



The Multitude and its Doppelgänger: An Exploration of Global Smooth Space

Mark Bonta¹

Associate Professor of Geography, Division of Social Sciences
Delta State University, Cleveland, MS 38733
mbonta@deltastate.edu

Abstract

Deleuze and Guattari's global smooth space of capital, coupled to the war machine and Hardt and Negri's 'Empire' and 'multitude,' serve as jumping-off points for an exploration of the tools and techniques used by the 'secret state' to achieve Pax Americana and Full Spectrum Dominance—contemporary militarist and 'intelligence' doctrines associated with the rise of the US Neoconservative movement, but rooted in a deeper geohistory of globalization and post-fascist transnational corporatism. The basic argument put forth is that Hardt, Negri, Deleuze, and Guattari do not sufficiently explicate (nor barely even acknowledge) the cryptic rhizomatics of the global corporatocracy, thus their support of global resistances and revolutions falls short and is theoretically weakened. This article explores a diverse array of 'conspiratorial' topics, largely through 'geopolitical forensics' lenses suggested by a materialistic reading of *A Thousand Plateaus*. The 'spectral networks' of International Communism and International Terrorism are presented as doppelgängers of the multitude—networks of bogeymen largely in the employ of Empire. The conclusion offers suggestions for several tunnels of approach to rhizomatic revolution, including confederated 'vacuoles' and holey spaces as foils to Full Spectrum Dominance. It is argued that neither 'Empire' nor the worldwide smooth space of peaceful terror take into account the continued existence of the 'deep' power centers of Russia and China, both of which, while



drawn deeply into global capitalism, resist submission to the one-world, one-system model projected by the West as a necessary state of security for the planet. Beyond these two are other emerging vacuoles of nation-state resistance that manage to maintain just enough separation from Western destabilization to be able to devise new modes of revolution at the state level—a prime example being Bolivia.

As the 20th century draws to a close, the United States stands as the world's preeminent power. Having led the West to victory in the Cold War, America faces an opportunity and a challenge: Does the United States have the vision to build upon the achievements of past decades? Does the United States have the resolve to shape a new century favorable to American principles and interests? (Project for a New American Century, *Statement of principles*, 1997)

The label full spectrum dominance implies that US forces are able to conduct prompt, sustained, and synchronized operations with combinations of forces tailored to specific situations and with access to and freedom to operate in all domains—space, sea, land, air, and information. Additionally, given the global nature of our interests and obligations, the United States must maintain its overseas presence forces and the ability to rapidly project power worldwide in order to achieve full spectrum dominance. (Shelton, 2000, 8-9)

Introduction: Mossadegh v. Multitude

In postmodernity, 'hierarchy' and 'structure' are dirty words. Takin' orders from the Man; a cog in the Machine. Pyramidal System, always/already resisted. Modernity's disaffected ooze away from the daily grind, glomming into mutualistic packs linked to other packs in decentered networks with transient and localized leaders—network *puissance*, the rhizome, rises up at many spots and resists tyranny. Cells armed with words and guns and cellphones sabotage operations of totalitarian/authoritarian/anti-democratic/fascist/centrally-planned states, spreading ideas of indigenous and peasant rights wrapped up in a universal, flat ontology of collective free will.

But these are also CIA operations and other machinations of secret states (states-within-states), so many of them, and therein lies our problem (Almond, 2000; Blum, 2004). Swarming (Arquilla and Ronfeldt, 2000). Netwar. Counterinsurgency does insurgency one better, interdigitated—which is which? Counterintelligence does intelligence one better (Agee, 1975). Counterterrorism improves on terrorism, anticipating it, infiltrating it, probing it and pushing it—which is which (Hess, 2002)? NED's networks, on all sides of the Ukrainian plateau, do better than missiles at taking out their rogues (Almond, 2000). Mossadegh, then and now. Resonate!

Hardt and Negri (henceforth 'HN') and Deleuze and Guattari ('DG') have traced forms and mechanisms of state power and capital accumulation from the heyday of hierarchy to today's 'postmodern' or 'postfascist' (DG) world networks, 'smooth spaces' that surround the earth (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 421), and 'Empire' (Hardt and Negri, 2000), the worldwide war machine yoked to the State. The potentials for resistance to 'Empire's network' are found within a complementary smooth space, what HN call the 'multitude' (Hardt and Negri, 2004). DG, particularly in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987), proffer not only theoretical geometrical smooth spaces (spaces occupied by immanent, self-organizing forces) and striated spaces (the elements of which are organized hierarchically by a transcendent *pouvoir*) but also their concrete mixtures—what we find out here in the world. Subtending both smooth and striated are holey spaces—the territories of moles, Virilio's 'mineral layer' (Bonta and Protevi, 2004; Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 480). Possibilities of creative resistances leap from the pages of *A Thousand Plateaus* (ATP); in HN, the multitude works through Empire, somehow—possibly parasitically—to bring about the near-infinitely de-centered planet of post-Empire. In concrete terms, the multitude is most closely compatible with the Global Justice Movement (known to its detractors as the 'Anti-Globalization Movement').

But from DG's writings on the Virilio-inspired global smooth spaces of capitalism and the worldwide war machine we can derive the conclusion that resistance to Neoliberal (Neofascist) globalization and Neoconservative militarism isn't simple. It never has been in the Western past, either, we find out, as we delve into declassified archives and learn more and more about the cryptohistory of Empire's network in seemingly spontaneous, stage-managed 'peoples' revolutions.' Nevertheless, neither DG nor HN satisfactorily discusses this situation and the fact that the State and the transnational corporation long ago learned every trick of the autonomous rhizome. Indeed, they have long been creating their own rhizomes for 'obscure' purposes while systematically infiltrating outsider networks that appear to threaten. The recent history of such infiltrations is well-documented—Operation CHAOS and the COINTELPROs in the 1960s and a host of other Operations and Projects, not just under the aegis of the CIA-Wall Street nexus, not just at the behest of the US, and not just in the 1960s (McGehee, 1999; Olmsted, 1996; Ostrovsky, 1991).

There exists a rich and rapidly growing ethnographic and analytical literature, part of a toolkit for rhizomatically-inclined social scientists and theorists to poke into the secret geohistories of capital and *pouvoir*. Philip Agee's seminal *Inside the Company: CIA Diary* (Agee, 1975) and William Blum's relentlessly documented *Killing Hope* (Blum, 2004) offer two of the best, most detailed, uncompromised and uncensored introductions to the scale and scope of secret government activity, without any nods to the censors (compare to the excellent but heavily-redacted Marchetti and Marks' *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, 1974, for example). Other uncompromised accounts of strong academic value include the oeuvre of Peter Dale Scott (e.g. Scott and Marshall, 1991; Scott, 1993) and works by

Bamford (2001), Dorril (2000), McGehee (1999), Ostrovsky (1991), and Webb (1999). Less harsh indictments include Cockburn and St. Clair (1999), McCoy (2003), Smith (1981) and Wise and Ross (1964). Of increasing value are clearinghouse websites containing recently declassified document scans; the best are *The Memory Hole* (Russ Kick, ed.) and George Washington University's *National Security Archives*. Other websites of value are the *Center for Research on Globalization*, *Covert Action: The Website for the Institute of Media Analysis*, *Cryptome*, and Public Information Research, Inc.'s *Namebase* (see bibliography for web addresses).

How can we afford not to theorize the 'subterranean' but quicksilver rhizomatics of the corporatocracy? How can we leave it out of our sober musing on geopolitical forensics? Asking, after DG (1987), not what rhizomes and hierarchies *mean*, but how they *work*: 'As Gabriel Tarde said, what one needs to know is which peasants, in which areas of the south of France, stopped greeting the local landowners' (216). Through this article, I argue that a reckoning of lying, conspiratorial operations—as much as we are permitted to learn of them—is a *sine qua non* for understanding the limitations that the worldwide smooth spaces of Empire place on the Global Justice Movement and what it can accomplish. In this map, the Pentagon's 'Full Spectrum Dominance' (Shelton, 2000; US Department of Defense, 2006), achieved by the peaceful terror of 'Pax Americana' (Project for a New American Century, 2000) plays the role of fixed point (attractor) for the world system—or, if you will, a black hole for the planet. After gaining an appreciation for the ramifications of Empire's networks and possible end points, we would need to re-envision, perhaps, rhizomes and spaces of global revolution—both in their philosophical and tactical modes.

Geopolitical Forensics of Empire

The CIA is not now nor has it ever been a central intelligence agency. It is the covert action arm of the President's foreign policy advisers. In that capacity it overthrows or supports foreign governments while reporting 'intelligence' justifying those activities[...]Disinformation is a large part of its covert action responsibility, and the American people are the primary target audience of its lies. (McGehee, 1999, 192)

You peel off Watergate and you find the Plumbers and the Ellsberg break-in. Peel off the Plumbers and you find the 1970 Huston plan to use the CIA and FBI for domestic surveillance, wiretapping and break-ins. But what would you find if you peeled off another layer and had a close look at that secret world from which these things had been launched? (Daniel Schorr, 'My 17 Months on the CIA Watch', as quoted in Olmsted, 1996)

Deception and provocation in all their forms—black operations ('black ops'), false flags, limited hangout, disinformation, cover stories, backstories, blackmail,

extortion, conspiracy—are not isolated signs of ‘rogue’ abuses by corporatized State (Empire) *pouvoir*, but rather standard ‘tricks of the trade.’ Deceptive operations are gleefully or repentantly recounted as such in numerous insider and *agent provocateur* accounts (see Agee, 1975; Baer, 2002; Hall, 1987; Smith, 1981). They do ‘work,’ of course, judging by 1980s Afghanistan, 2000s Iraq, 1950s Iran, and myriad other operations. The West has always been more relentless than its ‘deceitful’ opponents; British, French, and other global empires were hardly gained by exchanging pleasantries, respecting treaties, and engaging in chivalrous face-to-face combat alone. The geohistory of the North American continent, from a First Nations’ perspective, is found in the garbage can for broken treaties.

