

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of this book was largely put together during the invasion of Iraq by the Anglo-Saxon powers in the spring of 2003. The editors were not tempted by the war to chronicle the unfolding events leading to that war and its subsequent progression. Instead, they were working on a book about US power projection in the post-Cold War era and the fate of Theory in International Relations after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The creation of eight independent states in Central Eurasia (South Caucasus and Central Asia) changed the geopolitical landscape of the Soviet era. However, due to the justifications put forward by the American government and its allies for invading Iraq, we could not neglect the war. These justifications did contradict the geopolitical hypothesis on US power projection that we were working on at that time. If the Bush Administration, and the governments allied with it, had not lied about their motives for committing international aggression, our geopolitical analysis would lose credibility. We therefore tested the motive statements for their behavioral implications. We found that US and allied behavior on the ground was very different from what one would expect it to be if the invading powers had spoken the truth. On January 12, 2005, the Bush Administration, after having spent hundreds of millions of dollars on finding these weapons, quietly acknowledged that Iraq did not in fact have such weapons. On an earlier occasion, the US also acknowledged that its intelligence had failed to find any evidence of a connection between the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorists and the regime in Iraq. We therefore feel more confident in our geopolitical hypothesis: the invasion of Iraq is part of the process of constructing a new leg in America's Cold War 'defense perimeter.' By studying the history of American power projection from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century to the present, or its 'conjuncture,' as Braudel used that term in chapter two of his book, *Écrits sur l'histoire*, (Paris: Flammarion 1969), we hoped to contribute to a better understanding of American foreign policy on the Eurasian landmass, particularly in Central Eurasia and the Middle East since the end of the Cold War.

The approach we have brought to bear in the work is called critical geopolitics. We argue that this approach is particularly relevant for studying the foreign policies of projecting power beyond borders in the era of sequential industrialization. A process of power projection by a state-making elite during several generations is 'anonymous history.'

A partially industrialized world is characterized by vast inequalities in wealth and power.

In a multi-state system characterized by sequential capitalist industrialization, power projection is inevitably a competitive undertaking.

Competitive power projection by western countries since the beginning of the industrial era has ‘phased out’ of existence in the name of ‘progress’ small autarchic and mutually isolated societies. However, until the beginning of the industrial era, empires were successful in fending off penetration by Western powers. This began to change during the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Historical roles between expanding Islam and Europe under threat were reversed. As early as 1798, Napoleon invaded Ottoman territory. In the colonial era, the Muslim empires disintegrated, ending in colonization by Western powers due to the force of modern firearms, mustard gas and air power.

Policies of power projection beyond legal borders by industrialized and industrializing societies are therefore the driving force in the continuous process of transition from a world composed of small-scale societies, with domestic orders untouched by one another, and agro-aristocratic empires in Asia, to a single interdependent world society in a global capitalist economy.

In the constraining bipolar military order of the Cold War, US-engineered regime change in sovereign countries was legitimized as a contribution to the struggle against the global threat of communist dictatorship. However, US rationales for unilateral action abroad differ, whereas American behavior reveals a persistent pattern. Between 1798 and the outbreak of World War I, the US initiated 135 military operations abroad, including 14 in China alone, not to mention Sumatra and elsewhere in East Asia, without having been attacked first. At that time, the rationale given by the US was probably best described by President Wilson as the “army following the flag of commerce” and of “uplifting the host from barbarity into civilization.” In the less constraining unipolar military order of the post-Cold War era, military force again implements regime change in resource-bearing areas.

The critical geopolitical framework we bring to bear in this work aims at better understanding the position of the Central Eurasian region in the global order and the socioeconomic and ideological forces that penetrate the region from the outside. In that part of the world, the foreign policies of competitive power projection bring together China, Japan, Russia, the US and the European Union. The US is the only major power that since World War II invaded and occupied an oil-rich country. In that role, it succeeds Great Britain, the true creator of the state of Iraq.

The operating assumption on which we studied American power projection underway in Iraq and the Caspian region is twofold. Firstly, America's policy-making elite brings into its foreign policy projects directed at the region the functional requirements of the domestic socioeconomic order, part of which is to maintain its domestic position, further enrich it and create honor, including the spread of true religion, for itself. Secondly, to acquire the ability to set conditions for potential rivals, such as China, India, Japan, the European Union, to tap the fossil fuel sources on the Eurasian continent. This project will not be complete by inserting Anglo-Saxon oil companies into the Iraq oil stream. We anticipate that Russia's state-controlled oil and gas industry will be a future target.

However, in the current global system of instant communications, such operations are acted out in an ever more tightly interconnected system. Acting in a closed system, increasingly interconnected into one responding whole by means of instant communication, prevents policy makers from controlling outcomes. Lies do not matter as long as no one takes notice and the host being visited can be crushed without having fired a shot. Things are different when the elites of major powers, with the self-declared mission of civilizing the world and getting rich by it, are condemned by a world public as liars and torturers, while the dismal fate of the host is brought to the attention of a global audience. The political culture of power projection by a particular country, or its ideological form, depends on its prior history, on current power relations in the interstate system and on responses by host societies.

We argue in this book that the energy needs of expanding industrial economies in East Asia, Russia and Continental Europe are transforming the scattered industries on the Eurasian continent into one industrial system. That level of integration, however, is opposed by the Anglo-Saxon maritime powers.

The focus of the book is on Central Eurasia in today's global political, economic, military and sociogeographic global system.

However, the powers bordering on that region are part of the story as well. This applies in particular to Russia and its relations with the EU and the US, China, Iran and Japan. Under President Putin, the Russian state is reasserting control over regions in order to reestablish central control over the country's wealth in natural resources. Russia is therefore doing something that is apparently unacceptable to the US foreign policy elite: to impose conditions for Anglo-Saxon companies to access Russian natural resources, particularly energy resources. As long as the Russian state exists, extends from the Ukrainian-Belarus borders to the Pacific and is equipped with a second strike capability, the Anglo-Saxon powers will have a hard time changing that fact, missile shield or not. A disintegrating

Russia is no doubt in the interest of the maritime powers. ‘Democracy’ is the weapon of choice in present circumstances. Disintegration of the Russian state into a loose confederation without legitimate governments at the member-state and union levels, would deprive Japan, the EU and China from a potential counterweight against the US, that is prevent them from creating an integrated industrial system on the Eurasian landmass and linking that system to the fossil fuel sources of Russia, the Middle East and the Caspian region. The Orange Revolution in the Ukraine came too late to be incorporated into the book. We expect, however, that the democratic revolution in the Ukraine, in which the US is reported to have invested \$65 million, will open up a new chapter in US-Russian and EU relations in the new post Cold-War order.

Mehdi Parvizi Aminch  
Henk Houweling

Amsterdam, January 2005