

THE FIRST REAL WORLD WAR AND THE EMERGING NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST

Petri Minkkinen

University of Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: petri.minkkinen@helsinki.fi

Recibido: 14 Diciembre 2006 / Revisado: 24 Enero 2007 / Aceptado: 31 Enero 2007 / Publicación Online: 15 Junio 2007

Abstract: In this article the problematic of the First Real World War (FRWW) is discussed in the light of Emerging Nuclear Holocaust. This discussion begins with an overview of Warren W. Wagars science-fiction novel *A Short History of Future* and related some fifty years transition period conceived within world-systems analysis and as that of a major bifurcation by Immanuel Wallerstein. It may thus be possible to pass into the future sooner than anticipated and reconstruct the passage of history, actuality and future in actuality and nearer than anticipated future, possibly without a Nuclear Holocaust and it may be possible to end the FRWW without further negative regressions into the past and without a Second Real World War. Our common world is also experiencing a transition from a broad historical context of Eurocentric globalization into a non-Eurocentric one, which may also be non-capitalistic.

Keywords: First Real World War, Nuclear Holocaust, new imperialism, global nationalism, integral fascism, history, actuality, future, Eurocentric and non-Eurocentric broad historical context.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of new imperialism, militarist aggressive global nationalism and hard form of integral fascism of the George W. Bush administrations supported by his faithful “socialist” adjutant Tony Blair and the right-wing “social democracy” of the previous Finland’s coalition government headed by Paavo Lipponen, our common world seems to be heading for a total nuclear holocaust. In a sense, this possibly emerging global dystopia recreates the nuclear war scenario prevalent during the Third Eurocentric Civil War of the 20th century in the context of the First Real World War

(FRWW) *de facto* declared by the first Bush administration after the S-11-2001 atrocities. It is possible to suggest that the combination of development of nuclear power for military utilization represented by the Bush-Blair coalition and the development of civilian-commercial nuclear power represented by the civilian-commercial nuclear power promotion by Lipponen open up possibilities for direct or indirect annihilation of the human kind in the context of a Nuclear Holocaust in the foreseeable future.

On the other hand, as has been the case in the course of human history, though it is possible to identify certain cyclical and repetitive tendencies how the things have been and emerged, such tendencies are not however necessary and can be reversed through intentional human action and transformative politics. It is for example possible that the change of power relations taking place within the US political class may undo the dystopic aspirations of the second Bush administration and, among other things, undo the recent US tendency for militaristic adventurism and related promotion of military nuclear utilization and its escalation. On the other hand, the escalation of civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, lead by Lipponen, seems to have powerful supporters within the intermixed capitalist-political class not only within the European Union but also globally. Given the interrelated nature of military and civilian-commercial nuclear utilization and development, it is possible that even if the escalation and development of military nuclear power were to halt down as such, prevention of the emerging nuclear holocaust will fail due to partial nature of this de-escalation and the apparently peaceful nature of civilian-commercial nuclear development and utilization prepares way for the rapid re-

escalation of military nuclear utilization. In other words, even though it may be possible to promote de-escalation and lessen the prospects of nuclear holocaust through military nuclear utilization, we should not underestimate the combined power of military and civilian-commercial nuclear utilization promoters and consequent re-escalation.

In order to discuss these questions I first explain what is meant by the First Real World War and how it is related to the changes taking place in the global political and economic context. As an introduction to this discussion I analyze the world-systems analysis based science-fiction novel by W. Warren Wager. I proceed by analyzing the policy lines promoted by certain key actors which have promoted the possibility of emerging nuclear holocaust. By way of conclusion I discuss the emancipative transformations taking place in the global power relations and the possibilities to prevent nuclear holocaust in the context of compression of time and putting time back into joint.

1. THE FIRST REAL WORLD WAR

In his world-system analysis based science-fiction or science-fiction book *A Short History of the Future* (1989) W. Warren Wager made a long term future scenario which is temporarily in line with the analysis of Immanuel Wallerstein published in 1995, in which he suggested that “We are entering a period of transition, which may go on for some fifty years, and which can be described as a major ‘bifurcation’ (*vide* Prigogine) whose outcome is uncertain. We cannot predict the worldview(s) of the system(s) that will emerge from the ruins of our present one. We cannot predict what ideologies will be born or how many there will be, if any”¹. Within this time frame Wager perceived an actualizing nuclear war, the beginnings of which he described as follows:

“In 2044, the lords of capital ran out of luck. They had, from the beginning, made one fatal miscalculation. Even after they seized de facto control of most of the world’s affairs in the early 2000s, they did not oust the politicians and set up their own dictatorship.

Officially, legally, constitutionally, and sometimes in actual fact, sovereignty remained vested in the various states, which from time to time continued to indulge themselves in struggles for glory and mastery, as they had

done in the days of Napoleon Bonaparte Kaiser Wilhelm II or Adolf Hitler. The survival of sovereignty meant that deep within the world-system, which was otherwise managed quite rationally, lay a core of irrationality, kept alive and warm by puerile megalomania. As we have seen, capital actually benefited in its earlier days from this division of authority. But in time the division became obsolete and counterproductive. Since the lords of capital had imposed severe limits on the state system but failed to wring its neck, the possibility lingered that one fine day, when the attention of the Global Trade Consortium was occupied elsewhere, the politicians would run amok and plunge the planet into a general war”².

This prognosis, which contains the idea of a nuclear war between the Soviet Union and the United States, the latter of which had withdrawn from the Confederated States of the Earth, runs roughly the following course of events. By 2000 the world economic system, in the context of which Western capital had gone beyond the traditional boundaries of Western civilization, had become a nearly complete planetary system and the world economic order was “indelibly and irreversibly” capitalist. By 2008 the high commissioner of the newly formed Global Trade Consortium (GTC) was in a position to say to his GTC-fellows: “My friends, nothing can stop us now”. Multinational corporations had grown increasingly larger and by 2010 they were known in all languages as “megacorps”. In 2001, after the severe repression of 1995-2001, began the last Kondratieff long wave and with only brief interruptions “capital flourished as never before, aided by technological breakthroughs such as intelligent industrial robots. Until the 2030’s the situation of middle and lower social sections of the rich countries remained “at least tolerable” whereas “the masses in periphery and less affluent portions the semiperiphery [such as Spain, China and Brazil] gained nothing”. By 2030 the income distribution between the haves and the have-nots had become highly unequal, not only in the traditional capitalist countries but also in the socialist countries such as the Soviet Union, which belonged to the core countries. In Wager’s narrative, “The world economy of capital wrested unprecedented wealth from the earth [... and] at the peak of its last long wave, capital had carried our species to the threshold of universal abundance”. In 2032 the world economy entered into a great depression, which was “the most brutal in history”. In 2038 and

2043, which were the low points of this depression, “half of the workers in the core countries and more than half the workers in the periphery had no work”. There was a short recovery in 2041-42 followed by “a second plunge in the winter of 2041-42”. During the summer of 2044 things looked a bit brighter just before another kind of catastrophe³.

Meanwhile, in the context of the last long wave of capital, nuclear arms proliferation continued. At the time of the comprehensive arms limitation protocol signed at the Vienna conference in 1998 the United States, the Soviet Union, China, France, Great Britain, Israel, India, Pakistan and South Africa had nuclear weapons. In the context of Vienna protocol the number of nuclear warheads diminished but these arms become increasingly accurate and more difficult to detect. By 2011 the US had established its shielding system against nuclear warheads constructed in the context of the strategic defense initiative launched during the Reagan administration. The Soviet Union established their system by 2018 and the West Europeans with the help of Japan by 2021. Japan joined the nuclear club in 1999, Australia in 2008, Sweden in 2012, Switzerland in 2015, South Korea in 2017 and Italy in 2025. Also countries such as Iran, Iraq, Indonesia, Nigeria, Brazil and Argentina have for short periods of time had “a small number of battlefield weapons”. During the economic crisis of the 2030's and early 2040's “extremist political movements attained a measure of respectability” and “those with the most formidable backing from the elements of the ruling elites sought to revive nationalism, racism, and imperialism, in the guise of a people's crusade against what they perceived as a flabby, decadent cosmopolitanism”. The Middle East emerged as a major international problem, the Soviets invaded the West Bank “with the pretext to pacify the area” and the US and Soviet leaders “traded insults and threats of Armageddon”. The Soviets withdrew in October 2042 but decided to annex Israel in December 2043 and established the Autonomous District of the Jordan Valley (ADJOV)⁴.

The Second Vienna Conference of 2026 had established a “true world government by reconstituting the United Nations as the Confederated States of the Earth (CSE)”. Between 2026 and 2044 “the domination of poor countries by the rich was so complete that no significant military operations were required to

keep it functioning smoothly”. Before the Soviet annexation of Israel, the Palestinians had established a new political formation, the Independent Front for Freedom in Palestine in 2042, which was recognized by the CSE observers as “a legitimate indigenous protest movement and urged the Israelis to recognize and deal with it”, which they did not but instead engaged in repression which aroused the Arab population in arms. The occupying Soviets dominated the ADJOV, and engaged in repression against the dissident Israelis. In the US, president Mary Chávez had been in trouble in her bid for the second term due to dismal economic situation and she needed “a sensational victory in foreign affairs” and this need was reinforced because her Republican opponents wanted to “restore America's place in the sun” one of them “called for a crusade of crusades against the greatest heresy of our times, one-worldism”. Chávez called for “Soviet withdrawal and the full restoration of Israeli sovereignty ‘by Christmas’” and the US military forces around the world “were placed on full alert”. In December 2043 the CSE censured the US for its ultimatum to the Soviet Union and the next day Chávez “announced the withdrawal of the US from the CSE. The crisis deepened and without consulting any other power the US began its nuclear attack against the Soviet Union and in the course of nuclear war “Most of North America and the Soviet Union was destroyed, together with many parts of Western and Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and North America.” Nuclear war between Pakistan and India destroyed much of the Indian subcontinent. Parts of China and southern India, parts of Europe as well as parts of Mexico, Central America, Latin America, Australia and Southern Africa were less damaged in the war and its aftermath⁵.

Wagar's science-fiction contains various important elements which allow us to give credit to world-systems analysis and to his history of the future approach. However, when we analyze recent and actual events and development paths in the history as it happened in the really existing world, we notice that many of these events projected to the future have already happened or are in the process of formation. Next I proceed to explain these real world events and point at in proper places to the similarities and dissimilarities with Wagar's narrative. The thesis which will be analyzed and substantiated is that we may be in a historical situation in which many of the paths and events developed in Wagar's long term narrative are

compressed to the existing and emerging actuality and the transformations projected to the future are taking place here and now. I will also suggest that many of the historical events of different past decades and centuries are present in the actuality and in a historical period in which, as suggested by Jacques Derrida, “time is out of joint”⁶, we may well be in an actuality in which these historical events and paths and projected futures collide. Moreover, it may be possible to pass into the future sooner than anticipated and reconstruct the passage of history, actuality and future in actuality and nearer than anticipated future, possibly without a Nuclear Holocaust.