Deceit often seems obvious in retrospect (because some of the grosser violations, like Iraq 2003, quickly unravel; others are sealed for decades, after which they are ‘irrelevant’ to ‘current geopolitical realities’). However, what many otherwise reasonable people fail to understand is that multitudinous deceptions are also always ongoing, in the spectral, covert space-time that is by definition faster-than-legal and from which hatch the conditions for diplomacy and trade ties to succeed or fail, or happen in the first place. Why discredit one’s own party with a botched *Bahía de Cochinos* (Bay of Pigs) when a ‘false flag’ operation can successfully discredit the opposition without dirtying your own hands? Alternately, botch the *Bahía de Cochinos* on purpose to discredit a third party. Sophisticated black ops involve deep infiltration by non-official cover (NOC) *agents provocateurs*, spurring unwitting ‘terrorists’ or ‘anarchists’ to plan and carry out extreme acts—often beyond what they originally would have considered—without understanding that they are being steered, P2OG-style (Hess, 2002), by a group that seeks to use their actions to justify reactions of its own (self-righteous reaction being the prerogative of Empire). Particularly heinous (for having been exposed) examples include the Lavon Affair (Ostrovsky, 1991), Operation Northwoods (Bamford, 2001), and Stakeknife (Ingram and Harkin, 2004).

Greater degrees of perfection are reached when, for example, the secret state uses more than one smokescreen of plausible deniability to separate itself and its agents from a ‘terrorist’ group that carries out an act that is then not only blamed on the mystified terrorists, but also on their purported State sponsors (who in all truth may be also aiding the same group, albeit for different reasons). The purported State sponsor was, needless to say, the real target all along. Such a brilliantly executed ‘false flag’ easily leads to sanctions, war, and reconstruction or, in the case of internal civil conflicts, the destruction of real opposition—something that was largely successful in the US through the FBI’s COINTELPROs and the CIA’s Operation CHAOS in the 1960s and 1970s. These operations always leave a scum of suspicion, accusations, and other ‘anomalies,’ but with the respectable, mainstream media not probing too deeply, dissident critiques are facilely but effectively dismissed as ‘conspiracy theories.’ As discussed below in reference to 9-11, not all conspiracy theories are equal, however...

In the interests of entrained global capital flows and directed coagulations (portrayed brilliantly in Gaghan's 2005 movie *Syriana*), Empire's networks deploy a wide range of assets and tricks in the media (both mainstream and other) with 'diplomats who prefer to remain anonymous' leaking memos to befuddle researchers and create multiple truths, many contradictory. As the trails leading to and from earth-shaking events grow cold, the intermingled Woozle tracks, *a la* A. A. Milne's hapless Winnie-the-Pooh and Piglet, can no longer be distinguished in the common muck, while the testimony of unimpeachable witnesses is subject to the problems of human memory itself as well as to the oft-cited, almost multiple-personality disorder complexes of even (but perhaps particularly) the best 'superspies' (see, for example, Dorril, 2000; Ostrovsky, 1991). There is also, as in any operation involving high levels of dissimulation coupled with possibilities for personal power gain, the element of psychopathy (sociopathy) leading to completely fabricated but completely believable lives and situations (see Cleckley, 1964, and Hare, 1999, for psychopathy). Lurking in the background are the Intelligence Communities' woe-is-us statements that 'we are only known by our mistakes' and their brags that 'our greatest successes will never be known' (see Baer, 2002, and Thomas, 2002, for example). Meanwhile, the overt results of the 'successes'—cowed trading partners, war, reconstruction, a terrified and submissive populace, etc.—are usually obvious, but are attributed by swarms of superficial analysts and apologists to the interplay of understood and acknowledged processes rather than from covert machinations.

So geopolitical forensics research cannot be subjected easily to verification or falsification. In other words, 'truth' is relative and constructed not only as a function of the postmodern condition, but also as a function of the waters being muddied intentionally, often by people whose very job skills entail being able to hold multiple, contradictory identities—shapeshifters, in a sense. People who may or may not know what they're doing spread what may or may not be lies, depending on whether or not you believe them to be speaking truthfully, and whether they even care whether or not what they are saying bears any resemblance to that mythical state of 'what actually happened.' In this milieu, you can't often 'prove' much more than the 'limited hangout' narrative given the stamp of approval by respected figures. Because of 'plausible deniability' woven into the fabric of this reality, even years of careful ethnography among local victims and eyewitnesses may not add up to more than 'hearsay.' Plus, there are always problems with vagueness and amnesia, for reasons of 'National Security.' The situation is comparable to attempting to put together a jigsaw puzzle of a thousand pieces, of which 990 are 'classified.' (The declassification of US government documents *en masse* at the end of 2006 has certainly brightened things a bit, but a word of caution is in order: the best parts are still blacked-out in the declassified documents, and even if they weren't, the status of 'Truth' in such contentious current issues as Global Warming and Intelligent Design, for large sectors of a given population, never seems to correlate with the 'side' presenting the most sound evidence, not to mention the more logical arguments. Faith and force

(particularly of circumstance) do as much or more to influence prevailing narratives than scientific rigor).

The stigma attached to research into so-called ‘deep politics’ that I am calling ‘geopolitical forensics,’ particularly in the US and particularly post-John F. Kennedy assassination (when academics and highly respected investigative journalists were blowing apart conspiracy after conspiracy, up until around 1975 when the secret state was at its lowest ebb in the popular imagination, post-Watergate and Pike Commission, and after the existence of the COINTELPROs and Operation CHAOS were divulged [Olmsted, 1996]), has led to the unlikely and Orwellian application of the epithet ‘conspiracy theorist’ to dissident researchers with a functionalist bent—i.e., those trying to do detective work on political events under the assumption that anomalies, in a forensic sense, should not be seen as ‘noise’ (as they might be in a controlled experiment) but rather as possibly crucial evidence: the little bits of carelessness, the tracks of the secret state from which castes might be fashioned. Peter Dale Scott provides one of the most thoughtful analyses of the conspiracy smear in *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK* (1993); see also Fetzer (2006). Nevertheless, ‘conspiracy theorist’ has emerged as perhaps the most powerful discursive weapon to marginalize and belittle all inconvenient dissident positions, particularly when it is wrapped around the pole of totalizing conspiracism—the so-called ‘paranoid worldview’ in which secret actors have conspired in all historical events (history doesn’t happen by accident), tainted, it goes without saying, by McCarthyism, Hitlerian anti-Semitism, the Black Legend, and so forth. (‘Geopolitics’ itself, as an academic research, has of course had to stake claim to a minoritarian and radical terrain [e.g Tuathail et al., 1998] to combat its imperialist ‘grand narrative’ lineage from Halford Mackinder through Karl Haushofer to Samuel Huntington.) In other words, consensus opinion—respectable discourse—when it pays attention to ‘conspiracy theories’ at all, irresponsibly imputes ‘interpretosis,’ as DG would have it—a paranoia produced by the State in its Imperial Despotic mode and its signifying regime of signs—to ALL researches and theories that are trying to find out ‘what happened’ based on available material evidence and rigorous logic. While paranoia is indeed a social as well as psychological disease, it is worthwhile pointing out that the phrase ‘everything is connected’ (the tagline for *Syriana*) could as well be a description of an ecosystem or the global economy. Are biologists and economists similarly paranoid?

Speaking metaphorically, and a little over my head, I would suggest that deep political analysis enlarges traditional structuralist analysis to include indeterminacies analogous to those which are studied in chaos theory. (Scott, 1993, xiii)

Deleuze and Guattari’s version of complexity theory makes a distinction between connection, where bonds are formed that preserve difference, and conjunction, where a striating agent—often enveloped—forcefully joins the different into the Same. Signs are emitted during both combinatory processes, and

because connections and conjunctions interweave with each other in the operations of machinic assemblages, it is easy to confuse one with the other. (For example, at first approximation, romantic love and sexual desire are seemingly connective syntheses of human bodies, while Marriage is the conjunctive synthesis par excellence; but at a more rigorous level of analysis, sex, love, and marriage are entangled, conjoining and connecting with each other within a machinic assemblage—an operative network—of social relations, in which telling the striating from the smoothing forces is nearly impossible and possibly beside the point.) Religions—totalizing conspiracy theories, some of them—often do so. Nothing happens spontaneously or by accident; in everything there is a hidden hand that does the conjoining. Even army ant swarms, a weakly striated but strongly nonlinear pack-system, are in the beginning and the end controlled, guided, or at least inspired by God. Does it follow that the secret state is God?

A very touchy subject of ‘conspiracy-mongering’ in the early 2000s has been the cloud of anomalous events surrounding the day of 9-11-2001, as well as apparently related previous and subsequent ‘terrorist attacks.’ Widespread resistance to dissident theories about 9-11 is far stronger than the resistance to dissident Iraq 2003 theories (the build-up to the attack on Saddam Hussein’s government in March of that year), largely because an entire worldview, the worldview promulgated by Empire—and the generational War on Terror (War To Defend Freedom) that follows logically—is predicated upon almost blind acceptance of what David Griffin calls the ‘official conspiracy theory of 9-11:’ nineteen Arab hijackers guided by a man in a cave in Afghanistan (Griffin, 2005, 5). In the *fait accompli* of Iraq, however, the ‘Coalition of the Willing’ was already well ensconced by the time the pre-invasion ‘conspiracy theories’ were shown to be correct (though some, in early 2006, were still looking for Saddam’s WMD: see Stoll, 2006), but there is no turning back without, it is often argued, complete collapse in the region, leading to threats to energy supplies and terrorists again hitting the US mainland. But 9-11 is something much bigger, an epoch-changing event like the JFK assassination that raises specters of deep political realities far more monstrous than many US citizens might care to contemplate. The crux of the issue appears to be resistance to the idea of any Reichstag Fire-type operation where the US government, or ‘rogue elements’ of it, harms its own country for political and financial gains. It should be pointed out that while self-wounding, staged accidents, and incendiarism for insurance collection are common and widespread, the idea that these types of phenomena can happen at wider scales meets a resistance that states, in effect ‘it can’t happen in the US, period—therefore, we needn’t look at the evidence.’ The ‘Scholars for 9-11 Truth’ dissident group of ‘crackpot conspiracy theorists’ that coalesced in 2005 around a coterie of academics including Stephen Jones, David Griffin, and James Fetzer (supported, for example, by Jones’s (2005) study of the collapse of the World Trade towers), is reminiscent of groups that formed out of the political chaos (CHAOS) of the 1960s

and 1970s.² It is worthwhile to remember that those who questioned the self-evident ‘truths’ spread by the USSR’s secret state were often diagnosed with mental illness (Amnesty International, 1975). In any case, probably the most intriguing piece of 9-11 dissident literature is Paul Thompson’s 2004 *Terror Timeline* (Griffin 2004 and 2005 are also seminal works).

