

The Truth of Nation-State: Original Version

multicellular organisms take in oxygen and food as the needed nourishment. Such "Reason of the State" as the evolutionary goal of all modern nation-states in fact renders intelligible all contemporary international relations, from the unwielding behavior of the "rogue" states to the behavior of even such a contemporary nation-state as the American republic whose "fascist" tendencies and aggressive foreign policies would otherwise appear paradoxical, i.e. in seeming contradiction to the spirit and tradition on which this nation was founded. The principal reason (not the only) for which the American republic goes around the world conducting its "war against terror", for example, is to maintain control of the global distribution system of petroleum that it has set up since World War II, against the newly emergent China which attempts to cut in as required by its massive industrialization (the modernization of its metabolism): the United States is in competition with China for oil. (Of course the war has nothing to do with terrorism or spreading democracy and freedom, though it does have something to do with spreading free-market economy as a secondary motive.)² Moreover, the (in-)famous Wolfowitz Doctrine which America has adopted as its foreign policy principle for the twenty-first century – that "the goal of American foreign policy in the post-Soviet era [is] to maintain an overwhelming global dominance to prevent 'potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role' ... that "the crushing of any possible rival must be the 'dominant consideration,' as the U.S. strives 'to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would ... be sufficient to generate global power'", e.g. China... that, finally and in addition, America's global hegemony is to proselytize the world with the "single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy, and free enterprise." In other words, the American Way" (Pinkerton, *ibid.*) – is simply a straightforward manifestation of the Reason of the State, that the goal of the State is to become larger and larger and more and more powerful externally and internally (hence domestic surveillance and control of its population and global hegemony over other nations) and to consume more and more resources and "defecate" more and more waste matter (free enterprise and consumer market economy for which freedom and democracy are the *dispositifs*).

The state as a supraorganism that has fulfilled its "reason" (the nation-state) of course does not care about its "people", just as a person does not care about this one cell here or that one cell there of his or her body. Alain de Benoist (*ibid.*) for instance points out in regard to the war against terror that "Les mises en garde des Etats-Unis contre un fondamentalisme musulman qu'ils n'ont cessé d'attiser quand il s'agissait de faire pièces au nationalisme laïc arabe, ne peuvent cependant tromper personne. Leur tactique est de toute évidence de grossir le danger pour en tirer bénéfice. Tout comme naguère la 'menace soviétique', le 'terrorisme islamiste' fonctionne comme un prétexte destiné à légitimer un véritable racket politique, un chantage à la protection." ("The defensive stance of the United States against an Islamic fundamentalism that it never stops

provoking when it was about [instead of?] merging with the secular Arab nationalism, cannot however deceive anyone. Its tactics is by all evidence to increase the danger in order to derive benefits therefrom. Just like the 'Soviet menace' before, the 'Islamic terrorism' functions as a pretext for the purpose of legitimizing a political racketeering, an extortion of protection.") The benefits such tactics affords are for the state (a chance to increase its power), but it tremendously magnifies the dangers that individual American citizens face. Furthermore, the state can be entirely concerned only with its "head", caring about the self-preservation not of its entirety but only of the government which runs it, just as a person can be so engulfed in the fulfillment of his or her psychological needs (located solely in his or her brain) that he or she is willing to sacrifice parts of his or her body or even life entirely in order to satisfy these. The contemporary North Korea serves as an illustration. The nation's uncompromising behavior (insisting on declaring itself a nuclear power to ward off enemies; absolute refusal to liberalize its politico-economic structure despite the near-breakdown of its metabolism which the socialist system has entrained -- a famine that has killed off one-tenth of the population, the lack of electricity to light up cities and run transportation system, etc.) can *probably* prolong the life-span of the ruling regime, but at the risk of causing considerable damage to the supraorganism as a whole and weakening it permanently. Here we find the reason for the aforementioned irrational ways in which nations go to war: an incomplete identification between the identity of the supraorganism and its body, when that identity rests entirely in the "head function". (Mass tyranny -- to be seen later -- is then the fulfillment of such perfect identification.) In the next chapter we will learn how feminism has emerged as a function of this "Reason of the State" -- to help the supraorganism become more powerful and metabolize more intensely.