Human intervention in the events and paths of history always has an impact in the course of history. Sometimes it is possible that individuals and groupings with no anticipated possibilities of impact can change the ways the future develops in the actuality. It is often supposed that those individuals and groupings with most human and material resources and suitably placed in the locations, corridors and networks of power are best positioned to impact the course of history. It is however difficult to preview which kinds of individuals and groupings emerge as the makers of history and quite often those best equipped and positioned to have such an impact cannot manage the process they are about to initiate or have initiated, and despite apparent change of history’s course, they end up undoing the possibilities of the course of history they preferred. This is obviously the case of the new imperialist group of the United States which made an attempt to alter the course of history in the context of the events of 2001 which opened up possibilities to impose a new dystopic world-order in the context of their new imperialist political program and the First Real World War they initiated. True, they did have an impact, the highly negative consequences of which have terrorized and distorted our common world up to date but it is also evident that they cannot control the process they initiated and which has had tremendous unintended consequences which, for their part, have contributed to the emergence of an actuality and near future very much different to the state of affairs they had in mind to restore and impose. One important part of this unintended state of affairs is the fact that the United States is in the process of losing its global position, contrary to the project to preserve it and enhance it as planned by the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), which in 2000, the year

George W. Bush had been elevated to the presidency of the US, suggested that in order the required radical increase in U.S. military expenditure, “the process of transformation [which would bring this about], even if it brings a revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic or catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbour”⁷.

Besides the actualized wish of a catalytic event, the PNAC was aware that in order to balance the US military power, the “smaller adversarial states, looking for an equalizing advantage, are required to acquire their own weapons of mass destruction”. However, “whatever our fondest wishes”, the PNAC’s conception of the reality of world helped them to make a conclusion that there is no “magic wand” to eliminate these weapons or a wish to acquire them and thus “detering their use requires a reliable and dominant U.S. nuclear capability”⁸. Thus, the new imperialist aggressive global nationalists arose to power already in 2000 and launched the First Real World War in 2001, in a context of a US and global economic crisis threatening capitalist world-order or world-system, fearful one-worldism and other kinds of oppositional movements representing alternatives to the existing order of things, and the activation of semi-permanent Middle-East crisis, one purpose of which was to achieve a sensational victory and to restore Americas place in the sun, besides and along with launching a war against the humanity and especially internal and external others, with the help of nationally oriented economic sections of the US ruling classes with less de-territorialized economic interests and thus not solely by the politicians as such, though not necessarily in accordance with the sections of transnationally oriented economic classes, whose interests were at least somewhat better represented by the World Trade Organization established in 1995 as well as the Bretton Woods twins, International Monetary Fund and World Bank Group⁹.

What, then, do I mean by the First Real World War (FRWW) and why it has been launched at this particular situation? The First Real World War initiated by the first administration of George W. Bush is the first global war which is not waged primarily between the Eurocentric ideologues underlining the necessity of economic growth and their representatives. It is composed of the war on terror and non-white others, the new imperialist wars of occupation and a world-wide compound of internal civil

wars. In the case of first variant, the war on terror and non-white others, a gross generalization of labeling almost all kind of oppositional and activity and social alternatives promotion and production as terrorist activity is being made and this presupposition does not necessarily require that the alleged terrorists engage in violent activities. This was the initial tone and the intent of the new imperialists whom, in the context of S-11-2001 atrocities, created, reinforced and utilized an atmosphere of fear and intimidation which allowed them to impose strict social control and comprehensive and institutionalized system of internal surveillance within the United States and on its territorial borders and to strengthen and promote similar measures outside its national territory. Social control was extended also into the cyberspace of internet, as the surveillance of information circulating within this sphere was intensified¹⁰. Similar though not necessarily always exactly the same and of similar intensity measures of internal control were adopted also by other political entities, such as the European Union, despite the fact that many aspects of the occupation war in Iraq as well as the war on terror and non-white others in itself were criticized within and outside the decision-making circles.

It is also important to point at the non-white others element of the war on terror, due to the fact that many of its direct victims are of non-European descent – especially of Arab-Semitic descent or with “typical Islamist” physical features, the most potential terrorists of all – or mixed breed as is the case of for example Mexican mestizo-population within and outside the US as well as on entry and exit points of the US. Moreover, those of European descent but of “lesser breed” with darker skin colour are considered more potential terrorists than their whiter co-descendants. Also the fact that those belonging to non-respectable social sectors, even if their skin colour is white, are more potential terrorists, underline the importance of adding non-white others element, this time with the connotation of internal and external social others, to the name of this part of the FRWW. In the case of the United States – and also outside it – black skin colour, Islam as religion with constructed connotation to Islamism and social position as either internal or external other can also be defining features of a single human being. Moreover and in addition to the abovementioned necessary defining features, it is essential to remember that independently of

our social, economic or ethnic background, we all are considered potential targets of the war on terror and non-white others.

When we discuss terrorism, I have defined terrorism as “physical and mental violence against innocent civilians, which causes one or more deaths or injuries and which aims at the promotion of political objectives in ways which increase fear and disintegration in target community.” This definition can be applied to the cases of non-state terrorism as well as state terrorism and it excludes military, paramilitary and other such units which can be considered as parts of an asymmetric war¹¹. This definition demands further discussion of the legitimacy of the use of violence in the context of global war on terror and non-white others waged in auspices of the FRWW. It is evident that also in this case mental and physical violence against civilian population with above mentioned objectives can be seen as terrorism. Due to the fact that in the context of war on terror and non-white others we all are considered potential terrorists, this definition demands us to question the legality, not only of the war of occupation in Iraq which was from the point of view of international law clearly illegal, but also the whole idea of global war on terror and non-white others – and its applications in the national, macro-regional and global legislation and similar law-like degrees. Without going into deeper discussion on the human nature, which cannot be done in this context, it is possible to suggest that all human beings cannot be either bad, criminal, or terrorists – as suggested by the ideologues of war on terror and non-white others – at least all the time. From this it follows that such a war declared by a few persons leading one state¹² or certain human beings deciding on legislations¹³ allowing such a state of war, can be considered illegal, or only pseudo-legal, emerging from a repressive and non-representative social condition, and in any case, unethical. Moreover, in the context of a global state of war, such a war itself can be considered representing world-wide state-terrorism and as such a crime against humanity¹⁴.

On the second variant, the most obvious case is the II Iraq war launched in 2003 and declared over relatively soon but which has not ended by the time of writing this article in January-February 2007 and which is already lost by the US and the shrunken “coalition of the willing”. II Iraq war was initiated with the pretext of false and fabricated “causes” such as the claims of

Saddam Hussein Iraq's involvement with the atrocities of 9-11-2001 and that his regime possessed weapons of mass destruction, including a possibility that it was in a process to reinstate a supposed nuclear weapons production plan. This war has, as I warned in 2004, turned *also* into a civil war, which can be seen as one part and variant of the world-wide compound of internal civil wars intimately connected to the FRWW. However, one should not fall into a trap of believing that the II Iraq war is nowadays only a civil war, because this state of affairs is one aspect of the ongoing war of occupation¹⁵. Moreover, as it has been the case all the time, the presence of occupying foreign troops is the main – if not the only¹⁶ – reason for the ongoing civil strife. Moreover, the second Bush administration may be in a process to begin another new imperialist war of occupation also against Iran – the government of which has all the time been the main target, not only of new imperialist Bush administration, but also other US administrations ever since Iran's Islamic revolution in 1979. It is also possible that such aggressive policies will be launched against Syria. As was the case of Iraq, also now there are allegations that Iran is building or planning to build weapons of mass destruction, and in this case, as was also the case in the context of the I Iraq war, Iran's alleged nuclear weapons plans, which, as tend to be the case, conveniently forget the fact that both the US and Great Britain are renewing their nuclear weapons arsenal¹⁷.

In the case of third variant, a global compound or network of internal civil wars, civil wars are fought against the non-white, dissident, non-conformist and deviant elements in every country which is within the sphere in which the war on terror and non-white others is waged. These countries or other political units may have formal or less formal agreements or comparable arrangements uniting these internal civil wars, for example as a macro-regional or trans-regional internal civil war. In the case that such arrangements are global, the internal civil war component becomes a global internal civil war. In these latter cases it is possible to see certain similarities with the First, Second and Third Eurocentric Civil Wars of 20th century, which were, however, waged primarily between the Eurocentric economic growth ideologies and their representatives, which remains a separating feature in relation to the First Real World War and its components as defined here and elsewhere¹⁸. Moreover, internal civil wars as a

part of global network of internal civil wars, may be a result of a new imperialist war of occupation (as in Iraq) or be connected to an internal civil war which is related to the war on terror and non-white others as declared by the first Bush administration, and be connected to a civil war that predates the declaration of the FRWW and be related to the proto-phases of the actual war on terror and non-white others of earlier US administrations, which were also related to the power politics involved in the Third Eurocentric Civil War (as in Somalia)¹⁹. In any case, internal and possibly extended civil wars, are related to the war on terror and non-white others, and therefore, to the war against internal and external others, white or non-white, with the emphasis on the latter, and in general to the FRWW (against humanity).

An element which unites all parts of the First Real World War is a concentration and torture camp such as Guantánamo or Abu Ghraib. In order to end up into these facilities, you are supposedly a combatant or an enemy either of the war of occupation, the war on terror and non-white others or some or some part of the global network of internal civil wars, which may or may not overlap in a single human being. It is also possible to consider concentration camp as an element of this war and a social condition which defines one national state, in which case walls and other wall-like surveillance and control measures define the entry or exit, or lack of them in this political unit. In a situation in which this kind of state of affairs is imposed globally, there are natural limits for the entry or exit of this political unit, given the fact that at this point permanent human existence outside these limits is impossible and even the temporary being outside it is possible only for selected few. This is not however to be considered a necessary global condition.

The FRWW and its component war varieties can also be analyzed in terms of globalizing integral fascism, a part of which are differing modes of domination, repression, subjugation and forms of control and surveillance exercised by various social groups, especially but not only the ruling and governing segments of societies. These differing modalities are built into the broad historical context of Eurocentric globalization, a starting point of which can be located to 1492, as typical for the Eurocentric expansion and forms of global domination, but varieties of which have been present and will probably be in some form present outside the temporal limits of

this particular broad historical context²⁰. It is possible to analyze the political programs of neo-liberalism and new imperialism in connection with corresponding light and hard forms of integral fascism²¹. In the first case, there is a growing tendency toward transferring social control and domination to private or semi-private organs and institutions, in line with the overall tendency to privatize and individualize the economic, political, social and cultural practices. However, at least in some parts of the world there is, in the context of more or less sincere willingness to respect the human rights, a simultaneous tendency to uncover and judge past crimes against the humanity and the dissident sectors of societies, which may be related to increased importance given to individual human beings, in the broader context of tendency toward social atomization. Despite the seeming relaxation of social control and apparent and superficial individualization, there is, however, a growing market forces lead and political forces facilitated tendency toward the unification of human practices and norms and at least in some parts of the world, especially in the US and the UK, a growing tendency toward deeper and intensified social control, securitization and emerging militarization of societies in the name of protecting of a society which allows social atomization. Even if we find social and political dissolution in both rich and poor countries and wars in different parts of the world, there is a tendency toward peaceful resolution of conflicts and social change.