My use of the term ‘secret state’ recognizes the vast literature—selections of which are cited above—and the common popular as well as elite acknowledgment that the ‘powers behind the throne’ are the coalitions of secretive government agencies, many appearing, at least in modern guise, during or after WWII, that are little disturbed by surface changes but quite responsive to the needs of global capital and other implacable forces and flows. The CIA in the US, the Mossad in Israel (Ostrovsky, 1991), and MI6 in the UK (Dorril, 2000) are three oft-cited examples (though in reality in each case they simply embody the most ‘rogue’ elements of networks characterized as ‘intelligence communities’). These are widely acknowledged as necessary evils, however, in the face of the operations of the secret states at the heart of, for example, Iran (‘the mullahs’), Russia (‘former KGB hardliners and ultra-nationalists’), China (‘old-guard Communist Party’), Pakistan (the ISI), Syria (Ba’ath party), and so forth, where purportedly impenetrable cores of ruling parties are conflated with secret police apparatuses, spy agencies, certain elite military units, religious movements, and so forth. The birth pangs of the ‘Al Qa’eda network’ discourse are rather unique, in that its chief rogues—Osama bin Laden, Zarqawi, and other ‘operatives’—have embodied almost-perfect Emmanuel Goldstein³ personae that operate, somehow, independently of State sponsorship but in concert with drug traffickers and other organized crime networks (which, in dominant official discourse, also operate essentially disconnected from State sponsorship, or at least the sponsorship of ‘our allies’ and us). But this is all the type of disinformational crypto-diplomatic discourse that has little value for any geopolitical forensics investigating real flows and coagulations.

The frequently-invoked ‘necessary evils’ of the contemporary secret Western state apparatuses that bolster Empire are rarely equated with or traced to the operation of deep temporal secret and quasi-secret societies based on ‘eternal’ religious and moral principals, family ties, and other sources of a combined *pouvoir/puissance*. But literature and speculation abound on the decades- and even centuries-long ‘grip’ of the Garduña as the enforcers in Inquisition Spain; the medieval secret tribunals of Westphalia; the Carbonari and Camorra of Italy; the Assassins of the Middle East; Chinese Tongs and Triads (Chesneaux, 1972); US Cosa Nostra; and numerous secret societies with controlling influences in ethnic

2 Though it should be noted that the Scholars, on their website, appear to support the contention that a large jet did not hit the Pentagon—an issue that is often seen in dissident circles as itself a disinformation campaign to ‘muddy the waters’ and cast serious doubt on any and all dissident theories.

3 Big Brother’s pseudo-fictional nemesis in George Orwell’s *1984*.

groups across the world (Heckethorn, 1965, provides the ‘classic’ compendium of these). More relevant to Empire, historian Quigley’s largely shunned 1981 study of the Cecil Rhodes milieu—*The Anglo-American Establishment*—describes an unnamed late 19th and early 20th-century trans-Atlantic cabal with enormous geopolitical power, while Seymour Hersh has stated openly and not metaphorically, in reference to the US Neoconservative movement, that “we’ve been taken over by a cult” (Goodman, 2005).

Hysteria and panic inspired by the purported power of secret societies have, needless to say, resulted in genocide after genocide, from the Nazis (and long before) to 1990s Rwanda. At the same time, in the case of both these genocides, we seem to discover secretive groups such as the Thule Society and Germanenorden in Germany, and a cabal of Tutsi intellectuals in Rwanda, fomenting hysteria about other secret plots. In the early 2000s, we see widespread fear about secret societies controlling enemy States as a common theme, characterized in a ghastly, cartoonish fashion by the ‘plots for Zionist (or Zionist-Crusader) world domination’ and on the flip side, the ‘plot for Islamofascist world domination.’ Simmel’s classic 1906 article, ‘The sociology of secrecy and of secret societies,’ puts the fear, fear-mongering, and genuine plotting in perspective in its discussion of the historical and sociological forms and functions of secret societies (see also Erickson, 1981), which in general are characterized as strongly, often rigidly hierarchized networks embedded within other hierarchies, some of which are secretive as well, enabling the rise of new political movements to power (thus, the Carbonari in Italy, the Ba’ath Party in the Middle East, and numerous examples in China). Since the 1700s, the Freemasons have been frequent targets of infiltration due to the innate secrecy and hierarchical nature of their lodges. The most recent acknowledged Masonic infiltration was the devastating Propaganda Due (P2) Masonic Lodge phenomenon in 1970s and early 1980s Italy, in which Licio Gelli commanded secretive and absolute control over at least a thousand high-ranking military officers, leading Catholic church figures, high-profile politicians (including Silvio Berlusconi), and major capitalists (Ganser, 2005; Vulliamy, 1990); this was linked to the CIA’s stay-behind network that became known as Gladio and its nefarious ‘strategy of tension’ implemented to foment Cold War dichotomies between Right and Left across Europe.

The uncovered tracks and global ramifications of the P2 scandal, like those of the contemporary Iran-Contra and somewhat later BCCI scandals (see also Blum, 2004) are excellent evidence for Empire’s at times seemingly unguessable geopolitical agendas and alliances, masked by multiple and purposefully multivalent levels of secrecy and deception that are bound to fool any linear, cause-and-effect theoretical or investigative approach. Geopolitical forensics, to get around this, needs to employ a nonlinear approach that would, for example, seek to map the attractors and black holes, established pathways, and solidly supportable and predictable plans, actions and reactions, while also acknowledging contingency, creativity, ‘irrationality,’ and psychopathy. An excellent and popular

approximation of this is the late Mark Lombardi's 'conspiracy art' (National Public Radio, 2003).

What results is probabilistic, given all the conditionalities sketched above. To deal with uncertainty while still providing clarity, Scott (1993) employs the concept of the 'milieu' to replace the unknowable (even to the actors involved) interplay of haecceities. The 'Dallas milieu' or 'Chicago milieu' of the 1960s, for example, are Scott's rhizomes of interlinked and cross-compromised machinic assemblages of 'Mafia,' police forces, political parties and movements, dockworker groups, and so forth that, while retaining their differences, are capable of acting in concert, either systematically or on an ad hoc basis, all the while connected to other milieus. The indeterminacy remains, but the milieu serves to 'pin down' a temporally and spatially placed (but open, not bounded) coagulation of *pouvoir* and *puissance* with a probabilistic relationship to observed events.

Empire's Spectral Networks

We are 'fortunate,' in a sense, to have emerged since 9-11 into a dichotomized geopolitical discourse, at least on the part of the US, where we can understand the desired goal of Empire for a group of operators, popularly referred to as 'Neocons,' who have had innumerable successes, after a fashion, as part of the 'Global War on Terror.' Their network of thinktanks—prime among them the Project for a New American Century and the American Enterprise Institute—have made available online numerous policy statements and grand plans, most notably 'Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, forces, and resources for a new century' (Project for a New American Century, 2000). In this grand project, there is much reinvention of Cold War nemeses, and a renewed focus on Pax Americana, Henry Luce's imperial peace to be enforced, eventually, by what the Pentagon has called Full Spectrum Dominance (Shelton, 2000; henceforth 'FSD'). Complementing the thinktanks' online literature is the US Defense Department's wealth of reports and plans at Defense Link; the US Air Force also provides numerous online reports relevant to the FSD vision (see US Air Force, 2003); the Federation of American Scientists' website includes one of the most intriguing of these visions, *Air Force 2025* (US Air Force, 1996)—just the terms embedded in the chapter titles give some idea of this particular future: 'Worldwide Information Control System,' 'Global Battlespace Dominance,' 'Brilliant Warrior,' 'Peacespace Dominance,' Start-Tek [sic]-Exploiting the Final Frontier-Counterspace Operations,' 'Weather as a Force Multiplier: Owning the Weather.'

We should certainly remain unsure whether these are also the desired goals of non-American Empire and of the global market. Mindful of totalizing conspiracy theory, we should emphasize the contrasts between the relative 'mindlessness' of capital flows and the clearly conspiratorial *pouvoir* of the Neocons' militarism (not underestimating the 'hidden hand of the market,' however!). Nevertheless, the success and the sheer publicity of the latter's synarchical constructive chaos is an anchoring point among the cognitive dissonances of Empire's subjects—a bold

plan that gives us some idea of the black hole of macro-fascism that is inspired, one suspects, by more than profit and the bottom line. We could say, preliminarily, that FSD is the threat of the constitution of a Deleuzian ‘Full Body,’ an end-state of global organization (as opposed to the ‘Body without Organs’). We need to examine the evidence for this to be able to state that the multitude has not infrequently been duped (recently, for example, in the color-coded revolutions in the Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere). We will also see that the achievement of FSD appears to necessitate clashes with deep alternate centers of *pouvoir* such as China and Russia, and thus the black hole, or perhaps wormhole, of global thermonuclear conflict, rather than Pax Americana, could be the result (for the ‘threats’ posed by China and Russia, see Project for a New American Century, 2000 and PNAC sections on East Asia and NATO/Europe). While examining the precursors below, it is worth remembering that the (white man’s) ‘burden of civilization’ for the West is centuries old, and dreams of world conquest (e.g. magus John Dee’s angelically-suggested role for Elizabethan England: French, 1987) are nothing new. What is new, perhaps, is the possibility of attainment of global striation at a higher level of perfection through ‘smooth’ dominance over submarine space, ocean space, land space, airspace, outer space, and cyber space, as FSD would have it.

