of the United States Trade and Development Agency is to advance economic development and U.S. commercial interests in developing and middle-income countries (Agency, United States Trade and Development, 2007). According to the agencies website in Fiscal Year 2005, USTDA obligated nearly \$57 million in support of the development goals of project sponsors in 66 host counties around the world. Overall, there are more than 20 government agencies that provide information to business to assist them in foreign investment. Each year billions are spent on advantaging U.S. multinational corporations in the penetration and control of foreign markets. This is in addition to the State Department’s funding of military training and equipment programs, all serving to increase U.S. economic, military, and political control of areas that are being “assisted.”

The state also plays an important role in the promotion of U.S. culture in its cultural exchange programs and subsidizing of U.S. media and U.S. government owned media that promotes the U.S. culture and economic interests. The United States Information Agency (USIA) is a central agency in the coordination of this cultural penetration. Ideological control is an essential element of the cultural penetration of empire, as it is in the imperial

center. Acceptance of the neoliberal ideology rationalizes and promotes the economic, cultural and political control from the center. It becomes consensual and thus not requiring the increasing presence of military control.

Another important role of the imperial state is to establish governing systems in those countries it dominates to be compatible and open to penetration by the imperial state. Since the early 1980s, the U.S. government and corporate sponsored NGO, The National Endowment for Democracy has been a major player in this force of globalization. De Grazia refers to this as the second feature of the American Market Empire (De Grazia, 2005). She notes that the United States in reference to the penetration of Europe after WWII exported its civil society - voluntary associations, social scientific knowledge, and civic spirit—in tandem with, if not ahead of, the country's economic exports. U.S. government sponsored NGOs bring about the new civil society with its laws respecting private property, markets and a form of government that Robinson refers to as "Polyarchy" where local national elites who share economic and political interest with the elites of the imperial center are sponsored and schooled in running for office. NGOs like The National Endowment allows for the imperial center to exert its influence over the selection of candidates in countries that are targeted for incorporation into the empire (Robinson, 1996). Most recently, the initiative has focused on the New Independent States of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union and the Middle East, Afghanistan and Iraq, in particular.

The goal is to promote a civil society and a governing structure that allows for the continuation of the dominance of United States interest in how the society is organized. Democracy promotion provides an important ideological cover for foreign control, however one with risks. It allows for the penetration of U.S. sponsored interest groups (NGOs) that promote the interest of the imperial center. It also facilitates the flows of money from multinational corporations and organizations that it sponsors to various candidates who will promote the neoliberal agenda. The recent conflicts over NGO participation in elections in Russia and many of the former republics of the USSR represents an important new front in the extension of the empire into these new areas. And as we have seen in the past, when the elections go wrong in that the U.S. sponsored or approved candidates does not win, regime change (covertly or overtly) is often a fall back strategy, especially in areas that don't pose a threat of military or popular resistance. We have seen this regime change strategy when "democracy" failed U.S. interest used throughout the world from Guatemala, Chile, Iran, the

Dominican Republic, Haiti and most recently in the election of Hamas as the Palestinian Governing Authority.

Conclusion

We can't begin to understand the nature of globalization without understanding the nature of the globalizers, the empires of the past and the Empire of the United States of America that is dominant today in the world. These globalizers have most in determining the rules of cultural, economic, political and military integration and exchange that are the key elements of empire and globalization. In today's world most of the forces for globalization are engineered by the major international organizations that the United States has predominant power over.

This is not to say that there are not other forces, some counter to the forces of empire's globalization, and potential rivals who are attempting to direct these forces in their national or particular class or ruling elite interests. Certainly, there are some interesting developments throughout South America with the Bolivarian revolution started by Chavez that attempts to provide an alternative path of development and trade that is not mediated by the center. There is also the "independent" activities of China and Russia which although becoming increasingly integrated into the world economy dominated by the United States, also poses a potential threat to continued U.S. domination. China's particular activities in providing debt relief in Africa is creating a counterweight to the U.S. controlled financial institutions including the World Bank and IMF is a threat to the maintenance of U.S. control over this region. I don't think it is coincidental that the United States is now developing a military command structure for Africa as distinct from the European Command that it was once a part. Russia is also beginning to react to US efforts to penetrate their former sphere of influence in the former soviet republics and Eastern Europe. The U.S. as noted earlier has increased its efforts of political and military penetration and the plan to place a missile "defense" system in areas bordering Russia are certain to increase Russian buildup of weapons and increased use of its oil revenue to attempt to counter US efforts of continued penetration of the region.