In the latter case, despite the continuous privatization of social control and also of military and paramilitary based repression and warfare, there is a simultaneous revalorization of the public sphere especially in relation to law and order practices, repression and torture, social control and warfare with the pretext of “demands” of the war on terror and non-white others. There is effectively a reunification of private and public forms of social control, now with the emphasis on the latter, on every layer of the society, extending over every single human being, and especially internal and external others, dissidents and those considered socially deviant. Moreover, in the context of recovered sense of society and communality, and, after the relatively brief manufactured intensive period of outright fear, hate and fear and hate production, in the apparent context of still very limited reappearance of human liberties, social control within the societies and also by the individual members of civil society intensifies, again with

the pretext of the war on terror and non-white others. Social change is promoted – and attempted to prevent – by forceful, repressive and military means and there is a tendency to strive for domination of “friendly” states primarily through indirect and detached means and “unfriendly” states through direct and forceful domination on the spot. There is a general tendency toward undermining human and personal rights and the concentration and torture camps utilized by the aggressive and expansive nationalists during the Second Eurocentric Civil War reappear²². Security and surveillance structures are strengthened and in various states such as the US and Russia political decision-making circles are filled with people with roots in or with close connections to old and new intelligence institutions. On interstate and trans-social levels, it is possible to identify a dominant pole of globalizing integral fascism, the United States²³, as well as various forms of dependent integral fascism, of which, in the context of this article, one may point at small technologically advanced countries such as Finland and Israel, which are in many ways dependent on various social forces and practices of the dominant pole of integral fascism, and parts of the ruling and governing segments of which have also been in key positions in the construction of emerging nuclear holocaust, the problematic of which is to be discuss in the following section.

2. THE EMERGING NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST

In the context of Second Eurocentric Civil War the aggressive and expansive nationalist of that era, represented by the National Socialist German Worker’s party (NSDAP) applied a political program which was targeted against the non-white others, political opponents and other groups and individuals considered deviant from the point of view of the ideal society, social relations and social norms adopted by the adherents of NSDAP, the so-called Nazis. Their political program carried to the extreme the views related to racial hygiene and white supremacy that had been promoted in the United States and Europe during recent decades and which in various formulations had been built into the European global expansion which began during the 15th century and especially after 1492, as suggested by the view presented here on the inbuilt nature of integral fascism into the broad historical context of Eurocentric globalization. Their political program promoted

the extermination of Semites, especially the Jews, whom were considered as a racial group, as well as the Gypsies, homosexuals and communists, among others. In order to carry out the extermination program they utilized to the extreme the results of technological development involved in the capitalist modernity as well as the methodologies separating unwanted individuals and groups from the rest of society, which materialized in the form of concentration camp, the most (in-)famous of which was Auschwitz (Oświęcim), located in Poland conquered by the German army. The end result of this process, ending of which was not considered the first priority by the Allied leaders – or, for that matter, probably by the Soviets either – was the extermination of millions of human beings²⁴. We know this process by the name Holocaust (or Ha-Shoah), which most often is meant to refer the exterminations of Jews, which, though numerically large part of the exterminated, was by no means the only purpose of the extermination process. It is estimated that about 50 million people died during the Second Eurocentric Civil War of the 20th century, about 20 million of whom were Russians or Soviets. In this article I suggest that the ongoing process of escalation of civilian-commercial and military development and utilization of nuclear technology promotes a Nuclear Holocaust, which may lead to the death of millions or billions of human beings and possibly to an extermination of the humanity and substantial sections of flora and fauna as well²⁵.

Scientific research as in fact any other human activity has intended and unintended consequences as well as various combinations between such forms of consequences. The former, as represented in this case especially by natural sciences, has the capacity to unveil previously unknown possibilities to transform the relation between organic and inorganic worlds as well as these component worlds and parts of them themselves and the conjunct of organic and inorganic worlds. In the context of capitalist modernity and the political, economic and other competition and power struggles between different units within it pose and have posed threats for scientific inquiry by increasing the possibilities of unintended consequences of disinterested scientific inquiry – when scientific inquiry itself had not been subjugated into the service of such purposes. Basic natural science in relation to unintended consequences, i.e. use and misuse of the results of scientific inquiry, in

the form of civilian-commercial and military utilization of nuclear reactions²⁶ represents a clear example of this, as is suggested e.g. by the discussion what is the degree of guiltiness, if any, of Albert Einstein to the development of especially military nuclear power and mass-murders which took place in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After the Second Eurocentric Civil War, which was, as the First and Third Eurocentric Civil War of 20th century, a battle between the Eurocentric economic growth ideologies and their representatives, and in the context of which the United States had used nuclear weapons against the Japanese civilian population in abovementioned locations, there emerged concerns in relation to civilian-commercial and military utilization of nuclear reactions.

In the Agreed Declaration of November 15, 1945, the heads of state and government of the US, the UK and Canada “recognized that the development of atomic energy, and the application of it in weapons of war, have placed at the disposal of mankind ‘means of destruction hitherto unknown’”. In 1946 the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report recognized that, “the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the development of atomic energy for bombs are in much of their course interchangeable and interdependent. From this it follows that although nations may agree not to use in bombs the atomic energy developed within their borders the only assurance that a conversion to destructive purposes would not be made would be the pledged word and the good faith of a nation itself. This fact puts an enormous pressure upon national good faith.”²⁷ These early recognitions involve various points of interest from the contemporary point of view. First of all, it is relatively obvious that most if not all actors involved as well as human beings in general agree that nuclear reactions involve tremendous possible threats. Secondly, there is no reason to believe that the relation between civilian-commercial and military nuclear energy and its development has changed. Thirdly, it is evident that though nations may have agreements in relation to nuclear development and utilization, we most often have to rely on good faith in relation to their intentions. Now, the members of “international community” have expressed their concern over the nuclear development project of Iran and that they do not have good faith in Iran’s plans, which are supposed to lead to the development of nuclear capacity for military utilization. This lack of

faith is said to have increased due to Iran's president's suggestion that Israel should be wiped of the map. It is not difficult to accept the view that wiping out of Israel²⁸ and especially Israeli population with conventional or nuclear weapons is unacceptable idea and practice²⁹.

Then, on the other hand, we are required to have good faith in, say, the intentions of permanent member-states of the UN Security Council and Israel. As mentioned, the United States is the only country which has used nuclear weapons against the civilian populations. It is also well known that the surface nuclear tests of e.g. the United States, France and Soviet Union-Russia have caused deaths and serious illnesses with possible transmission to the following generations within white population with European descendants as well as non-white populations with no such descendants. We are also aware that all the abovementioned countries are engaged in the commercial-civilian use of nuclear reactions and possess nuclear weapons, the destructive potential of which is well above the one's used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Moreover, besides the famous accidents in commercial-civilian nuclear plants of Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, there has been a continuous line of such accidents, as well as those related to military nuclear utilization e.g. in submarines, the severity of which has varied and that we can read almost daily basis of the problems related to civilian-commercial nuclear plants³⁰. Moreover, even if one were to have such good faith, there is a history and very likely the actuality of accidental use of nuclear weapons, as is reported to have happened for example in February 13, 1950, when an US military plane "B-36 en route from Alaska to Carswell Air Force Base in Fort Worth, Texas" in bad weather conditions dropped the nuclear weapons it carried "off the coast of British Columbia", Canada³¹. However, in recent decades and in the actuality it is not realistic to expect such a good faith, in a bit similar fashion though arising from different kind of world-view than that expressed by the PNAC, in their proposition in relation to small states, with clear implication especially to those populated by the non-white others.

One of the features neo-liberal and new imperialist political programs share, in the context of integral fascist mentality, is the tremendous contempt of human beings as individuals as well as human race as a whole, keeping in mind the partial reservations with this

respect mentioned above. In the first case, human beings are perceived as disposable commodities and depersonalized inputs in the economic processes – unless completely marginalized as excessive human waste of otherwise rational processes. In the second case, human individuals are perceived as potential threat units which can be shot, bombed and tortured to death. Humanity in itself is perceived as untrustworthy composition of dehumanized objects which can be wasted for example through a Nuclear Holocaust. In both cases dehumanization is carried to its extreme. However, despite the general tendency toward dehumanization, the non-white others are considered the most disposable. In the context of emerging Nuclear Holocaust, one may point at the earlier concept mega-death which was coined as a unit referring at a million deaths caused by a nuclear strike – and popularized by a heavy music group which adopted the term as its name. Within the ruling and governing circles which are in favor of neo-liberal political program and/or new imperialist political program and their respective modalities of integral fascism, there is a tendency to support both civilian-commercial and military utilization on nuclear reactions. This is one example of the general tendency involving contempt of human beings and the humanity, which is included also in popularized easy greenish – and also in certain brands of green fundamentalist – thinking, that human beings are less important than other segments of flora and fauna without considering enough human beings as parts of the ecosystem and our common world. One may also ask, in relation to the discussion on climate change, whether the concern over the rising sea levels at least partially involves a worry that the well-to-do rich country inhabitants can also in the future enjoy their beach mansions, in the context of which it is nice to express concern over the survival possibilities of polar bears or poor country inhabitants whom happen to live at low-land coastal areas?³²

Why then there has been an increasing tendency to forget the linkage between civilian-commercial and military nuclear utilization as well as the prospect of emerging Nuclear Holocaust? Besides the contempt of human beings, one can suggest that in general level this is related to the lack of historical knowledge and incorrect understanding of the contemporary global processes. On more practical-ideological level, we find the supporters of neo-liberal and new imperialist political programs doing active

propagation in favor of nuclear utilization. In relation to civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, one can point at the views of John Rich, Director General of the World Nuclear Association, who was of the opinion that his "personal friend of many years" [at that time] prime minister Paavo Lipponen "has contributed additional leadership by speaking clearly about modern Europe's need for nuclear power". Moreover, he recollected that Mr. Lipponen had considered European anti-nuclearism as "economically absurd"³³. When Finland's Parliament made a decision which allowed the construction of a new – country's fifth – nuclear plant in May 2002, the *Financial Times* considered in its editorial that this decision "has given the nuclear industry a morale boost". At that time a new nuclear plant would be the first one within the European Union in 10 years and also the United States had refrained from new nuclear plant construction for 20 years. However, they thought, at that time the nuclear industry could not yet "claim any renaissance". Besides this, outside the European Union-US context, various nuclear power plants were under construction in various Eastern European and Asian countries³⁴. In today's world things have changed considerably with this respect and it is hard to deny the responsibility of Lipponen lead (or Finnish industry lead) pro-nuclear power coalition in relation to this development. Mr. Rich, among many others, justifies the benefits of civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, among other things, with its supposed benefits in the struggle against the climate change, which is increasingly conceived as a result of human activity. One can accept the view which has received increasing support that climate change, which is increasingly conceived as human-made, is the main environmental threat our common world is facing. On the other hand, why should we accept the claim that civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, having its considerable problems in itself, as well as a clear linkage with the military nuclear utilization and the emerging Nuclear Holocaust, would be a solution, which it clearly is not and cannot be?