In the postmodern era (1945-present), two spectral networks—International Communism and International Terrorism (Sageman, 2004)—have had life breathed into them and have served, in concert with the ‘Evil Empire’ and certain ‘rogue states,’ to instill microfascisms in many a democratic- and freedom-loving body in the USA, while in realpolitik advancing the spread and penetrations of Empire. The grand International Communist Conspiracy, with roots in the late 1800s, was the earlier of the two, and it served its purpose well all the way up to the end of the 1980s. To keep the Reds at bay, the secret state infiltrated the Left as successfully as the Right (Quigley, 1966), coming to saturate the media, academe, and public relations (Saunders, 2000), though often passing itself off as inept, inefficient, and even relatively powerless. During this time, subversive revolutionary movements both domestic and foreign were not necessarily decapitated as often as they were made safe, channelled into ‘more productive’ operations; or, if need be, as described above, swung in the other direction, steered and tricked into spectacular false flag operations that gave excuses for jailtime, invasion, toppling of regimes, or at least sanctions or discrediting. Authoritarian/communist/police states with eyes everywhere became necessities not only because of internal paranoia and the ‘nature of totalitarian State power’ but also because of the myriad sabotages practiced by the ‘free world’—the experience of *Gladio* (Blum, 2004) is extremely instructive here, and the case of Castro’s Cuba comes to mind as well. Terrible questions are suggested, such as if some political prisoners really are plotting to violently overthrow the regime, then should the regime, to prove its ‘commitment to democracy,’ let them go?

The newer menace of international Islamic terrorism is built on the premise of a network that arose out of two secretive groups—Wahabism, based in Saudi Arabia, and the Muslim Brotherhood, engendered in Egypt—that coalesced in the 1980s through resistance to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. Emboldened by the withdrawal of the USSR, the foreign mujahedin returned to their countries and were rebuffed, if not detained and tortured, by the regimes in power, who did the bidding of the US. Thence, led by Osama bin Laden, they turned on the West (Esposito, 2002; Scheuer, 2003; Sageman, 2004). But the very existence of a self-named and cohesive ‘Al Qa’eda’ network, which was named at the behest of FBI agent John O’Neill (Frontline, 2002), has been questioned, most notably and effectively in the BBC documentary ‘Power of Nightmares’ (Curtis, 2005), which argues that International Terrorism is the ultimate bugaboo narrative that serves to bolster the power of governments that no longer provide us with comfort and positive achievement (capitalism does that) and so have refashioned themselves as our protectors from nightmares.

‘Al Qaeda’ has, nevertheless, taken on a monstrous existence, just as the International Communist Conspiracy did in the days of McCarthy—perpetrating devastating crimes such as 9-11-2001 and 3-11-2003 and 7-7-2005 (intriguingly, the only person to ever be convicted of 9-11 plotting was released in early 2006 in Germany—the US government was unwilling to provide prosecutors with requested evidence: Agence France-Presse, 2006). Ahmed (2006) provides a solid argument for Al Qa’eda as intricately interwoven with what we are calling Empire. The evidence for the perpetrators behind 9-11, as well as other terror events, points back to Empire’s networks (conservatively put, ‘rogue elements of X’), and particularly, as gagged whistleblower Sibel Edmonds has it (www.justacitizen.org; see Rose, 2005, and other literature on her case), to networks of far-right mercenaries (which of course Osama bin Laden always was in any case) duping other cells of mercenary-terrorists connected not to ‘rogue states’ like Iraq, Iran, and North Korea but to major Western powers and allied states, to NGOs and drug trafficking, money-laundering, influence-peddling, and other P2/Iran-Contra/BCCI/Gladio-type operations. Needless to say, massive funds are poured into the US’s ‘black budget’ and its open budget to better fight this terrorist menace, possibly by infiltrating its cells and pushing its operatives to carry out acts they might not otherwise choose to, horrendous crimes that give Empire an excuse to further its agenda (Hess, 2002).

Global Smooth Spaces

It can be predicted that the impending problems of the economy, which will consist in reforming capital in relation to new resources (undersea oil, metallic nodules, foodstuffs), will require not only a redistribution of the world that will mobilize the worldwide war machine and train its parts on the new objectives; we will also probably see the formation or

re-formation of minoritarian aggregates, in relation to the affected regions.’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 472)

Striation, of course, survives in the most perfect and severest of forms...; however, it relates primarily to the state pole of capitalism, in other words, to the role of the modern State apparatuses in the organization of capital. On the other hand, at the complementary and dominant level of *integrated (or rather integrating) world capitalism*, a new smooth space is produced in which capital reaches its ‘absolute’ speed...the multinationals fabricate a kind of deterritorialized smooth space... (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 492) (italics in original)

The global smooth space of capitalism seizes every opportunity to extend the hidden hand of the market and the Neoliberal globalization project, via mechanisms such as the WTO, the IMF, CAFTA-DR and the FTAA, seeking to privatize every last square centimeter, every thought, every gene, for when everything is owned, in the Neoliberal equation, only then can the Public Good be guaranteed—Ayn Randian and Milton Friedmannian visions, needless to say (excellent testimony to this is found in the movie and supporting interviews for *The Corporation*: Achbar et al., 2004). There are tugs of war, of course, and often brutal ones, between international finance (the Wall Street-City of London axis particularly), manufacturing, energy, and retailing sectors, intersected by the tools and techniques (and profits) of the information sector. Whether and when Empire’s networks subtend or overcode the perpetual expansion of profits is unclear, but we certainly know by now that DG’s quarter-century-old pronouncements on the dangers of the postfascist global smooth spaces of the worldwide war machines harnessed to transnational capital have been proven correct. Striation and hierarchization, or at least the fears of them, are but tools to fool producer-consumers by channeling the public good and the products of labor into the ends desired by the free market. ‘Big Oil’ is an obvious example—and a venerable one—of the hold that global capitalism has on the State (see Galeano, 1998, on Standard Oil in Latin America, for example). The petroleum-saturated State has become largely a function of the needs of Big Oil, its investors and its stockholders, while the public trust is now represented as, in effect, ‘corporations do things better and deliver what we need; our duty is to consume their products.’

The Global Justice Movement (GJM), like State socialism before it, is perhaps the greatest real threat to Empire (not spectral in the sense that International Terrorism is), and after the 1999 ‘Battle for Seattle’ the security zones for the World Economic Forum and other such meetings have deepened and hardened. The GJM is the archetypal rhizome, a smooth space of global revolution, decentralized, enabled by the Internet, capable of plugging into myriad allied resistance movements, always paranoid but healthily so, as a safeguard against infiltration. But there are drawbacks, associated with speed and ethics. The global networks deployed by Empire to do its dirty work have little need to operate legally or follow bureaucratic guidelines: they can infiltrate and exfiltrate anywhere and

everywhere; their budgets are in the billions of US dollars; they can place stories, and particularly backstories, at will in the major and minor media; violence and torture are some of their tools of trade. Meanwhile, even a broken store window can be anathema for the GJM, because this gives Empire the excuse to crack down. We see self-immolations, hunger strikes, marches, bitter words, and many real victories, but always an extremely careful approach to destruction so as not to invite the wrong kind of retaliation. One reads of ‘lifestyle anarchism’ and scoffs, perhaps, but one knows that, even in Bolivia, Evo won in part because the Indians knew better than to go too far, and not create an excuse for tyranny and dissolution of all that had been gained (not creating the excuse, for example, to ‘send in the Marines’ or provide air support—not yet, anyway). But I wonder, then, whether the open-source global smooth space of the GJM is always/already too contaminated to operate in, even in the present—not to mention the future, which we can now briefly discuss, enabled by the War on Terror/Terra.

Full Spectrum Dominance: The Smooth Space of Pax Americana

This worldwide war machine, which in a way ‘reissues’ from the States, displays two successive figures: first, that of fascism [...] and the second, post-fascism, figure is that of a war machine that takes peace as its object directly, as the peace of Terror or Survival. The war machine reforms a smooth space that now claims to control, to surround the entire earth. Total war is itself surpassed, toward a form of peace more terrifying still (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 421)

In the US, our waking nightmare is Henry Luce’s old dream of the American Century, still vivid after sixty years, interrupted by the disgust engendered by Vietnam, by Goldwater, McCarthy, and Watergate, by divulgations of CHAOS and COINTELPROs, by the Pike and Church committees, but taking ashape anew in the Reagan Era and culminating with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the USSR, and Desert Storm. Though Empire’s reach expanded in the 1990s in the Clinton era, the Project for a New American Century was born among anti-Clinton factions united under the aegis of Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Dick Cheney and others who had claimed during the administration of George H. W. Bush that the time was ripe to expand US hegemony with the ‘collapse of communism,’ rather than engage in ‘appeasement’ of rogue regimes in an endless series of Sunshine policies.

In *Rebuilding America’s Defenses* (PNAC, 2000) (see also Study Group on a “New Israeli Strategy toward 2000,” 1996), released prior to George W. Bush’s first appointment to the US presidency, plans for the New American Century are laid down in clear language and generally sit well with Pentagon strategic reviews of the same period. *Rebuilding America’s Defenses* infamously wishes for a ‘new Pearl Harbor’ to galvanize traditionally isolationist US citizens to rally around active US intervention overseas (notably, the document makes only scant mention of terrorism). The American dream of a global smooth space, as mentioned above,

involves Full Spectrum Dominance (FSD) and such programs as weather modification ('weather as a force multiplier': US Air Force, 1996), biowarfare, supersoldiers, and a missile shield.

Wallerstein (2002) and others would have us believe that Pax Americana is now in shambles, but there is little evidence for this after George W. Bush's anti-isolationist 2006 *State of the Union* address and the release of the Pentagon's *Quadrennial Defense Review Report* (2006).⁴ Coincidence by coincidence and convenience by convenience, Pax Americana asserts itself in the new millennium; one momentous event was the gathering of the entire Intelligence Community under a new czar, John Dmitri Negroponte, an *éminence grise* tempered in Honduras during the Contra War (see Kornbluh, n.d.), in Vietnam, at the UN during the lead up to the 2003 Iraq invasion, and as ambassador to Iraq. This was part of the most significant restructuring of the US covert apparatus since the 1947 National Security Act.

The documents and positions cited above are framed within the US's 'problems' of China and energy security, and in 2008 are clearly linked to the erection of 'missile shield' components in places such as Poland, read by Russian leaders as a direct threat to them rather than as a somewhat unlikely deterrent to Iran and other, smaller rogue states. The solution, as put forth by the Pentagon, is the push toward FSD, the attractor of Empire in which the ultimate terror of eternal peace will be realized, going beyond even DG's discussions of this in *A Thousand Plateaus* (the Cold War and Mutually Assured Destruction).