There are many other potential forces both internal and external to the imperial center that can change the nature of the forces of globalization. More scholarly work needs to focus on these forces and their potential impact on the nature of globalization. In general, more scholarly work needs to focus on the nature of empire, and in particular the Empire of the United States of America, as a central force in the globalization and its outcomes for

human wellbeing. There are winners and losers in the stories of empires, and the legacy of empires is mixed as it relates to these outcomes, the case of the United States is no exception.

REFERENCES

- Agency, United States Trade and Development. (2007). *Mission Statement of USTDA*. Retrieved April 9, 2008, from United States Trade and Development Agency: <http://www.ustda.gov/about/mission.asp>
- Anderson, S., Bennis, P., & Cavanagh, J. (2003, February 26). *COALITION OF THE COERCED? How the Bush Administration Influences Allies in its War on Iraq*. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from Institute for Policy Studies: <http://www.tni.org/mil-docs/coalition.pdf>
- Bank, Inter-American. (2005, March 6). *Sending Money Home: Remittances to Latin America from the US, 2004. Executive Summary*. Retrieved February 12, 2007, from Inter-American Development Bank Search Page: <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=547214>
- Bello, W. 1. (1999, November 27). *The Iron Cage: The WTO, the Bretton Woods Institutions and the South*. Retrieved January 23, 2007, from Transnational Institute: http://www.tni.org/detail_page.phtml?page=archives_bello_ironcage
- Bensinger, K. (2005, March 15). *Like the US, Mexico feels Wal-Mart era*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from Christian Science Monitor: <http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0315/p01s03-woam.html>
- Brown, D. (2001). *Bury My Heart At Wounded Knee*. New York: Holt.
- Churchill, W. (1997). *A Little Matter of Genocide*. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Committee, U. S. (1970). *Report by the Subcommittee on Security Agreements and Commitments*. Washington D. C.: United States Government.
- De Grazia, V. (2005). *Irresistible Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Eakin, E. (2002, April 2). It Takes an Empire,' Say Several U.S. Thinkers. *New York Times*.
- Ellwood, W. (2001). *The No-Nonsense Guide to Globalization*. Toronto: New Internationalist Publications.
- Estes, H. M. (1997). *United States Space Command. Vision 2020*. Retrieved November 15, 2007, from <http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/usspac/visbook.pdf>
- Ferguson, N. (2004). *Colossus: The Price of America's Empire*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Fitzpatrick, J. C. (1944). *The Writings of George Washington*. Retrieved May 15, 2008, from Washington Resources at the University of Virginia Library: <http://etext.virginia.edu/washington/fitzpatrick/>

- Frank, A. G. (1979). *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Friedman, T. (1999, March 28). What the World Needs Now. *New York Times* .
- Gardner, L. C., LaFeber, W. F., & McCormick, T. J. (1973). *Creation of the American Empire: U.S. Diplomatic History*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Giddens, A. (2006). Dimensions of Globalization. In D. S. Eitzen, & M. Baca Zinn, *In Globalization: The Transformation of Social Worlds*. Belmont: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Grandin, G. (2006). *Empire's Workshop*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Guissé, E. H. (2004, February 27). *Third World Debt A Continuing Legacy Of Colonialism: Working paper UN Sub Commission on Human Rights* . Retrieved January 2007, 2007, from Southcentre.org/info/southbulletin/bulletin8: <http://www.southcentre.org/info/southbulletin/bulletin85/bulletin85.htm>
- Haas, R. N. (1999, September/October). *What to do with American Primacy*. Retrieved May 18, 2008, from Brookings Institution: http://www.brookings.edu/articles/1999/09diplomacy_haass.aspx
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hiatt, S. (2007). Global Empire: The Web of Control. In S. Hiatt, *A Game As Old As Empire* (pp. 13-29). San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2003, June 11). *After Winning the War The Empire Expands Wider and Still Wider*. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Counterpunch: <http://www.counterpunch.org/hobsbawm06112003.html>
- Institute, I. I. (2006). *World Rankings*. Retrieved June 26, 2008, from Financial Services Fact Book: <http://www.iii.org/financial2/world/world/>
- Johnson, C. (2004). . . *The Sorrows of Empire*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Kennedy, R. G. (2003). *Mr. Jefferson's Lost Cause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krauthammer, C. (2001, March 5). The Bush Doctrine. *Time*.
- LeFeber, W. (2002). *Michael Jordan and the New Global Capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Luce, H. R. (1941). *The American Century*. New York: Farrar and Rhinehart.
- Magdoff, H. (2003). *Imperialism without Colonies*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Maier, C. S. (2005). An American Empire?: The Problems of Frontiers and Peace in Twenty-First Century Politics. In L. C. Young, *The New American Empire* (pp. xi-ix). New York: The New Press.
- McChesney, R. (1997, November/December). *The Global Media Giants*. Retrieved June 12, 2000, from In Extra! FAIR: <http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=1406>