Now, there is nothing new that the owning, ruling and governing segments, in situations in which there is a threat to their own social position and existence, posed by radical ideas and practices as well as active individual and more collective action and organization are forced to adapt ideas – in real or and most often milder versions – promoted by such thought and action. In these situations the reason for doing so

is related to the willingness to prevent more radical social transformation and preserve the basic social structure intact even if there is or may be considerable revisions in the ways and modalities of managing the social system. Such was the case during the 19th century when in the context of revolutionary action and radical ideas presented by thinkers such as Karl Marx forced the practitioners of political economy to delimit their inquiry in order to externalize the problematic aspects related to the social reality reflected by the discipline as well as to introduce a certain degree of social protection. Another example is the New Deal policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, which were adapted amidst the economic crisis of the 1930's and in relation to the problems encountered with the revolutionary Mexico, in the context of which a set of policies admitting the problems of speculative capitalism, limiting the influence of certain sectors of national capitalists, transforming the foreign policy line of the US as well as increasing social protection were introduced, again in order to preserve the basic social structure³⁵. Another possibility is to adapt a repressive and aggressive posture in order to undo the emancipative and progressive social transformative politics and their realization – a policy line adopted successfully for example by Joseph Stalin and Adolf Hitler during their lifetime within their jurisdictions and increasingly unsuccessfully by George W. Bush within and beyond his jurisdiction.

In relation to civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, the nuclear industry, its association and their friends have utilized the crowing concern on climate change in order to promote their "economically non-absurd" interests. In the case of various countries, including the dominant promoter of new imperialism and hard form globalizing integral fascism, the US, as well as a representative of dependent form of integral fascism, Finland, there has been a perceived need to underline the importance of energy security, yet again, also but not only in relation to civilian-commercial utilization of nuclear reactions. Both of these countries and Israel have also been concerned with the internal and external security, due to real or constructed reasons. Though Finland has both internally and externally (especially within the European Union) promoted practices related to the war on terror and non-white others, there is a relatively broad understanding that internal and global security is related to socio-political issues (which, however, have not sufficiently been

reflected in the overall policies of societal development of that country) and not necessarily to terrorism as such³⁶. On the other hand, the overall Finnish integration policy in relation to the European Union is based on the imaginary of potential external threat from the part of Russia³⁷, which has been reflected in the urge that Finland should belong to all core institutions of the EU as well as in the views presented by some ruling and governing sectors – though not shared by the population – that Finland should become a member of NATO, a military alliance which has clearly been transformed into a part of new imperialist policies to be found, besides the US, within the EU. On the other hand, the US and Israel, both of which are constructed as states on conquered territories³⁸ (as well as Finland, for that matter³⁹) and have been actively promoting policies aimed at the internal and external others of all racial descendants as well as constructed and self-enforced external threat, to be struggled against with all possible means, including nuclear weapons, for the use of which they themselves have granted a right.

On the other hand, all these three and many other countries have promoted policies which promote internal and external insecurity, either through neo-liberal political program or new imperialist political program with respective forms of integral fascism⁴⁰. This is also related to economic globalization, however defined or applied within these political programs, one aspect of which has been the emergence of corporations with global or nearly global presence and/or activities, such as General Motors, Exxon, Sony, Shell and Nokia, all of which have interests to be defended and countries, institutions and political actors promoting and defending their interests, and the representatives of which are also by themselves interest promoters and creators.

In relation to civilian-commercial nuclear utilization as well as ruling and governing classes to tackle this issue without compromising their vested interests, one may point at another Finnish key figure in relation to the FRWW, the war on terror and non-white others and the emerging Nuclear Holocaust, Jorma Ollila, the former CEO of Nokia, a nominally Finnish but mostly foreign own telecommunication giant, which as other similar high-tech corporations, contributes to the development of equipment which serves the purpose surveillance component involved in the

war on terror and non-white others, and the current chair of board of oil-giant Shell. The relation of Anglo-Dutch Shell to the new imperialist war of occupation in Iraq is evident, not only because British troops participate and also Dutch troops have participated in the war of occupation⁴¹, one purpose of which is to destroy Iraq's previous social structure and reconstruct this country in order to serve the particular economic interests of especially the US but also "allied" economic forces, first of all those involved in non-deterritorialized economic activities, such as oil extraction and refining. Shell is also among the oil-giants to which the Bush administration has planned to prioritize in the utilization of Iraq's oil assets through the production sharing agreements (PSA) which would give them oil extraction rights for a 30 years period⁴². Moreover, Ollila leads the European Round Table of Industrialists (ERT) and has been involved in the activities of Trilateral Commission and Bilderberg Group, all of which plan and organize the activities of rich country ruling and governing segments. From the point of view of the war of occupation, his participation to the Bilderberg meetings has given him possibilities to socialize with the key figures of NATO and US officials involved in the planning of the war of occupation⁴³.

Besides benefiting from and most likely supporting the war of conquest in Iraq, Shell positively though not necessarily with full sincerity conceives alternative energy sources such as advanced solar, wind, biofuels and hydrogen as parts of a "long-term response to climate change and concerns about energy security."⁴⁴ Of these, biofuel fever has already increased the suffering of poor people for example in Mexico, where this has been at least a partial reason for price increase of maize which is the basic staple of local poor people, especially indigenous people⁴⁵. However, oil majors have a major stake in the continuity of oil production and can be seen as at least partial competitors with civilian-commercial nuclear utilization. Besides that it is obvious that at least the "Western" oil and nuclear industries, besides willing to increase their share as providers of the contemporary and future energy consumption, have a shared interest in propagating for "energy security" while at the same time benefiting from the wars of conquest as well as from the escalation of civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, with evident connection to military nuclear utilization. In other words, while benefiting from the war and nuclear escalation,

they both stand to improve their future earnings the field of partly competing alternative energy sources, especially those conceived as alternatives to greenhouse gas emissions and CO₂. This is reflected also in the policy line of the ERT, which indicates concerns over CO₂ emissions and the development of climate friendly technology, though basically interested in business competitiveness, as indicated in its letter to the European Commission, which does not exclude civilian-commercial nuclear utilization from the possible alternatives to CO₂ emissions⁴⁶.

In this case we can detect yet another case of green-washing, in similar ways the social democratic parties which supposedly promote common good while pushing further reforms based on neo-liberal political program and the conservative parties claiming to promote well-being of the workers but effectively interested in the deepening of these “reforms”, besides being even more in favor of new imperialist political program and hard form integral fascism than social democratic parties⁴⁷. Moreover, the ERT and other business organizations have traditionally had close relations with the European Commission, which has proposed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promotes the creation of true internal EU energy market, and conceives nuclear energy as a way to promote a shift to low carbon energy and suggests that if the level of nuclear energy use reduces, this must be rebalanced by “other low energy sources”⁴⁸. Therefore, despite different ways to masquerade the civilian-commercial nuclear utilization issue, when not promoted openly, many ruling and governing elements are in favor of it and in the context of European Union, which has, despite previous, shown more interest in environmental problems, there are two countries, Great Britain and France, which are in possession of nuclear weapons and of these, Great Britain has announced to develop further its nuclear weapons arsenal⁴⁹.

In relation to military nuclear utilization, we should remember, that after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the East-European “real socialist” bloc, the “international community” (which in this context should be read as those parts of representatives of Eurocentric ruling segments aiming at dismantling not only “real socialism” but also milder “socialist” or more “social democratic” attempts to promote social justice and alternatives) expressed concerns over the unstable situation in these ex-communist

countries, which opened up possibilities for stealing and selling nuclear devices to “terrorists” and other elements unsatisfied with the US-led capitalist expansion in the context of capitalist triumphalism and the ever increasing implementation of neo-liberal political program. During the 1990’s the United States succeeded temporarily in reversing the overall post-early 1970’s tendency of US global decline, as suggested by the world-systems analysis⁵⁰, which has however continued and intensified during the Bush the younger administrations engaging in the implementation of new imperialist political program from the beginning of 2000’s, partly due to the increasing awareness of this tendency of decline. We should also remember that in the context of declaring the FRWW, which can also be conceived as a war against human-beings and humanity, the Bush administration singled out an Axis of Evil, composing of Iraq, Iran and North Korea – in some formulations also Brazil, Venezuela, and Cuba, of which Brazil seems nowadays to be removed from the list – and announced to develop further its own nuclear arsenal and tactical warheads⁵¹. Their aggressive new imperialist policies suggested to other countries that ultimately the only way to prevent aggressive action from the part of the new imperialist US is to develop forms of nuclear military utilization, which is clearly related to the civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, and which, as indicated, has been promoted by the ruling and governing segments of the Euro-US area, among others. Since then there has happened considerable “progress” with this respect.

As indicated before, neither civilian-commercial nor military nuclear utilization can be considered safe. Now, in the beginning of year 2007, it is possible to point at yet another sign of this tendency, with certain parallels to the Soviet decline and collapse, that is, the concern over the capabilities of the US military establishment to guard its own nuclear arsenal and related information⁵². In order to counter this misconduct, the Bush administration, in the context of its overall rearmament program and aggressive global policies, is planning to develop new kind of nuclear warhead which would be “sturdy, reliable and secure from terrorists” and which could “replace the current arsenal with Reliable Replacement Warheads”⁵³. This program would allow the development a “first new nuclear warhead in nearly two decades”. The United States is a signatory to the

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which at least in theory requires the ultimate “liquidation of all their existing stockpiles” of nuclear weapons. Those in favor of the program suggest it would allow the reduction of current stockpile of “some 6,000 warheads to perhaps 2,000 or less”. According to General James E. Cartwright, who heads the US Strategic Command, these new warheads would allow maintaining a stockpile “that would be the smallest practical to maintain its credibility”⁵⁴. However, these 2,000 “modernized, more reliable and safer” nuclear warheads would still be enough for the annihilation of the whole existing world and in the overall context of aggressive new imperialist US global policies, their only real effect would be to promote global nuclear rearmament, as has already happened as a direct cause of these policies⁵⁵.

An indication of this is that in December 2006 Israel’s Prime Minister Ehud Olmert was interpreted admitting in an interview on German television the well-known unspoken fact that Israel possesses nuclear weapons, which was naturally denied by the Israeli authorities. Moreover, in an interview on Israeli television, Olmert claimed – forgetting the views expressed by expansionist Zionists and Jewish hard right – that Israel has “never threatened any nation with annihilation”. He went on to confirm the established fact that “our” nuclear weapons are good whereas those of “theirs” are necessarily bad by saying that “Iran, openly, explicitly and publicly threatens to wipe Israel of the map. Can you say that this is the same level, when they are aspiring to have nuclear weapons, as America, France, Israel, Russia?”⁵⁶ Olmert’s revelation aroused immediately reactions in Arab world and Islamic countries as well as around the world. That was also the case of Egypt, the president of which Hosni Mubarak announced in a summit with Olmert in January 2007, that his country does not want nuclear weapons – a stance adopted already in early 1990’s when they declared in Baghdad in the presence of Saddam Hussein that “the Middle East should be free of weapons of mass destruction – atomic, biological and chemical” – “but since they appear highly present in the area, we must defend ourselves.” Both indicated their uneasiness with Iran’s [supposed] nuclear weapons ambitions and Olmert – trying to undo his admittance, which has also been considered as tactical – that “Israel will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East”⁵⁷. However, soon after it was revealed that

Israel has plans to “destroy Iran’s uranium enrichment facilities with tactical nuclear weapons”, which would allow Israeli’s without a fear of “Second Holocaust”, as was done against Iraq’s nuclear reactor in Osirak in 1981 with conventional weapons. It was however indicated by the “sources close to Pentagon” that the US would not give – at least pre-attack – approval for the use of tactical nuclear weapons⁵⁸.