Following DG and their prime inspirations (Fernand Braudel and Paul Virilio, for example: see particularly Virilio, 1998), we can rapidly trace the evolution of Full Spectrum Dominance, bounded in each epoch by technological horizons, and beginning with the Urstaat's⁵ striation of cities and countryside. The growth and contractions of what Frank (in Frank and Gills, 1996) has asserted to be the 'one world system' include imperial striation of inland and near-shore waters and strategic chokepoints to guarantee hegemony (via 'protection' of trade routes and ports, for example). Larger striated seas such as the Mediterranean aided the conjunction of surrounding lands by unified empires (during Pax Romana, for example), or the connection of imperial enemies (Turks and Europeans, for example) within a wider economic rhizome (Frank's world system, temporally 4500 years deeper than Wallerstein's).

4 My reading of this report is that 'constructive chaos' is seen as a good thing by the Neocons—they are, in other words, not fibbing when they speak of Iraq as a success and of the strong potential for a new Cold War with the Russian 'Bear' of 2008, as well for an invasion of Iran (still in the future at time of writing). They are in no way desperate, in retreat, or a sign of the loss of American hegemony at the expense of brute power—I ascribe a certain theatricality and a huge margin of deception to the ebbs and flows, and the character substitutions that characterize the rightwing revolution of Neoconservatism.

5 Urstaat: DG's term for the archaic State and state-form that was spawned from the city-states of Mesopotamia

Because the present conjunctions and connections of Empire derive from European world hegemony through colonialism, we need to underscore Iberian, French, British, Dutch, Italian, and other powers' desires to striate the planet for varied commercial and politico-religious goals unified by capitalism and Christianity (even where terrible inter-European conflicts existed, as between England and Spain). The originary fourteenth-century drive of Henry the Navigator, derived from his leading position in the Order of Christ (an offshoot or reinvention of the Knights Templar), was a neo-Crusader project concerned with circumnavigating Africa and joining the forces of Prester John to circumvent the Moors' and Turks' territories and take back the Holy Land. The Columbian project was obviously based on a desire to connect, if not conjoin, the economies of the Orient and Europe and again avoid the eastern Mediterranean, which, after 1453, was clearly in the Ottoman sphere. Later, the world vision of Tudor and Stuart England was derived from the force of the Church of England and the mysticism of magus John Dee and polymath Francis Bacon, who dreamed of and advocated a British Empire based on the resuscitation of Atlantis and the myths of Madoc and King Arthur (see Taylor, 1930 and 1934). The polycentrism of Empire as a globe-spanning phenomenon most certainly dates from at least 1600, then.

With European investment banking capital in the main financial centers (Venice, Florence, Amsterdam, London, etc.) as the driving force, we see the enabling of sea-power and the striation of the world ocean's surface. With each voyage a thickening web of European tendrils, and European gunboats in the ports of sultans and kings, 'kept the peace.' With the evolution of the 'fleet-in-being' and, from the late 1600s, the 350-year supremacy of the Royal Navy as a guarantor of Western domination in commerce, the world ocean became definitively European. From there ensued a step-by-step process of penetration into the interiors of all continents and then increasingly rigid striation (though with economic striation complete, the granting of political 'independence' became possible). The notable exception to western European striation were interior eastern and northern Asia that came to be striated by non-western European/US powers, resulting today in Russia and China.

In the twentieth century, Empire took flight, with the consequent horrors of aerial bombardment and chemical warfare. Then came radar, spy satellites, GIS/GPS, and remote-controlled Predator drones, piloted from Langley but flying over Yemen, deploying Hellfire missiles to eliminate terrorists (Meyer, 2006). And given the thermonuclear bomb and the ICBM, we are of course still firmly in the global peace of Empire, the peace of terror that DG describe, with the ultimate horrors of the war machines always deferred, and thus profits that continue to accrue as capital flows unrestrained but for the occasional 'rogue.' Deference, not deterrence, has been the primary psychological weapon of Empire since the early 1950s.

By the 1930s, we also had the U-Boat and the beginning of the 'conquest' of the interior of the oceans, where nuclear missile-armed submarines 'prowl' close

to the shores of ‘rogue states,’ moles popping up anywhere, the striation of the land achieved from smooth undersea space. And still, even the ‘humble’ land-based tank is a purveyor of smooth space, as it has no need to follow boundaries, *limes*, lines, or grids (DG, 1987). It smoothes striated space, at least up to a point.

The GJM does not have anti-tank missiles, but it does have words. But thence ARPANET and the Internet, and global forums of discontent. No longer is it necessary for Empire’s agents to guess at what we subjects are thinking, or misjudge public sentiment, when, under the guise of ‘anonymous’ screen names, weblogging communities pour forth their innermost feelings. Cyberspace provides statistical insights to intelligence analysts even where IPs are masked, though at the same time, ‘too much freedom’ has led the Pentagon to call for reins on cyberspace and to package it with FSD.

And all these nomadic forces that rage across, around, under, and through our striated and segmented spaces and lives as well as our global smooth space of revolution connect, rhizomatically—submarine and aircraft carrier and satellite and tank and underground bunker and cybernetwork; embodied in the supercomputer, supersoldier, and superspy. For despite the GJM’s rhizomatic slimemold that can coalesce anywhere into a body of resistance (thanks to the Internet), Empire’s global smooth space can anticipate this and rise up beside it and within it, even as a function of it, matching it, haecceity for haecceity (almost), and also descend upon it at (almost) any point, in (almost) any place, for (almost) any reason or for none at all, with few strictures of legality, where a backstory can always be created, where the gulag of Guantanamo—a named place—imparts less security than the undivulged locations whither terrorist-militant-dissidents are rendered. Given, there are setbacks, as there were for Francis Walsingham, engineer of England’s spy network, after 1588. Nevertheless, FSD continues to approach us, for some as greater monetary profit but for others as a distinct type of reward for militantly religious patriots. Oliver North, as defended by the American Civil Liberties Union, is a seminal and highly instructional figure in this, a Cold Warrior *par excellence*.

Where and when are the boundaries? Full Spectrum Dominance takes us to space, both to earth orbits and to ‘outer space.’ Here we encounter the Missile Shield, killer satellites, laser cannons and mirrors, the militarization of space by the US and the final triumph of Empire, the use of the global smooth space to striate everything forever—the triumph of post-fascism: Orwell’s eternal boot on the face.

Nazism in Germany, as DG point out, was from the start suicidal (DG, 1987; Virilio, 1998): desperate, starved for fuel, and floundering for lack of resources to run its war machine. Japan’s lightning conquest of archipelagan smooth space was turned back and swallowed, point by point, by encompassing Western power, while Germany was sucked toward the Caucasus and the Caspian by its need for fuel, but exhausted by the USSR, at the same time that the world ocean was in transition from Royal Navy to US Navy hegemony. At the end of

World War II and at the beginning of World War I, world economic power was orchestrated by the same financial centers (Wall Street and the City of London) though with somewhat different arrays of secondary financial centers linked to these poles. So polycentric Empire grew even as two of its most massive components committed suicide.

But is Pax Americana also suicidal? Is American global post-fascism doomed, as Wallerstein (2002) has it? Perhaps, but does Empire, even if it ultimately shrugs off Pax Americana, as the culmination of the Urstaat always already contain within it the conditions of its own collapse and fragmentation (even beyond the likelihood of thermonuclear war)? Here we are not speaking solely of the positive *puissance* of multitude, but also of feedback loops that stem from a physicochemical logic and prerogative far deeper than the cancerous growth of the world economy. Does the world economy, consuming finite resources to feed its infinite expansion, end up consuming itself, octopus-like, as the biosphere is converted to degraded forms of energy? Do positive feedback loops thus precipitate a ‘civilizational’ collapse? If so, does the Full Body of post-fascism, encompassing the entire planet and its environs, feed upon itself and commit suicide (thermonuclear exchanges no longer deferred?).

What possibilities does the multitude’s global smooth space of revolution really have in its struggles to localize power once again, decentering networks and retooling commodity chains, and trying to rescue the human mind from dreams of endless accumulation, when hundreds of millions of urban Chinese and Indians (for example) are only now beginning to dream a hybrid ‘American’ Dream in their own countries? I am also reminded of the hopelessness of little Guernicas and Pathan wedding parties—had they only known! Instead of a boundless multitude to match a boundless Empire, the latter reserving physical violence as its privilege and the former always already yoked to global capitalism, can we imagine, instead, a defense of the hierarchy and the nation-state dominated by a strong core, with clear boundaries between each and its neighbors, and 170+ total units (why not melting into thousands?), within a weakly connected and radically decentered world economy? We might, rather, be speaking of Switzerlands—confederated ‘societies against the State.’ After DG, we can also speak of terrestrial holey space, the underground, physically as well as discursively, a counter-web of deceptions to match imperial deceptions and, perhaps, even destructions to match destructions.

These are, of course, dangerously radical, even reactionary, ruminations. At very least, though the GJM is crucially important even if parts of it become co-opted, and we will return to it in the conclusion, we will first consider how ‘black box’ ‘rogue’ nation-states function as foils to and disruptors of Pax Americana. Here we are concerned with their functionality vis-à-vis the apparently suicidal tendency of Empire, NOT necessarily with the well-being of their citizens relative to governments that meet Pax Americana’s approval (though this is a bit of a moot point, since the ‘democratic miracle’ of Iraq, post-Saddam, is currently [2008] the most dangerous and violent place on Earth). I also don’t wish to be entrapped by

the ‘I admit that Saddam was an evil dictator’ type of statement, which forces the speaker to admit that, despite the illegality of the 2003 invasion, Empire was really correct in its actions. Thus I am bracketing ‘freedom’ and ‘democracy,’ as tainted and cynical as they have become (or always were?).