- McKinley, J. J. (2004, September 28). *No, the Conquistadors Are Not Back. It's Just Wal-Mart*. Retrieved August 4, 2006, from New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/28/international/americas/28mexico.html?ex=1254110400&en=9f21ee7203878784&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt>
- Monthly Review. (2002). *U.S. Military Bases and Empire*. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from Monthly Review: <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0302editr.htm>
- Morley, D., & Robins, K. (1996). *The End of What? Spaces of Identity. Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- Munkler, H. (2007). *Empires*. Malden: Polity.
- Nation, T. (2002, January 7/14). *The Top Ten*. Retrieved May 2, 2006, from The Nation Magazine.: <http://www.thenation.com/special/bigten.html>
- Network, C. B. (2008). *About CBN WorldReach*. Retrieved February 23, 2008, from CBN.com: http://www.cbn.com/worldreach/worldreach_about.aspx
- Pearce, J. (1982). *Under the Eagle*. Boston: South End Press.
- Perkins, J. (2004). *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler .
- Petras, J., & Veltmeyer, H. (2001). *Globalization Unmasked*. London: Zed Books.
- Programme, U. N. (1998). *United Nations Development Report 1998*. Retrieved January 23, 2006, from Human Development Reports: http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1998_en.pdf
- Proliferation, T. C. (2008, February 22). *The FY 2009 Pentagon Spending Request - Global Military Spending*. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from The Center for Arms Control and Proliferation: http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/securityspending/articles/fy09_dod_request_global/
- Renner, M. (2000). *Corporate Mergers Skyrocket*. Retrieved January 24, 2007, from Global Policy Forum: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/soecon/tncs/mergers/renner.htm>
- Ritzer, G. (2004). *The Globalization of Nothing*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forest Press.
- Robinson, W. J. (1996). *Promoting Polyarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roy, A. (2004, December 7). *People vs. Empire*. Retrieved January 6, 2007, from In These Times : <http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/1740/>
- Schiller, H. (1969). *Mass Communications and the American Empire*. New York: Kelley.
- Schiller, H. (1985, September 21). Breaking the West's Media Monopoly. *The Nation* , pp. 248-251.
- Schlosser, E. (2001). *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal*. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin Co.

Shields, J. C. (1997, May). *Export Promotion Programs*. Retrieved February 21, 2008, from Corporate Wealthfare Project & TaxWatch: http://www.fpif.org/briefs/vol2/v2n34exp_body.html

Solimano, A. (2001, November). *INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC ORDER: AN OVERVIEW*. Retrieved January 3, 2008, from Macroeconomics and Growth Development Economics Research Group: The World Bank: http://66.102.1.104/scholar?hl=en&lr=&q=cache:gyT60tgFMF4J:econ.worldbank.org/files/2728_wps2720.pdf+author:%22Solimano%22+intitle:%22International+Migration+and+the+Global+Economic+Order:+...%22

Sourcewatch. (2007 , November 16). "*Christian Broadcasting Network*. Retrieved February 20, 2008, from Sourcewatch: http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Christian_Broadcasting_Network

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Tabb, B. (2004). "The Two Wings of the Eagle." *Pox Americana: Exposing the American Empire*. In B. J. Foster, & R. W. McChesney. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Tinker, G. E. (1993). *Missionary Conquest*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press.

VanAlstyne, R. W. (1960). *The Rising American Empire*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Wallerstein, I. (2003). *The Decline of American Power*. New York: The New Press.

Weinberg, A. K. (1935). *Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Williams, W. A. (2007). *Empire as a Way of Life*. Brooklyn: Ig Publishing.