It is also worthwhile to remember that Israel continued its aggressive policies against the Palestinians during and after her 2006 war against the Hezbollah and Lebanon⁵⁹. This caused alarm also in Egypt which just before Olmert’s nuclear weapons admission decided to reinforce its police forces on its border with Gaza in the context of a circulating idea that Israel was about to bombard frontier area in order to “close clandestine tunnels” of the Palestinians whose movements through Israel to West Bank has been restrained by Israel. Such bombings with “intelligent bombs” were considered alternatives to the reoccupation of the Gaza Strip⁶⁰. Also Iran, which certainly remembers Israel’s unilateral (with US approval or guidance) military attacks against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq’s nuclear energy facilities, reacted to Olmert’s admission. Iran called for the UN Security Council to take actions. Iran’s UN ambassador Javad Zarif said admission had “removed any excuse – if there ever were any – for continued inaction by the council in the face of this actual threat to international peace and security”. He also proposed that the Security Council should “compel it [Israel] to abandon nuclear weapons, urge it to accede to the NPT [Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty] without delay and demand this regime to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] full-scope safeguards”⁶¹.

However, within the process in which an attempt is made to guarantee that Iran would not develop nuclear weapons – but which would allow nuclear energy for “peaceful” purposes – UN Security Council decided on December 23, 2006 to impose trade, financial and training embargo on Iran covering such activities in relation to the supposed development of nuclear weapons. In the case that Iran does not comply with the requirements of the resolution 1737 (2006), the Security Council shall “adopt further appropriate measures under Article 41 of Chapter of the United Nations to persuade Iran to comply with this resolution and the

requirements of the IAEA". The resolution allows a nuclear program for peaceful purposes, "noting that such a solution would benefit nuclear non-proliferation elsewhere" and welcomes "the continuing commitment" of permanent Security Council members and Germany as well as the "support of the European Union's High Representative to seek a negotiated solution"⁶². To be sure, it is highly recommendable that there will be a negotiated solution. However, one is forced to ask why Iran deserves such a resolution and no resolution is considered necessary in a situation in which Israel admits – strategically or not – possessing nuclear weapons. Moreover, despite the known dangers related to commercial-civilian nuclear energy, "peaceful" nuclear energy is allowed despite the obvious interconnectedness of military and commercial-civilian nuclear utilization. It is also curious that the Security Council does not consider the US and British plans to develop further their nuclear arsenal worth a resolution, even if it is *certain* that those making the resolutions are by now perfectly well aware that the Bush US administration and its aggressive new imperialist policies have forced those in danger of US aggression to prepare for such aggression and that the policies of this administration allowing for itself new generations of nuclear weapons, is *the* most important threat to non-proliferation⁶³.

Iran has all the time been the main US and also of the current new imperialist administrations target in Eurasia and in the context of multilayered policy involving various options within the scale ranging between pressure based diplomatic efforts and direct military invasion. This has also been admitted by the military establishment and a senior adviser on the war on terror and non-white others of Pentagon has been reported saying "this White House believes that the only way to solve the problem is to change the power structure in Iran, and this means war". This latter option could also include the use of tactical nuclear weapons, an option considered viable by various prominent security official of the Bush administrations such as the national-security adviser Stephen Hadley and Under-Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. The overall idea of "treating tactical nuclear weapons as an essential part of the U.S. arsenal" and [...] their suitability 'for those occasions when the certain and prompt destruction of high priority targets is essential and beyond the promise of conventional weapons' was presented in "an ad-

hoc panel on nuclear forces sponsored by the National Institute for Public Policy, a conservative think tank", which was organized in January 2001 when Bush the younger was preparing to take office as the President. On the other hand, there are reportedly strong sentiments in the US military "against brandishing nuclear weapons against other countries"⁶⁴. Despite such attitudes within the US military, we are not allowed to forget the fact that the US is the only country in the world which has used nuclear weapons against civilian population – in a war situation, during the nuclear weapons tests also other countries have exposed civilian populations to deadly radiation – and that the US army has frequently used depleted uranium in its recent war efforts for example in Iraq, Kosovo and Afghanistan⁶⁵.

Though it is essential to consider events and developments in relation to the Middle East conflict and Eurasia (in this case especially Iran), due to especially the US and Israeli policies and their interconnectedness with the Armageddon scenarios present for example in the religious right supporting Bush administrations new imperialist policies⁶⁶, and without necessary in-built Armageddon scenario, also due to the inbuilt use of force threat in the abovementioned UN Security Council resolution, despite its punctuation on negotiated solution, it is possible to point at various related problems which are more or less connected to Wagar's science-fiction. For example both China and India have suggested the development of solar-energy which could be channeled to earth through equipment installed on the moon. This could be one possible alternative energy source but, at the same time, it necessarily arouses the question on the possible misuse of this kind of technology in the context of a sort of latter-day version of Star Wars kind of militarization of space, which may or may not be related to China's recent "successful test of an anti-satellite weapon", criticized by the US, Japan, Britain and Australia⁶⁷. Such plans have by no means abandoned by the US new imperialists and their supporters in the US military-industrial complex either, as indicated by the reports that the US is about to build missile shield system sites to Eastern Europe (Poland, Czech Republic)⁶⁸ within the EU, as has been the case also of CIA torture-concentration camps e.g. in Poland. Here one should remember also the recent announcement of the British authorities about their scheme to develop their own rocket

technology which would allow British only moon flights, and at the same time, develop technology which would provide own carriers of nuclear weapons, in the context of a sort of a “rocket security” version of “food security” and recent “energy security” thinking, thus improving their “national” capabilities⁶⁹, despite the continuing US-UK special relation, notwithstanding the attempts to make at least an apparent separation to Blair legacy by the Gordon Brown government⁷⁰.

The question on US missile shield system in Eastern Europe has emerged as one of the most acute problems in relation to the emerging Nuclear Holocaust and it may also increase the possibilities that the actual FRWW develops into a “Major War” between major powers, including those central from the point of view of declining Eurocentric world order. In relation to US missile shield system in Eastern Europe, Immanuel Wallerstein has underlined that its main purpose is to protect the US against Western Europe, i.e. mainly the European Union. Besides being an attempt weaken Western Europe, its objective is to “create a situation in which the United States is forced to support the east Europeans.” He also points out in the situation in which the US “withdraws from Iraq and recalibrates its global stance to take into account of its diminished geopolitical power, sustaining the Polish and Czech regimes may seem less useful, may even fade totally from importance.” In that situation the Eastern European governments – while being economically and militarily dependent on Western European powers – “would be on their own”, “especially when there is a closer Paris-Berlin-Moscow rapprochement”⁷¹. It is evident that the “threat” of Iran or North Korea has nothing whatsoever to do with this missile shield system. Moreover, as Wallerstein suggests, the European Union can be considered its major target due to the fact that the PNAC has had at least from 1992 had the objective to prevent the emergence of any competing power or area.

I would not however underestimate the possibility that the US missile shield system is targeted also against Russia. Its political target may well be the European Union, which cannot at least now be considered a military threat to the US. But, besides being a political target, it is not difficult to think that Russia is its target in military terms. Russians clearly think so and President Vladimir Putin has said his country

“would take ‘appropriate measures’ to counter the system”. Putin also announced that Russia was about to freeze its commitments under the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) treaty⁷². Moreover, the head of Russia’s Armed Forces General Staff, Yury Baluyevsky, said his country can develop “anti-aircraft and anti-missile defenses superior to any that exists, ‘including the United States and I am ready to prove that’”. He also said that the elements of the shield can become targets of Russian forces, “strategic, nuclear or other [...]”⁷³. One can thus easily conceive situations in which the missile shield system(s) do not decrease the possibility of Nuclear Holocaust but increases its possibility considerably. In such a situation it does not really matter much, whether a nuclear war begins first between the US and Russia, the European Union and Russia or even the European (and possibly Russia) and the US. Moreover, such a situation would clearly represent a “Major War” between Eurocentric major powers, which goes directly against the presuppositions presented by those suggesting that there has been a tendency of declining possibility of war between major powers, as thought by many authors in a compiled work edited by Raimo Väyrynen⁷⁴. Moreover, if there is a direct war between these Eurocentric powers possessing nuclear weapons, it is quite probable that these weapons will also be used.

Also India has engaged in the space race supporting also military missile development and both the US and Russia have promoted civilian-commercial nuclear cooperation with India⁷⁵. In the US case, there seems to be a shift from considering Pakistan an important ally in the war on terror and non-white others toward favoring India⁷⁶, possibly because India has played important role as an high-tech production and development location and India is been considered a democracy⁷⁷. Pakistan and India are already in possession of nuclear weapons and in 2005 North Korea declared to be a nuclear power and this seems to have been confirmed by the nuclear weapons test this country made in October 2006. In the end of January 2007 it was reported that North Korea and Iran have began to extend their existing military cooperation to nuclear issues⁷⁸. North Korea has been able to escape the US military aggression and there has been some discussion that this would have been possible also for Iraq if it would have possessed nuclear weapons. During year 2007 there has been negotiations between North Korea and the US, in which

North Korea has been able to get economic and political benefits while making promises to withdraw from the development of military nuclear utilization without completely abandoning civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, which, however, in the last instance, promote similar consequences.

Independently of how things develop in relation to nuclear utilization programs of North Korea and Iran, among others, such changes do not have an impact on the problematic question according to which “we” can possess the means of military and civilian-commercial nuclear utilization while “they” cannot – unless “they” are allowed to possess for example nuclear weapons or neither “we” nor “they” are allowed to possess them and forms of civilian-commercial nuclear utilization. It is also possible that there is a connection between North Korea’s nuclear development and the appointment of South Korean Ban Ki-Moon as the Secretary General of the United Nations⁷⁹. Also some countries of Latin America, which has been declared a nuclear weapons free area, may find it necessary improve their preparedness to counter possible – though at the moment unlikely – US aggression, as is the case of Hugo Chávez administrations Venezuela, which has announced an acquisition of Russian Tor M1 missiles⁸⁰. Therefore, in the context of First Real World War and with the help of commercial-civilian nuclear utilization use promotion by Paavo Lipponen and military nuclear utilization use propagation by George W. Bush, our common world is facing an emerging Nuclear Holocaust.