Confederations as Vacuoles (Foiling FSD I)

It would be nothing to do with minorities speaking out. Maybe speech and communication have been corrupted. They’re thoroughly permeated by money—and not by accident but by their very nature. We’ve got to hijack speech. Creating has always been something different from communicating. The key thing is to create vacuoles of noncommunication, circuit breakers, so we can elude control. (Deleuze, 1995, 174)

Deleuze, realizing the penetrative and saturative possibilities of Empire’s global smooth space, hints in *Negotiations* (1995) at his need for increased envelopment and for the formation of vacuoles, presumably bounded space-times within which much can be achieved, but not so openly. Here, I co-opt this phrase to comment on the phenomena of democratically-elected and decidedly non-authoritarian Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and Evo Morales in Bolivia, the former a figure of hope for much of the US Left in the devastation left by Hurricane Katrina in 2005 (Whitney, 2005). Here is an archetypal figure adored in working-class Latin America because his ‘Bolivarian revolution’ has redistributed wealth without curtailing liberties. Chavez is an elected leader who is also from the military, funded by oil wealth and clearly a threat to Pax Americana. ‘Socialist’ and in support of similar nation-state projects elsewhere in Latin America, he (and to a certain extent Lula, Evo Morales, Daniel Ortega and the rest of the ‘New Left’ leaders in Latin America who emerged in the mid-2000s) is also clearly in favor of globalization, but of a quasi-Neoliberal globalization that purports to be emancipatory and socialist: free trade where the deck is not stacked against the Global South, for example. This is nothing new for the so-called South, and we have also witnessed the overthrow of revolutionary leaders there again and again, from Mossadegh and Allende to Arbenz and Lumumba. The social conditions achieved in Libya under Qaddafi are somewhat analogous, and the reforms promised by Hamas’s participation in the 2006 election in Palestine, not to mention the socioeconomic advances in 1990s and 2000s Iran, also exemplify cases of being indispensable to the global economy but not shying away from attacking Pax Americana (it is hardly a coincidence that Iran, Libya, and Venezuela are all petroleum exporters). A world peppered, or even dominated by countries such as Bolivia, Venezuela and Libya is one possible foil to FSD and Pax Americana. This type of world is also the threat (of ‘regional superpowers’) decried by the Project for A New American Century (2000).

For Iran and North Korea, the barriers to Empire are the possibilities of checkmating any further aggression by Empire. Both cases are intriguing—they are

part of the Axis of Evil (or they were, if by time of reading they no longer exist as they were in mid-2008). With Iraq, they are listed as rogue states in *Rebuilding America's Defenses*, impenetrable black boxes that tend to 'force' the West to call for the use of nuclear strikes against their 'hardened infrastructure.' For Pax Americana to (have) triumph(ed) in these two notable cases, the deep power centers of China and Russia might have to have been thoroughly infiltrated to guarantee some sort of implicit consent, but there have been few signs in the 2000s that this has happened. Indeed, the opposite appears to have been happening. As Pax Americana has extended itself into the Ukraine, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, and elsewhere, deep power centers in China and Russia have appeared to fold in upon themselves (again?) and also connect with each other. Again, it should be possible to appreciate the Russia-China nexus as a foil to FSD while not condoning the abuses that occur in either country. Certainly, Full Spectrum Dominance cannot be achieved as long as Russia and particularly China have not come to accept the inevitability of Pax Americana (I believe it was 'wishful thinking' in the 1990s that both powers were fully within Empire; any cogent analysis since 2001 should show that this never happened). Typical situations were Vladimir Putin's promotion of a new Russian missile capable of penetrating any missile shield (Isachenkov, 2006) as well as the 2008 Russian counter-invasion of South Ossetia in the face of Georgian aggression.

If we understand the nerve center of Empire in nation-state terms as primarily manifested within the interwoven 'trilateral' alliance of Japanese, European, and US capitalist, military, and interlinking secret state apparati, we can see that the 'problems' of autonomous Russian and Chinese deep power centers have never been 'solved' to the satisfaction of Empire, despite the inroads made during the nineteenth-century Great Game, the Opium Wars, the Cold War, and even China's Deng-inspired turn to capitalism. One of the signal moments of resistance recently was the destruction of Khodorkovsky and the re-assertion of Russian state power over Yukos and over the oligarchs in general. Thence the condemnation of 'increasingly authoritarian' Putin, and now Medvedev.

In a functional sense, Pax Americana's exteriors need not be benign and equal-rights-for-all confederations, but only conglomerations, cultural as well as historical and certainly spatial, that can only be expressed through a nation-state, an envelope of bounded space, tangible, where penetrations and trespasses can be measured and defined—where the Monroe Doctrine and FSD do not apply. Roguishness (anti-cosmopolitanism and anti-Enlightenment) might prove to be a source of *puissance-pouvoir* connective synthesis, even if a provincialism according to Empire, perhaps. We could argue that the fortified nation-state, playing some of the same dirty tricks as Empire's network, half-in and half-out of it, deploying spies and goons perhaps, and not 'perfect' by any means, will provide a means whereby Pax Americana, if not Empire, is turned back and fails or at least forges a return or evolution to a more equitable world-system of multiple power centers that do not all adhere to Neoliberal models but instead permit local

economic and political solutions that can even become state policy, thus not continuing to a mass suicide. Nation-states and confederations would be nodes in a decentralized world network-space no longer dominated by the West or the North. It is helpful to remember that the real enemy is not Subcomandante Marcos but Yasir Arafat—'the Arafat,' so to speak, meaning the warrior persona who desires only a real nation-state (a land for a culturally heterogeneous people) no matter what it takes, a figure who is undermined and perhaps corrupted but dies intact, the dream intact. Arafat, who begins by fighting dirty, who loses when he compromises and is reviled both for doing so and for not doing so. Hence the world focus on the Palestinians, a relatively small conflict in terms of lives lost (as compared, for example, to the virtually ignored millions of the Congo), but the primordial symbol of resistance by many and by all means and the apparent necessity of the minor and minoritarian sovereign country.

Excavating Holey Spaces (Foiling FSD II)

All of this serves as a reminder that the smooth itself can be drawn and occupied by diabolical powers of *organization* [... T]his demonstrates above all that there exist two nonsymmetrical movements, one of which striates the smooth, and one of which reimparts smooth space on the basis of the striated. (Do not new smooth spaces, or holey spaces, arise as parries even in relation to the smooth space of a worldwide organization? Virilio invokes the beginnings of subterranean habitation in the 'mineral layer,' which can take on very diverse values.) (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 480) (*italics in original*)

Another way of resistance is via holey space, and this is first a matter of the very composition of substances. There is an arms race between the eye in the sky and the underground dweller in spaces resistant, even invisible to radar, heat sensing, and other techniques. For every advance in Empire's technology, the rogue states and terrorists tunnel even more. Nevertheless, the palatial caves of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, and the nuclear-proof bunkers of Saddam in Iraq, never materialized as advertised, and appear to have been disinformation. Caves and 'spider holes' were used, of course, but effectively as propaganda devices to make the enemy appear subterranean and cowardly. The cases of North Korea and Iran are unclear, because it is the US government that assures us that there are vast Weapons of Mass Destruction programs in hardened underground bunkers, and that the countries are thus resistant to attack from the air, or resistant to non-nuclear approaches (Vick, n.d.). While we would expect this, we know that command centers for the US military—not to mention the Israeli nuclear weapons program—are also underground. Who is fooling whom, or is it mutual?

Full Spectrum Dominance breaks down in holey space. There cannot be free motion underground through the substances that comprise the ground—soil and rock and magma—in the way that movement is possible through liquids

(freshwater and saltwater), gases (atmosphere), and the near-vacuum of outer space. Ways have to be prepared first. Tanks are out of the question. GPS is helpless. The underground cannot be defoliated. Hence the strength of the post-2003 Iraqi resistance, and the catastrophic destruction as the reigned-in war machine of the 'Coalition of the Willing,' attempts to wage urban warfare without actually dropping an atomic device (everything but that, as we were 'privileged' to understand about Fallujah), as the militants plant Improvised Explosive Devices under cover of darkness. Buildings are the enemy as well, because they connect to each other and to the physical underground through subsurface corridors. Because Empire doesn't have perspective in holey space (there is no landscape to gaze at), its force and skill is only at most equal to that of resistance in many important ways. Empire can 'drain the swamp' but also has to plug all the holes if it can find them, pouring killing liquids and gases down into them. The rhizomatic resistance, however, morphs into fire ants, and, needless to say, takes care of itself with a secrecy and paranoia that brooks little dissent.

Clearly Empire's black ops networks use the same techniques as its militant opponents, and turn and double-turn operatives, and also paint us a picture of an autonomous Al Qa'ida that dwells underground, and even in buildings we can't admit to attacking because they're holy (see Bernton, 2005), but it is nevertheless true that FSD flounders without X-Ray vision, so to speak. Holey space is only created and destroyed by displacement of solid material. In this respect there is also forest, where we have environmental NGOs and government ministries that might (just might) speak out harshly against the use of defoliants against revolutionaries holed up in national parks; thus forest is a weaker companion to the inside of buildings and the actual underground. The rhizomatic resistances, then, have the potential to grow stronger than the above-ground ones like the GJM that resists through transparency and openness, and abhors deception and silence unless circumstances force them (or, perhaps, when it's 'playful'). As with historical revolutionary movements, there is also the necessity of secret networks 'on the surface' as companions to sites of physical resistance.

Is violence an issue? Should it be an issue if we are wondering how to foil FSD, and even Empire? Gandhian and Kingian non-violence did make the difference, but are they always the *a priori* moral high ground? In both cases the State was embarrassed and turned back by the willingness of the multitude to withstand physical abuse, but would that be the case today? Worldwide protests of over ten million dissidents did not halt the Iraq war in 2003. Should the Iraqi resistance send human waves clutching flowers at the American tanks, rather than planting IEDs? Would a Salt March work? If a peaceful movement uses only peace and words, will words prevail, and will, thus, any violent act serve only to help derail the progress made at the table (if an uncompromised table for negotiations can even be reached)? Conversely, if a resistance movement within—rather than on the margins of—Empire adopts violent tactics, is it not most likely going to be construed as a black operation, CHAOS-style, by the historically-attuned members

of the Global Justice Movement? The Black Panther Coloring Book was, I am told, highly believable in its time.