CONCLUSION: BEYOND THE FIRST REAL WORLD WAR AND THE EMERGING NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST

Our common world has in recent years entered in a period of *interregnum*, a concept which Antonio Gramsci connected to the crisis of authority, in the context of which consensus in relation to the everyone benefiting nature of the actual form of the existing social system created by the ruling classes and the intellectuals producing explanations why this system is beneficial has vanished. In Gramsci’s understanding hegemony or hegemonic situation can exist only when there is consent of the ruled in relation to the benefits of social order, during which the utilization of coercion or physical force is not considered necessary and coercion is only latent. When consent disappears the

hegemony is also lost and what remains is pure domination based on naked coercion. In the situation of interregnum and the crisis (of authority) “the masses have become detached from their traditional ideologies, and no longer believe what they used to believe previously [...]” For him the crisis exists because “the old [system and belief system] is dying, and the new cannot born.” Gramsci discusses whether this “rift between popular masses and ruling ideologies” can be “cured” by resorting to simple use of force in order to prevent “new ideologies from being imposing themselves” and whether this situation can be resolved through the restoration of old order, a possibility he rules out though not “in an absolute sense”. The physical coercion leads to “a widespread skepticism” and “a new ‘arrangement’ will be found”, which may include purification of the dogma (“catholicism will even more become simply Jesuitism”) or a transition towards a new social system and a belief system (“the possibility and necessity of creating a new culture”)⁸¹. In the context of and before contemporary interregnum, the neo-liberal political program which surpassed and purified neo-classical economics from “socialist” Keynesianism and/or other alternative socio-economic thought-practices close to economic nationalism, was at least partially surpassed by the competing new imperialist political program, both of which are today increasingly delegitimized even if the new imperialists have tried to construct a new hegemonic consensus in relation FRWW and its component part war on terror and non-white others as well as hard form integral fascism. In order to surpass the FRWW and the emerging Nuclear Holocaust, it is necessary to surpass neo-liberal and new imperialist political programs and proceed toward more emancipative, social, democratic and ecologically responsible ideas and practices, too.

In the course of this article it has been possible to identify various similarities between Warren W. Wagar’s science-fiction narrative and the events and tendencies of the real world. It was also suggested that as Jacques Derrida wrote in the 1990’s, the time has been out of joint. It may well be the case that in the context of interregnum in which the time is out of joint, we are in a situation in which many tendencies collide and that the quasi-identical replica of 20th and 21st centuries involved in Wagar’s world-systems analysis based temporalization should be reviewed in ways which accept the possibility

of compression of the future, in the context of which it is possible that both the negative and positive tendencies are visible and happen earlier than anticipated and that in the process of going beyond the interregnum in which time is out of joint, a sort of re-composition of time may take place and the transition towards more emancipative social orders can take place earlier and possibly also without the Nuclear Holocaust. In relation to this discussion and our possibilities to anticipate or preview the future I have suggested that we have no possibilities to predict with certainty the death of capitalist world-system for example in 2009 or 2040⁸².

What, then, are the colliding tendencies resembling situations from the past century our common world has been facing in the context of interregnum or the period of bifurcation. First of all, we are in a revolutionary and war phase resembling that of 1910's situation. There has been a revolutionary situation in Mexico at least from the 1990's and there is in the actuality. Moreover, from the 1990's we have seen a formation of global movement for alternatives and we have strong anti-systemic and pro-alternative forces operating for example in Latin America and Eurasia. The alternatives movement has been active also in Europe and United States, among other places, not to forget Asia and Africa. Secondly, the speculative decade and the depression decades of 1920's and 1930's bear considerable similarities to those of 1990's and 2000's. Therefore, as was evident in the beginning of 2000's, the world economy entered in a crisis period resembling that of 1930's, which may result in W-movement (crash, temporal recovery, depression) as in the 1930's and recovery being possible only after the Second Eurocentric Civil War. There is no certainty of a lasting upward Kondratieff cycle – the temporalization of which has never been exact – despite certain recovery of the world economy until recently, due to, among other things, the capability of economic forces to keep the relatively appreciated US dollar rate in relation to Euro and the rise of China and India, the overall weight of which in the global gross product is not at least yet decisive, though their existence has given the ruling and governing classes a possibility to promote downward social development in the rich countries, and in the context of continuing US global decline. Moreover, in 2000's we can see ideological dogmatization (or "purification") of all ideological-political varieties, oil price crisis and eagerness to develop alternative

energy sources resembling the similar tendencies of 1970's. Of these, the ideological dogmatization and radicalization resembles also the situation of 1930's, when the representatives of aggressive nationalism arose to power in Germany and that of 1970's, when both the neo-liberal political program and new imperialist political program and their supporters strengthened their position and of which the latter grouping arose to power in the US in 2000. Latter of these, along with the short and long-term problems of the US economy, continue to pose a threat to world economy, especially in the case of escalation and deepening of the FRWW in Eurasia. The latter of these is directly related to the emerging Nuclear Holocaust.

Moreover, the world-economy and global governance system is heading towards macro-regionalization, with possible reconstruction of the governance system at the global level, including reforms on institutions and possible creation of new institutions. Within this framework there are also tendencies toward strengthening nationalism and localism. In this context we are witnessing a transition from a broad historical context of Eurocentric globalization toward a non-Eurocentric and possibly multi-centric broad historical context and possibly also a post-capitalist order though this latter is more uncertain than the former and depends also on the definition of capitalism adopted⁸³. It also seems to be the case that there is a transition from a world order in which a unified socio-economic system is required toward a world order in which co-existing but differing socio-economic systems are allowed and possible. Moreover, depending on what directions the development of world order system assumes or is made to assume, we may also be heading toward, so to speak, towards 1950's or 2050's, in which case it is possible to prevent the emergence of the Second Real World War (SRWW). In this or resembling case it may be possible to undo not only new imperialist political program and related hard form of integral fascism but also neo-liberal political program without lapsing into confrontations familiar from the Third Eurocentric Civil War of 20th century and in which peaceful co-existence of differing socio-economic systems is possible.

On the other hand, the ideological analysts of the Bush administration have proposed that the war they have started is a long 30-years war, or

a Long War, as suggested by General John Abizaid, both prognoses which put temporal limits on the war on terror and non-white others which in George W. Bush's initial view was declared a temporarily unlimited eternal war⁸⁴. In this case which is more in tune with the prospect of the idea of long crisis period we find also in the world-systems analysis temporalization (1914-1945)⁸⁵, Wallerstein's discussion on 50-years bifurcation period and that of Wagar's⁸⁶, we may indeed end up having a Second Real World War, either in the context of a continuing and intensifying FRWW, or as a SRWW which could involve a Nuclear Holocaust – which, given the possibility of compression of time suggested here, may also take place during 2007, 2008 or 2009, in the case that the work of the proponents of civilian-commercial and military nuclear utilization is allowed to continue, in which case also the FRWW could end up as a Nuclear Holocaust.

One might consider a situation for which there are certain grounds in the actual order of affairs that it is possible to go beyond the FRWW and also the emerging Nuclear Holocaust. Given the fact that around the world there are emerging alternatives and also those that are already been put in practice at different degrees and varieties and there is growing pressure for ending the wars of occupation also in their initial source the United States, and also abundant criticism of the practices of the war on terror and non-white others as well as neo-liberal and new imperialist political programs and related light and hard forms of integral fascism, and also willingness to undo them, it may be possible that we may have a change to proceed towards a world order in which the maintenance of social orders based on single or only slightly differing modality is not a necessity and the imposition of which is not considered tolerable. This would also require ending the actual FRWW for otherwise we may face a renewed regression into the era of past Eurocentric Civil Wars, in which competing social orders and their representatives fought wars against each others, but in a new global context in which these social orders are not necessarily any more based on Eurocentric economic growth ideologies but more indigenous and area specific socio-economic orders. In recent years and decades we have faced enough negative regressions to past – which is not to claim that all things in the past were bad – which allow us to suggest that it would be highly recommendable to be able to not face yet another such regression.

On the other hand, as the renewed insistence on suitability of both military and civilian-commercial nuclear utilization, with their abovementioned inter-changeability does not support such a positive move towards surpassing negative regressions, other more peaceful and non-nuclear solutions should be preferred. There is neither enough historical evidence that political or other social entities could resist the temptation to use nuclear weapons or that civilian-commercial nuclear utilization would be safe enough, nor enough natural scientific evidence supporting the benefits of either of these forms of nuclear utilization. On the other hand, we have evidence the human beings are capable of improving and transforming the social conditions of their existence – even if one keeps in mind the multiple misgivings of such attempts – as well as their abilities to invent alternative sources of energy – all of which, as noted, are by no means unproblematic – which have been and continue to be necessary for the human existence in one form or another, independently of our views of the importance of economic growth and the socio-economic conditions in the context of which this latter question should be tackled with. However, in the final analysis, the emerging Nuclear Holocaust cannot be prevented unless all countries and other entities proceed with complete nuclear disarmament. Moreover, in order to complete military nuclear disarmament, it is necessary to proceed also with the complete civilian-commercial nuclear utilization disarmament, due to the obvious link between these forms of nuclear utilization. Moreover, it is not possible to prevent the escalation of conflicts between rich and poor countries or within countries without denouncing neo-liberal and new imperialist political programs as well as other political programs which are targeted against internal and external others and especially non-white others and aim at preventing the equality between rich and poor or “us” and “them” between and within countries. However, as suggested in this article, in the context of time compression and putting time back on joint, the emerging Nuclear Holocaust can be prevented and emancipative social transformations can be achieved without renewing more negative regressions into the past.

NOTES

¹ Wallerstein I., *After Liberalism*. New York, The New Press, 1995, 90.

² Cit. Wagar, W., *A Short History of the Future*. Afterword by Immanuel Wallerstein,

Chicago/London, The University of Chicago Press, 1989, 104.

³ Wagar, W., *A Short History of the Future...* op.cit. 12-21.

⁴ Wagar, W., *A Short History of the Future...* op. cit. 104-112.

⁵ Wagar, W., *A Short History of the Future...* op. cit. 42, 112-121 & 132-133.

⁶ Derrida, J., *Specters of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International.* Translated from the French by Peggy Kamuf. New York/London: Routledge, 1994.

⁷ PNAC (The Project for a New American Century, 2000), *Rebuilding America's Defenses. Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century. A Report of The Project for a New American Century.* September 2000, 51. Available from internet in: <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefences.pdf>>. The establishment of the PNAC took place in 1992 and some of the views represented by this group were expressed by Richard Cheney and Paul Wolfowich, inside Bush the younger administration from 2000, already at that time.

⁸ PNAC (The Project for a New American Century, 2000), *Rebuilding America's Defenses...* op. cit., 7.

⁹ On the discussion on the different sectors of US ruling classes, see e.g. Davis, M. "The New Right's Road to Power," *New Left Review*, 128, 1981; Gill S., *American Hegemony and Trilateral Commission.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

¹⁰ Though there is nothing new in the surveillance of opposition, internal and external "enemies", the process of creation and recreation has been typical in – but by no means only – in the United States, in this particular case of internet surveillance, one can make a comparison to the case of China.

¹¹ I presented this definition in Minkkinen, P. "Sallimme terrorismin ja vastaterrorismin kierteen jatkumisen?", *Kansan Uutiset*, August 11, 2005.

¹² Especially because the key political figure representing the social forces willing to impose this kind of war, George W. Bush, cannot claim, due to the fraudulent US presidential election processes, legitimate authority.

¹³ Especially due to the fact that usually only seldom 100 percent vote in the elections, those making such decisions, quite often do not represent the majority of a given political entity.

¹⁴ If one wishes, this can be compared to the discussion in which George W. Bush, who has declared that any state harboring terrorists is terrorist, and that from this it follows that the US harboring terrorists, is a terrorist state and that the person allowing such a state of affairs, such as George Bush senior or George W. Bush, are both terrorists. As in this particular case of a television documentary the discussion was related to Cuba, and the US presidents protecting terror activity against the Cuban civilians as well as terrorism attempt in form of attempts to murder Cuba's leader Fidel Castro, it must be remembered that in the case of Bush the senior, murder attempts were made before the

declaration of the war on terror and non-white others. In the case of Bush the younger, even if this state of war was already declared, the issue of murdering Castro as well as the whole "Cuba question" predates it. Moreover, even if in the context of the declared war on terror and non-white others, one were to consider legitimate to assassinate a foreign head of state, this would make it equally legitimate to assassinate George W. Bush. However, as the definition of terrorism I presented did not strictly cover the heads of state, even if as such they can often be considered, in the last instance, being responsible for military and paramilitary activities, they could be considered representing non-civilian population. In this case, in the case we accept the basic human right to live, especially after the act of birth-giving, we must either abide this rule also in the case of the heads of state or consider as terrorist acts also purposeful violence between the abovementioned parts of asymmetric war. In any case, this opens up the question whether political violence can be accepted in some circumstances or whether it is unacceptable in all situations, and cannot be resolved in the context of this article.

¹⁵ Only case in which it would be possible to say that the war is only a civil war would be a situation in which the occupation army has withdrawn and all other possible non-Iraqi elements are disengaged of this conflict. Even in this case it would be necessary to admit that the war of occupation is the cause of civil war.

¹⁶ Here one must remember that there was accumulated internal disputes and hatred in Iraq before the II Iraq war. Here again one is not allowed to suppose that such accumulations would result only from strictly internal affairs: we must remember the foreign imposed – even if UN allowed – embargo-policies of 1990's and early 2000's as well as the fact that Hussein's regime was an US ally during its war against Iran during the 1980's and that foreign corporations were selling components for the weapons of mass destruction which Hussein's regime used against its internal enemies. Among many other related things one should also remember the highly complex international issue of the Kurds, a nation without a state.

¹⁷ See the discussion in the section , *infra* "The Emerging Nuclear Holocaust".

¹⁸ See e.g. Minkkinen, P., "New Imperialism and Beyond. Why New Imperialism Will Fail and Unseat Bush Administration?", *Historia Actual On-Line*, 4, (2004), [Revista en línea] Disponible desde internet en: <<http://www.online.historia-actual.com/hao/Volumes/Volume1/Issue4/esp/v1i4c6.pdf>>; id., *KAKTUS, Bush ja Pohjois-Amerikan tulevaisuus. Kriittinen avointen historiallisten kontekstien tutkimus ja muutoksellinen politiikka.* Helsinki, SRTY/Like, 2004.

¹⁹ Some are of the opinion that the Third Eurocentric Civil War (also known as Cold War) did not end with the collapse of the Soviet Union, as it was defined more on terms of the war of global north against the

global south. In this case we could consider events that took place after the collapse of the Soviet Union taking place e.g. in Somalia carrying on with the elements involved in the Third Eurocentric Civil War. However, even with such imports the present situation and especially the US the attacks must be considered from the point of view of the FRWW as defined above. In other words, there are elements of continuity and discontinuity.

²⁰ This is related not only to the forms of governance, property and labor control, and human participation adopted but also to the question of the so-called human nature and the possibilities of human development as individuals and as a species. These questions will be tackled with in separate works.

²¹ For a deeper and broader discussion on integral fascism, its modalities and forms of existence in economic, political, social and cultural spheres see Minkkinen, P., “El fascismo integral globalizante y la recreación de la dominación de pocos a los muchos,” *Relaciones Internacionales*, 2007.(de próxima aparición).

²² On the latter see the section, *infra*. “The Emerging Nuclear Holocaust” below.

²³ The new imperialist and hard form integral fascist elements of which try to build a new hegemonic consensus (in Gramsci’s meaning of hegemony) especially among the ruling and governing segments of other states and state-like entities. This proposition does not however imply either lasting success of this attempt or improving global position of the US, quite the contrary.

²⁴ Estimates of total death toll vary, one possible number being 13.364.500, which is the maximum estimate mentioned under the category “Total Deaths from Nazi Genocidal Policies”, which covers not only the concentration camps proper but also for example internment and transit camps and ghettos, and of which European Jews represent 5.600.000-6.250.000, Soviet prisoners of war 3.000.000 and Polish Catholics 3.000.000.. Therefore, considering the conventional figure of 6.000.000, which covers the estimated death toll of Jewish victims underestimates the total death toll and represents at least a partial holocaust denial. *The Holocaust Chronicle*, available from internet in <<http://holocaustchronicle.org/HolocaustAppendices.html>>

²⁵ It has been suggested that for example rats have considerable preparedness for survival in extreme conditions and it is possible that they could survive a Nuclear Holocaust.

²⁶ The term nuclear reactions does not refer here at those taking place in the sun, or similar “fixed stars”, this term in itself being problematic given the commonly accepted view that the universe expands “away” from the “location” of the primary explosion, which are also the source of the possible alternative solar energy utilization.

²⁷ See The Acheson-Lilienthal Report. Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy, March 16, 1946. Reproduced in

<<http://www.learnworld.com/ZNW/LWText.Acheson-Lilienthal.html>>; Greenpeace USA, “The Link Between Nuclear Power and Nuclear Weapons,” available from internet in <<http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/campaigns/nuclear/safety-and-security-/the-link-between-nuclear-power#>>. According to the latter source, “Civilian programs sprang from the perceived need to produce plutonium.” This latter point is of interest in contemporary situation in which there are power politics based allegations that Iran may use its civilian-commercial nuclear energy development to produce nuclear weapons, whereas no such concern is present in the most of discussion of the governing sectors of “international community” in relation to such relation of nuclear development policies of e.g. permanent UN Security Council Member-states.

²⁸ This is, to be sure, also related to the question whether we consider the state-system in itself important and worth preserving and the opinions with this respect tend to vary considerably.

²⁹ Equally unacceptable is the extreme Zionist view, that the Palestinians should be pushed beyond Jordan River, thus finalizing the colonization or occupation Palestinian territories, formalized by the establishment of the state of Israel, in the context of Euro-US sense of guilt due to the extermination of Jews during the Second Eurocentric Civil War.

³⁰ See e.g. *Calendar of Nuclear Accidents*, available from internet in <<http://archive.greenpeace.org/comms/nukes/chernob/rep02.html>>. Recently there has been discussion about the safety problems of Swedish nuclear plants, and there have been nuclear reactor problems in Finland, the native land of pro civilian-commercial nuclear utilization Paavo Lipponen and in both of these countries, which supposedly have better safety-regulations and nuclear plants than in Russia, there has been worries about the nuclear safety in the latter country.

³¹ See *U.S. Nuclear Accidents*, available from internet in <<http://www.lutins.org/nukes.html>>.

³² Especially this latter part clearly involves also certain concern on the fate of the humanity, which however, given that such thinking involves excessive delimitation of human freedom, does not really differ much from the views expressed by the proponents of military or commercial-peaceful nuclear utilization with the prospect of Nuclear Holocaust, or any supporter of especially hard form integral fascism, whom supposedly protect human freedom by taking it away from everyone.

³³ “Prospects for an Expanding Nuclear Future: A Global Perspective,” Remarks by John Ritch, Director General, World Nuclear Association, NEI Fuel Cycle Conference, San Francisco, 2 April 2001, available from internet in <<http://www-world-nuclear.org/dgspeeches/nei2001.htm>>.

³⁴ “LEADER: Finnish start,” *Financial Times*, May 27, 2002; Ritch, J., “Prospects for an Expanding... op. cit.

³⁵ See e.g., Heilbroner, R., *The Worldly Philosophers. The Lives, Times and Ideas of The Great Economic Thinkers*. Updated seventh edition, New York, Simon & Schuster (Touchstone), 1995; Tannenbaum, F., *Mexico. The Struggle for Peace and Bread*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1950; Minkkinen, P., *KAKTUS.. op. cit.; id., Meksikon 1900-luku. Vallankumouksellisen maan politiikka, talous ja ulkopoliittika*. Helsinki, Gaudeamus, 2007.

³⁶ Finland has, however, been active in the promotion of the control of external borders of EU and the interchange of “terrorist” information between the US and the EU, thus applying policies adopted also by the US, especially in its new imperialist and hard form integral fascist phase, and Israel.

³⁷ Which has itself utilized the framework provided by the war on terror and non-white others for internal repression against the Russian Russians as well as internal non-white others and engaged in a war of internal conquest in Chechnya, formally part of Russia, and has interests to be defended also in the broader context of Eurasia, the control of which has been aspired by the US new imperialists in order to influence the development of this area in itself as well as the development of the EU, Russia, China and India.

³⁸ There are, of course, varying opinions on the justification and legitimacy of both of these conquests, a topic which cannot be discussed in a sufficiently broad manner in the context of this article.

³⁹ Various tribes or nations of what later become to be known as Finns pushed the Saami people towards North to the areas that had been conceived by the Romans as Ultima Thule. There has been discussion that (Ultima) Thule was located by the Greek and Roman geographers in Iceland but also in the context of this discussion it is not ruled out that its location could have been in Scandinavia, Shetland or even the Faroes, and thus also the Northern parts of Fennoscandia. Later in the context of crusades and expansion of Catholic form of Christianity the tribes or nations that we know now as Swedes conquered and inhabited especially the coastal areas of Finland. Magnusson, M. and Pálsson, H., *The Vinland Sagas: The Norse Discovery of America. Grænlendinga Saga and Eirik's Saga*. Translated with an introduction by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Pálsson. London, Penguin Books, 1965. 12.

⁴⁰ Minkkinen, P., “El fascismo integral... op. cit.; id. “The Politics of Exclusion and Repression and Beyond – U.S. North American Policies in the Global Context,” *Revista de Historia Actual*, 4, 2006.

⁴¹ See e.g. “Iraq Coalition Troops,” available from internet in http://globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iraq_orbat_coalition.htm.

⁴² “Nueva ley petrolera iraquí permitirá la explotación de crudo a Occidente”, *La Jornada*, 9 de enero de 2007; Muttitt, G., *Crude Oil Designs: The Rip-Off of Iraq's Oil Wealth*, 2005. Available from internet in:

http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/oil/2005/crude_designs.htm#5.1.

⁴³ See, e.g. European Round Table of Industrialists homepage, <http://ert.be/home.aspx>; Escobar, J. “The Roving Eye. Bilderberg strikes again,” *Asia Times Online*, 10 May 2005, available from internet in

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Front_Page/GE10Aa02.html; Mayeda, A. and McGregor, G. “VIP’s arrivals marked by a discreet ‘B’,” *The Ottawa Citizen*, 9 June 2006, available from internet in <http://www.infowars.com/articles/nwo/secretb.htm>.

⁴⁴ See “The Shell Sustainability Report 2005. Meeting the Energy Challenge,” available from internet in http://www.shell.com/static/envirosoc-en/downloads/sustainability_reports/shell_report_2005.pdf.