At what point in the resistance to FSD do assassination, dissembling, at very least destruction of property and espionage, become acceptable tactics, as they were during the revolutions that gave birth to Empire's component states (the Boston Tea Party with its terrorist Indians!), and in the 19th century among the anarchists, the Bolsheviks, etc.? Here we move into the unsayable, because we would be talking about monkey-wrenching and PETA, ELF, ALF, and the Environmental Investigation Agency, the purloining of corporate memos and of tactics that even the Mayor of London has mused about (Strange, 2005). It might appear that the excesses of Empire are increasingly breeding a class of intellectuals who are musing and pondering the viability of illegal and also violently anarchistic means. Of course, the Zapatistas, darlings of *la resistance*, did carry real guns that clearly were meant to be fired.

Revolutionary Rhizomes

The minorities issue is instead that of smashing capitalism, of redefining socialism, of constituting a war machine capable of countering the world war machine by other means. (Deleuze, 1995, 172)

So what are the rhizomes of resistance to Empire up to these days? The projects bear some similarity to Empire-vetted ones, but minus the international consultants and conditions. Sustainable development, watershed protection, and biodiversity conservation—but through local control over local resources; corporate and elite accountability—to local spaces; the rule of law—applied to national and transnational elites. Most cells and groups don't win awards and don't have the money or sponsors to go to the World Social Forum, which is probably beside the point anyway. Environmentalism is the new communism, as the saying goes in Honduras; even in the 1980s, environmentalists were 'watermelons'—green on the outside, red on the inside. (There exists a compromised, corporate-friendly environmentalism as well, so we need to make the distinction. See St. Clair, 2003).

I was a participant-observer in a local struggle around the turn of the century in Honduras, and observed the deployment of spies by the protest movement (a network of townspeople, villagers, and outside sympathizers resisting a hydroelectric project) who infiltrated the families and interests comprising and supporting the installation of the hydro project. Each side spied on the other, but only one side (the hydro company) went so far as to employ violence; the resistance attracted national and even, briefly, international attention, but lost, according to many local people, because it turned the other cheek rather than following 'eye for an eye' logic. Its leaders had been trained in highly effective techniques of nonviolent resistance, and argued that if they resorted to guns to wipe

out the opposition, this would give the State the perfect excuse to step in and clamp down. The State did, anyway, deploying special forces/death squad operatives in response to ‘false flag’ staged attacks on hydro company personnel. The dam was built and ecological catastrophe has resulted; not all the words, testimonies, experts, and takings-of-bridges, nor even a mass demonstration in the capital, could defeat the corporation and its backers acting wholly illegally. I have written on this in detail elsewhere (see Bonta, 2004 and 2005; Bonta and Protevi, 2004), but not on what emerged beginning in 2004 and 2005, as the successful hydro company was awarded several more concessions for hydro projects in a neighboring municipality, under the aegis of the Plan Puebla-Panama and the soon-to-be-approved Central American Free Trade Agreement. The reaction of the local people was different than it had been a few years’ previously—arms were stockpiled and I was told that the problem that was presented would be solved through ‘traditional means,’ i.e. through physical elimination of the company’s operatives. Several spokespeople I interviewed were adamant in their ridiculing of the methods used next door, the nonviolent tactics that were brushed aside by the State and the corporate-development bank nexus. This seems to encapsulate the frustration and future plans of many such movements; it should also be said that this particular armed resistance (comprised of peasants and elite alike) greatly desired a Honduran leader akin to Hugo Chavez. They remained fiercely nationalistic, and sought simply a redistribution of power; none were ‘Marxists’ but all were *ambientalistas* (environmentalists).

My sketches are obviously more recent than what Deleuze and Guattari or Hardt and Negri give, so I have the luxury of hindsight into Empire’s quickening turn for the worse and the sudden resurgence of Pax Americana. DG warn us that a smooth space is never sufficient; it cannot save us (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, 500), and they are far from the naïve flow enthusiasts that they have been made out to be (Bonta and Protevi, 2004). We need our coagulations and envelopes! They suggest that better assemblages can be made, that consistency of heterogeneous elements, stronger rhizomes, will be locally striated and locally smoothed; nothing that they wrote in 1980 is not applicable now, though they never offered us a blueprint for a ‘new Earth’ or a Body without Organs that ‘we’ could just run out and use. But at least Deleuzian geophilosophy, through its rigorous application of non-linear dynamics, resolves and goes beyond the many epistemological and ontological debacles and dichotomies inherent to positivism, structuralism, phenomenology, and post-structuralism (e.g. human v. nature and structure v. agency). On the other hand, both students of the free market and militarists are also enamored of complexity theory, and long ago stopped thinking linearly. Models of complex systems provide us with a more accurate model of reality, of the way things work, but certainly do not proscribe an ethics; hence rhizomes can be used in many ways. Holey space is not moral, but it is certainly useful.

We can and should nibble at Hardt and Negri in *Empire* and *Multitude* to probe their weaknesses. HN pass judgment on Al Qaeda and on suicide bombers,

without once plunging into the evidence that challenges the standard accounts. They recognize that ‘it takes a network to fight a network’ (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 58) but nowhere admit that the network is fighting a (spectral) network that was created by the network to striate Empire’s producer-consumer-warriors. They use turns of phrase such as ‘This democracy is a dream created in the great revolutions of modernity but never yet realized’ (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 67) and among these revolutions they number the American—which, it should be pointed out, increased the power of the landed elite and furthered the disenfranchisement of minority groups (the same happened with the early nineteenth-century revolutions in Latin America). In any case, most of the founders and framers (with the possible exception of Thomas Paine) are well known to have resisted what is naively thought of as ‘democracy.’ HN speak of the ‘de-democratization’ of Nicaraguan and Cuban guerrilla movements upon coming to power, without addressing the constant and corrosive effect of the CIA in undermining the enemies of capitalism, and forcing extreme measures of security on both regimes to keep a handle on power long enough to redistribute wealth and make other gains. Blum (2004), using a plethora of primary sources, is a far better account of what ‘democracy’ has really meant, particularly to the poor, and why it is such a tainted, even poisoned term.

HN’s multitude—though it is a useful conception—is apostrophized and hypostatized: ‘What needs to be understood, and is indeed the central point, is how the multitude can arrive at a decision’ (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 338); in this critical query, the book flounders, because that is the wrong question. There is no one multitude except as victims of the global economy. Going to the World Social Forum or even anywhere outside one’s own borders is a function of sponsorship and fuel prices and salary and so forth. ‘We’ are all connected nicely together, today—if only the other five billion of us had access to the Net, too!—in a decentralized network that relies, ultimately, on Empire to maintain it. Who is co-opting whom when the GJM plots openly but few can hack the intranets of the corporate and government worlds to discover what is being plotted therein?

The answers to virulent globalization are not necessarily global in scope or method. The international legal framework is so easily ignored and flaunted that we return again to meaningful vacuoles of resistance: family, village, watershed, municipality, tribe, region, and nation-state. But HN offer ‘one approach to understanding the democracy of the multitude [...] as an open-source society, that is, a society whose source code is revealed so that we all can work collaboratively to solve its bugs and create new, better social programs’ (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 340). But this is Kropotkinian geographical anarchism based on mutual aid—‘we’, whoever that is, have had all these answers for over a century. In addition, we have (had) the social programs we need. Taxes plowed back into social programs that are overseen by watchdog groups have worked quite well, when the public trust is taken seriously. But HN claim that the ‘democracy of the multitude’ is not the same as ‘direct democracy’...

in which each of us would take time out of our lives and our work to vote continually on every political decision. Remember Oscar Wilde's ironic remark that the problem with socialism is that it would take too many evenings. (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 350)

Yet the difference appears superficial; theirs is based on needing a new politics and a new science, but not because Empire is breaking down; rather, because the multitude can already govern itself. But, the book ends without any prescription—'a book like this is not the place' (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 357)—but that some sort of act will happen, a 'radical insurrectional demand' that will 'thrust us like an arrow into that living future.' But the multitude, of course, will not read their book, or *A Thousand Plateaus*, or Madison or Lenin. 'They' will not come to any realization that they 'are' a multitude. Networks of people, however—families and communities, primarily, or at least those that take themselves seriously—will engage in mutual aid, as they always have (becomings-mutual: the holobiont⁶); will seek control over the natural resources under their feet and over their heads, as they always have (becomings-earth); will be peaceful and violent by turns or together, as they always have (becomings-peaceful and becomings-violent). The actuality of a multitude (not *the*) in the Deleuzian sense is that it is a heterogeneous assemblage of heterogeneous assemblages, an assemblage connected to other assemblages both machinic (material) and enunciatory (with a regime of signs, a semiotic), that coheres for reasons some see as self-interested and others see as symbiotic. It self-organizes. It doesn't have a past or future, because linear time is part of Empire's account of its own reign on Earth. Looking to a 'living future' is deceptive—the answers and programs and resistances and rhizomes are already here, in the middle, all around. Henri Lefebvre (1991) has much to tell us and much inspiration on our way to producing spaces that actually work for emancipated communities. Otherwise, we can only say that local solutions will always be geographical, for purely phenomenological reasons of what we experience every day, our horizon, where we dwell, what necessarily concerns us; and for the non-reasons behind the earthquakes, hurricanes, ice storms, and other judgments. In other words, grab a shovel!

The worst of the world war machines reconstitutes a smooth space to surround and enclose the earth. But the earth asserts its own powers of deterritorialization, its lines of flight, its smooth spaces that live and blaze their way for a new earth (Deleuze and Guattari, ATP, 423).

References

- Achbar, Mark, Jennifer Abbott and Joel Bakan. 2004. *The Corporation*. Zeitgeist Films.
- Agee, Philip. 1975. *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*. Toronto: Bantam Books.

⁶ Holobiont: strictly speaking this refers to the coral animal's symbiotic milieu; it is here used metaphorically.