⁴⁵ See e.g. Posada, M. et al., “Incesante alza del precio de la tortilla; llega hasta \$ por kilo,” *La Jornada*, 10 de enero de 2007; Ocampo Arista, S. “El alza al precio de la tortilla podría detonar estallidos sociales: UNORCA,” *La Jornada*, 27 de enero de 2007; Gonzalez Amador, G. e Israel Rodríguez J., “Especulación, causa del aumento a tortillas: Ortiz,” *La Jornada*, 12 de enero de 2007. Other possible causes mentioned were the neo-liberal policies of Mexico, NAFTA and speculation. All of these are probably partially to blame: US producers and corporations control the majority of production and market and “free trade” and speculation together with the increasing demand for biofuel production are causes for an untenable situation. It is also interesting to note that despite the claim involved in orthodox economics, free trade does not seem to lower food price. In relation to biofuel based demand, though Shell is not the only actor responsible for this, one may here remember that Shell played an important role in a process in which foreign oil majors tried – and still do – to undermine the nationalization of Mexico’s oil assets after the Mexican revolution of 1910 (See e.g. Minkkinen Minkkinen, P., *Meksikon 1900-luku. Vallankumouksellisen maan politiikka, talous ja ulkopoliittika*. Helsinki, Gaudeamus, 2007. Tulossa.). Moreover, with a reference to Finland, the co-governing Centre Party has promoted biofuel production also in Finland which supports its base in countryside and at the same time the directors of Finnish state oil firm Fortum, promoting biofuel “revolution”, have received considerable option benefits, which is basically unearned income due to the fact that they have benefited from recent high oil prices, as has also Shell and other major oil corporations.

⁴⁶ See “ERT letter to Mrs Margot Wallström, Member of the European Commission,” 12 July 2004, available from internet in <http://www.ert.be/doc/0092.pdf>.

⁴⁷ The most evident though by no means the only case being the Labour Party of Great Britain.

⁴⁸ “Commission proposes an integrated energy and climate change package to cut emissions for the 21st

Century,” 10 January 2007, IP-07-29_EN-1.pdf, available from internet in <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/index_en.htm>.

⁴⁹ The former has been deeply involved in the illegal occupation of Iraq, whereas the latter has criticized it. On the other hand, whereas all UN Security Council permanent member-states possess nuclear weapons as ultimate weapons against those threatening their position, and in the case of France, this has been also the ultimate guarantee against the possible rise of Germany, though within the EU this issue has been tackled otherwise.

⁵⁰ See e.g. Minkkinen, P., “New Imperialism and Beyond... op. cit.; The representatives of neo-Gramscian international/global political economy or transnational historical materialism also acknowledge the US hegemonic decline but conceive its continuity in the context of trilateral or transnational hegemony.

⁵¹ Ibid. op. cit.; id. *KAKTUS*... op. cit.; id. “The Politics of Exclusion ... op. cit.

⁵² See e.g. Bowes, P. “FBI probing ‘nuclear info leak’,” *BBC News*, Los Angeles, 26 October 2006, available from internet in <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/americas/6089642.stm>>, in which it is also reminded that some of the items found seems to be from “the cutting-edge centre for nuclear weapons research”, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, which “has a history of high-profile problems, including breaches in security”.

⁵³ See “EDITORIAL, Busywork for Nuclear Scientists,” *The New York Times*, 15 January 2007.

⁵⁴ “U.S. Selecting Hybrid Design for Warheads,” *The New York Times*, 7 January 2007.

⁵⁵ For example I these assurances of safer though smaller nuclear arsenal, we can see real world similarities to Wagar’s science-fiction discussed above.

⁵⁶ See e.g. “Olmert’s Apparent Nuclear Admission,” *Al-Jazeera*, 11 December 2006.

⁵⁷ See Roe Nahmias, “Mubarak Hints: We’ll Develop Nukes,” *Ynetnews*, 5 January 2007, available from internet in <<http://www.ynetnews.com/Ext/Comp/ArticleLayout/CdaArticlePrintPreview/1,2506,L-3348600,00.html>>.

⁵⁸ Uzi Mahnaimi and Sarah Baxter, “Revealed: Israel Plans Nuclear Strike on Iran”, *The Sunday Times*, 7 January 2007.

⁵⁹ On its analysis in global context, see Minkkinen, P., “The Politics of Exclusion... op. cit.

⁶⁰ “Egipto refuerza su frontera con Gaza ante versiones que Israel atacará,” *La Jornada*, 29 de octubre de 2006.

⁶¹ “Iran Acts Over Israeli Nukes,” *Al-Jazeera*, 20 December 2006.

⁶² UN Security Council. *S/RES/1737 (2006) Non-proliferation*. Adopted by the Security Council at its 5612th meeting, on 23 December 2006, available from internet in: <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/unsc_resolutions06.htm>.

⁶³ In principle Iran has exactly the same right to develop both commercial-civilian and military nuclear utilization as any other country. However, as it is pointed out in this article, the objective should be to abandon both forms of nuclear utilization by all countries or similar entities, including all current member-states of the UN Security Council.

⁶⁴ Hersh, S. “The Iran Plans,” *The New Yorker*, Annals of National Security, Issue of 17 April 2006, available from internet in <http://www.newyorker.com/fact/contents/articles/060417fa_fact>.

⁶⁵ On the latter, see e.g. Parsons, R. J., “America’s Big Dirty Secret,” *Le Monde diplomatique*, March 2002, available from internet in <<http://mondediplo.com/2002/03/03uranium>>, in which it is reported that depleted uranium is used [not only in bullets but also] in bunker bombs.

⁶⁶ On the analysis contextualizing Armageddon thinking, see Minkkinen, P., “The Politics of Exclusion... op. cit.

⁶⁷ “China’s Anti-Satellite Missile Test Criticised,” *Financial Times*, 19 January 2007; “China Missile Test Disturbs Japan,” *Al-Jazeera*, 19 January 2007.

⁶⁸ See e.g. Xuequan, M., “Russia: Missile Shield in Eastern Europe is a US Threat,” *Centre for Global Research on Globalization*, available from internet in <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=XUE20070124&articleId=4562>>.

⁶⁹ On the related discussion on the possible development of technological base in UK and e.g. “establishment of a national space agency” see Weston, A. “Parsimony and Piecemeal: What Future Does Britain Have in Space?”, *The Space Review*, 8 January 2007, available from internet in <<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/780/1>>.

⁷⁰ The Brown government has indicated its willingness to decrease the participation of British forces in Iraq while at the same time there has been discussion on the increase of British participation in the war efforts in Afghanistan.

⁷¹ See Wallerstein, I. “A Missile Defence Shield: Crazy Idea or Rational Objective?”, *Commentary* No. 211, 15 June 2007, available from internet in <<http://fbc.binghamton.edu/211en.htm>>.

⁷² See Oleg Shchedrov, “Putin Says Russia Will Counter U.S. Missile Shield”, *Reuters*, April 27, 2007.

⁷³ “Russian Army Official Says US Missile Shield Is Aimed at Russia”, *Infowars.com*, April 25, 2007, available from internet in <http://infowars.com/articles/ww3/russia_army_official_says_missile_shield_is_aimed_at_russia.htm>.

Baluyevsky was also of the opinion, that besides Russia, China is a target of the US missile shield system.

⁷⁴ Väyrynen, R., *The Waning of Major War. Theories and Debates*. London/New York, Routledge, 2006.

Various authors do however problematize the concept of major war, also from the point of view of its Eurocentric conception of major powers.

Moreover, some authors are not so certain about the waning of the major war in itself.

⁷⁵ See e.g. VandeHei, J. and Linzer, D. "U.S., India Reach Deal on Nuclear Cooperation," *Washington Post*, March 3, 2006; Isachenkov, V. "Russia, India Cement Nuclear Ties," *Washington Post*, 25 January 2007.

⁷⁶ Minkkinen, P., "The Politics of Exclusion... op. cit.

⁷⁷ Considering India as a democracy is of course very problematic. Even if the country has somewhat functioning formal representative democracy, it is hardly possible to conceive a country which has both deeply embedded socially and ethnic-religiously excluded and repressed social sectors a democracy in any deeper and meaningful sense. From this perspective, it is of course possible to suggest that in our contemporary world – or in past world, for that matter – there are no really democratic countries (on this discussion see Minkkinen, P., "La democratización de México en el contexto mundial," *Relaciones Internacionales*, 72 (Octubre-Diciembre de 1996), 33-47).

⁷⁸ "Corea del Norte realiza ensayo nuclear," *La Jornada*, 9 de octubre de 2006; Con Coughlin, "N Korea Helping Iran With Nuclear Testing," *Telegraph*, January 26, 2007.

⁷⁹ On the importance to develop non-imperialist UN Rapid Deployment Forces and a decision-making system on their use, the selection process of the members of which would combine democratic and expert selection, see Minkkinen, P., "The Decision-Making System of the United Nations Rapid Deployment Forces," *Alternatives*, 2007(forthcoming).

⁸⁰ "Ratifica Chávez compra de misiles ante un eventual ataque extranjero," *La Jornada*, 2 de febrero de 2007. Mexico, which has experience with US military expansion, has in recent decades been active in promoting nuclear free Latina America and also demanded complete nuclear disarmament (see e.g. Minkkinen 2007c). At least Brazil has earlier been discussed to have nuclear development capabilities, which is, in fact, becoming increasingly commonplace.

⁸¹ Gramsci, A., *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1971. especially 275-276; see also Gill, S., "Theorizing the Interregnum: The Double Movement and Global Politics in the 1990s," in Hettne, Björn (ed.), *International Political Economy. Understanding Global Disorder*. Halifax, Fernwood Books, 1995, 65; who has formulated Gramsci's expression in a more optimistic way "The old is dying, the new is being born and in the interregnum there are many morbid symptoms."

⁸² Minkkinen, P., *KAKTUS...* op.cit. 98.

⁸³ See and compare *ibid.*; a similar kind of possibility can be found in Tamdgidi, M. H., "Toward a Dialectical Conception of Imperiality: The Transitory (Heuristic) Nature of the Primacy of Analyses of

Economics in World-Historical Social Science," *Review*, XXIX, 4, 2006. 323, Figure 4, in which a possible transition toward a Non-Imperial World-System is suggested.

⁸⁴ See e.g. "The Long War," November 17th, 2006, Commander John Philip Abizaid and Ms. Sarah Sewall, speech in Harvard University, Institute of Politics, available from internet in <http://www.iop.harvard.edu/pdfs/transcripts/abizaid_11.17.06.pdf>, in which is discussed also about the fight against Nazi's and Bolsheviks. Besides this, there has been a tendency to refer to Islamic radicalism or fundamentalism representing "Islamofascism", a convenient term for an attempt to legitimize partially all component wars of the FRWW and divert discussion from the new imperialism and hard form integral fascism represented by and in this case especially the US. Similar temporal thinking was present also in the abovementioned PNAC report of 2000.

⁸⁵ Wallerstein, I., "The Global Picture, 1945-90," in Hopkins, Terence K. and Wallerstein, Immanuel (coordinators), *The Age of Transition. Trajectory of the World-System, 1945-2025*. London/New Jersey, Zed Books, 1996. 215; himself discusses 1914-1945 period also "as one long 'thirty years' war". Therefore the temporal horizon is similar though the related considerations on a preferred emerging social order most likely are not.

⁸⁶ Wallerstein, I. *After Liberalism...* op. cit., 90; Wagar, W., *A Short History of the Future...* op.cit.