- Agence France-Presse. 2006. World's first Sept 11th convict released in Germany. Feb. 8. Online at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_kmaf/is_200602/ai_n16044878; last accessed August 20, 2008.
- Ahmed, Nafeez Mosaddeq. 2006. Terrorism and statecraft: Al Qaeda and Western covert operations after the Cold War. *Research in Political Economy* 23: 149-188.
- Almond, Mark. 2004. The price of People Power. *The Guardian*, December 7. Online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1367965,00.html>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Amnesty International. 1975. *Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR*. London: Amnesty International Publications.
- Arquilla, John and David Ronfeldt. 2000. *Swarming and the Future of Conflict*. RAND Corporation. Full text online at http://www.rand.org/pubs/DOCUMENTED_briefings/DB311/. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Baer, Robert. 2002. *See No Evil: The True Story of a Ground Soldier in the CIA's War on Terrorism*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Bamford, James. 2001. *Body of Secrets: Anatomy of the Ultra-Secret National Security Agency from the Cold War through the Dawn of a New Century*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bernton, Hall. 2005. Magazine ad unleashes "Hell" for Boeing and Bell. *Seattle Times*, October 2. http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2002532657_boeingadm.html. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Blum, William. 2004. *Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions since World War II*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press.
- Bonta, Mark. 2005. Becoming-forest, becoming-local: Transformations of a protected area in Honduras. *Geoforum* 36 (1), 95-112.
- Bonta, Mark. 2004. Death toll one: An ethnography of hydropower and human rights violations in Honduras. *GeoJournal* 60 (1), 19-30.
- Bonta, Mark and John Protevi. 2004. *Deleuze and Geophilosophy: A Guide and Glossary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Center for Research on Globalisation. Online at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Chesneaux, Jean, Ed. 1972. *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China, 1840-1950*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Cleckley, Hervey. 1964. *The Mask of Sanity* (4th Ed.). St. Louis, MO: CV Mosby Co.
- Cockburn, Alexander and Jeffrey St. Clair. 1999. *Whiteout: The CIA, Drugs, and the Press*. New York: Verso.
- Covert Action: The Website for the Institute of Media Analysis*. Online at <http://www.covertaction.org>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Cryptome. Online at <http://cryptome.org>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Curtis, Adam (dir.) 2005. *The Power of Nightmares* (documentary film). British Broadcasting Corporation.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1995. *Negotiations 1972-1990*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus, Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dorril, Stephen. 2000. *MI6, Inside the Covert World of Her Majesty's Secret Intelligence Service*. New York: The Free Press.
- Erickson, Bonnie H. 1981. Secret societies and social structure. *Social Forces* 60(1), 188-210.
- Esposito, John L. 2002. *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fetzer, James H. 2006. Thinking about "Conspiracy Theories": 9/11 and JFK. Online at <http://www.scholarsfor911truth.org/fetzerexpandedx.htm><http://www.d.umn.edu/~jfetzer/fetzerexpandedx.pdf>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Frank, Andre Gunder and Barry K. Gills (eds.). 1996. *The World System, Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?* London and New York: Routledge.
- French, Peter J. 1987 [1972]. *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Frontline. 2002. *The Man Who Knew*. Online archive at <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/knew/>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Gaghan, Stephen (dir.). 2005. *Syriana* (film). Warner Bros.
- Galeano, Eduardo. 1998. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ganser, Daniele. 2005. *NATO's Secret Army: Operation Gladio and Terrorism in Western Europe*. London: Taylor and Francis.

- Goodman, Amy. 2005. Seymour Hersh: "We've been taken over by a cult." Interview on *Democracy Now* radio, January 26. <http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=05/01/26/1450204>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Griffin, David Ray. 2005. *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press.
- Griffin, David Ray. 2004. *The New Pearl Harbor, Disturbing Questions about the Bush Administration and 9/11*. Northampton, MA: Interlink.
- Hall, Sam. 1987. *Counter Terrorist*. New York: Donald I. Fine, Inc.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hare, Robert. 1999. *Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths among Us*. New York: Guilford.
- Heckethorn, Charles William. 1965 (1897). *The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries*. New Hyde Park, NY: University Books.
- Hess, Pamela. 2002. Panel Wants \$7bn Elite counter-Terror Unit. *United Press International* Sept. 26. Archived at <http://bailey83221.livejournal.com/2007/02/26/>; last accessed August 20, 2008.
- Ingram, Martin and Greg Harkin. 2004. *Stakeknife: Britain's Secret Agents in Ireland*. Dublin: O'Brien Press.
- Isachenkov, Vladimir. 2006. Putin boasts of new missile's capability. *Associated Press*, January 31.
- Jones, Stephen E. 2006. Why indeed did the WTC buildings collapse? Online at http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse_Jones_Thermite_World_Trade_Center.pdf. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008. (Vol. 3, Sept. 2006, of online Journal of 9/11 Studies, <http://www.journalof911studies.com/>, last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Kick, Russ (ed.). n.d.? *The Memory Hole*. Online at <http://www.thememoryhole.org/>. Last accessed Aug, 20, 2008.
- Kornbluh, Peter (ed.). n.d. The Negroponte file. Online at the *National Security Archives*, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB151/index.htm> Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Marchetti, Victor and John D. Marks. 1974. *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- McCoy, Alfred W. 2003. *The Politics of Heroin: CIA Complicity in the Global Drug Trade*. New York: Lawrence Hill Books.
- McGehee, Ralph W. 1999. *Deadly Deceits: My 25 Years in the CIA*. Melbourne & New York: Ocean Press.
- Meyer, Josh. 2006. CIA expands use of drones in terror war. *Los Angeles Times*, January 26. Online at <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-predator29jan29,0,5819230.story?coll=la-home-headlines>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- National Public Radio. 2003. The 'Conspiracy' Art of Mark Lombardi, Late Artist's Swirling Diagrams Chart Scandalous Relationships. November 1. Online at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=1487185>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- National Security Archive, *The George Washington University*. Online at <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Olmsted, Kathryn S. 1996. *Challenging the Secret Government: The Post-Watergate Investigations of the CIA and FBI*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Ostrovsky, Victor and Claire Hoy. 1991. *By Way of Deception*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Project for a New American Century*. 2000. Rebuilding America's defenses: Strategy, forces, and resources for a new century. Online at <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>. Last accessed Aug, 20, 2008.
- Project for a New American Century*. 1997. Statement of principles. Online at <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Public Information Research, Inc. *Namebase*. Online at <http://www.namebase.org>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Quigley, Carroll. 1981. *The Anglo-American Establishment from Rhodes to Cliveden*. San Pedro, CA: GSG & Associates.
- Quigley, Carroll. 1966. *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Rose, David. 2005. An inconvenient patriot. *Vanity Fair*, September. Online at <http://www.vanityfair.com/commentary/content/articles/050919roco03http/>

- [/www.informationclearinghouse.info/article9774.htm](http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article9774.htm). Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Sageman, Marc. 2004. *Understanding Terror Networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- St. Clair, Jeffrey. 2003. *Been Brown So Long, It Looked Like Green to Me: The Politics of Nature*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Saunders, Frances Stonor. 2000. *The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*. New York: The New Press.
- Scheuer, Michael ("Anonymous"?? explain). 2003. *Through Our Enemies' Eyes: Osama Bin Laden, Radical Islam, and the Future of America*. Dulles, VA: Potomac Books.
- Scholars for 9/11 Truth*. Last accessed May 5, 2009 at <http://www.scholarsfor911truth.org/>
- Scott, Peter Dale. 1993. *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scott, Peter Dale and Jonathan Marshall. 1991. *Cocaine Politics: Drugs, Armies, and the CIA in Central America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shelton, Henry. 2000. *Joint Vision 2020*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Simmel, Georg. 1906. The sociology of secrecy and of secret societies. *American Journal of Sociology* 11, 441-498.
- Smith, Joseph Burkholder. 1981. *Portrait of a Cold Warrior: Second Thoughts of a Top CIA Agent*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Stoll, Ira. 2006. Iraq's WMD secreted in Syria, Sada says. *The New York Sun*, January 26. Online at <http://www.nysun.com/http://www.nysun.com/foreign/iraqs-wmd-secreted-in-syria-sada-says/26514/http://www.nysun.com/foreign/iraqs-wmd-secreted-in-syria-sada-says/26514/>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Strange, Hannah K. 2005. London mayor defends some acts of terror. *United Press International* and *Washington Times*, September 24. Online at <http://washingtontimes.com/world/20050924-111442-8920r.htm>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Study Group on a "New Israeli Strategy toward 2000." 1996. A clean break: A new strategy for securing the realm. Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies. Online at <http://www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Taylor, Eva G. R. 1934. *Late Tudor and Early Stuart Geography, 1583-1650*. London: Methuen.

- Taylor, Eva G. R. 1930. *Tudor Geography, 1485-1583*. London: Methuen.
- Thomas, Evan. 2002. Bring back the exploding cigars. *New York Times*, February 3, last accessed Aug. 20, 2008 at <http://www.nytimes.com/http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C02E3D71E3BF930A35751C0A9649C8B63&fta=y..>
- Thompson, Paul. 2004. *The Terror Timeline : Year by Year, Day by Day, Minute by Minute: A Comprehensive Chronicle of the Road to 9/11—and America's Response*. New York: Regan Books.
- Tuathail, Gearoid O, Simon Dalby, Paul Routledge, eds. 1998. *The Geopolitics Reader*. London, UK: Routledge.
- US Air Force. 2003. The U.S. Air Force Transformation Flight Plan. Online at www.af.mil/library/posture/AF_TRANS_FLIGHT_PLAN-2003.pdf. <http://www.qr.hq.af.mil/>Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- US Air Force. 1996. Weather as a force multiplier: Owning the weather in 2025. In *Air Force 2025*, online at <http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/usaf/2025/>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- US Department of Defense. 2006. *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*. Online at <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/QDR20060203.pdf>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Vick, Charles P. n.d. North Korea special weapons guide. *Federation of American Scientists*. Online at <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/dprk>
Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Virilio, Paul. 1998. *The Virilio Reader*. Ed. James Der Derian. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Vulliamy, Ed. 1990. Secret agents, freemasons, fascists... and a top-level campaign of political 'destabilisation'. *The Guardian*. December 5, p. 2.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2002. The eagle has crash landed. *Foreign Policy* 131, 61-68.
- Webb, Gary. 1999. *Dark Alliance: The CIA, the Contras, and the Crack Cocaine Explosion*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Whitney, Mike. 2005. Chavez and the Crawford madman. *Znet*, November 21. Online at <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=9166>. Last accessed Aug. 20, 2008.
- Wise, David and Thomas B. Ross. 1964. *The Invisible Government*. New York: Random House.