Footnotes

1. James P. Pinkerton in "Superpower Showdown" (*The American Conservative*, Nov. 7, 2005): "In the 20th century, the greatest updater of Montesquieu's views was Sir Norman Angell, whose 1910 book, *The Great Illusion*, boldly declared that war was obsolete. 'The warlike nations do not inherit the earth,' he maintained. 'They represent the decaying human element.' Angell's argument -- that nations connected to each other by market economics have no choice but to co-operate with each other on politics—struck a resounding international chord. His book was translated into 25 languages, selling more than two million copies. It even gave rise to 'Angellism,' a body of thought holding that 'military and political power give[s] a nation no commercial advantage.' Indeed, Angell concluded, 'It is an economic impossibility for one nation to seize or destroy the wealth of another, or for one nation to enrich itself by subjugating another.' In many ways, of course, he was right: it didn't make economic sense for countries to go to war against each other. Nevertheless, they did go to war. The Angellists failed to understand that countries fight over perceptions of slight, as well as regard for status. For all the alleged hardnosedness involved in planning for war, actually going to war is rarely a rational decision."

2. The French New Rightist Alain de Benoist, for example, in "Les États-Unis et L'Europe", has spoken of the true purpose of the American "war against terror":

Cependant, en s'efforçant de prendre le contrôle du pétrole irakien, les Américains visaient encore un autre objectif, plus important encore que celui qui consiste à assurer leur approvisionnement. Cet objectif est de contrôler les ressources énergétiques dont vont dépendre dans les décennies qui viennent les économies de leurs principaux concurrents, à commencer par la Chine et l'Europe.

La guerre en Afghanistan a déjà permis aux États-Unis de prendre le contrôle du pétrole de l'Asie centrale et de la mer Caspienne, soit 26 % des réserves mondiales, rendant ainsi plus difficile l'accès de la Chine à une source d'approvisionnement autre que le golfe Persique. Des troupes américaines ont été installées au Kazakhstan et en Ouzbékistan pour protéger les voies d'acheminement du pétrole. Des instructeurs militaires ont aussi été envoyés en Géorgie, étape-clé de l'oléoduc reliant la Caspienne à la mer Noire et à la Méditerranée. A plus long terme, l'objectif des Américains est d'obtenir des Russes que leur production pétrolière se déverse en Occident, et non en Asie, et d'encercler la Chine par un réseau d'alliances avec la Russie, l'Inde, la Corée du Sud, Taïwan et le Japon. Dans une telle perspective, mettre la main sur le pétrole de l'Irak, en attendant de s'emparer de celui de l'Iran, c'est se donner les moyens d'une éventuelle asphyxie énergétique de la Chine, c'est-à-dire se prémunir contre toute hostilité de la part de Pékin. C'est aussi un atout évident pour faire du XXIe siècle un siècle américain.

However, by attempting to take control of the Iraqi oil, the Americans were aiming at still another objective that is even more important than that which consists in assuring the provisioning of oil [after its relationship with Saudi Arabia has deteriorated]. This objective is to control the energy resources on which their principal competitors in the years to come are going to depend: to begin with, China and Europe.

The war in Afghanistan has already allowed the United States to take control of the oil of Central Asia and the Caspian Sea, or 26% of the world reserve, thus making more difficult China's access to a source of oil supply other than that of the Persian Gulf. American troops have been stationed in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan to protect the oil pipelines. Military advisers have also been sent to Georgia, a key point of the pipeline connecting the Caspian Sea to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. In the long term, the goal of the Americans is to obtain from the Russians the condition that their oil production be diverted to the West, and not to Asia, and to encircle China with a network of alliances consisting of Russia, India, South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. In such a perspective, to get a hand on the oil of Iraq, while waiting to take over that of Iran, is to give oneself the means for an eventual energy-wise asphyxia of China, that is to say to ensure oneself against all hostility on the part of Beijing. It is also an obvious opportunity to make the 21st century the American century [c.f. the Project for the New American Century as that latest manifestation of the Reason of the State: the Wolfowitz Doctrine].

Therefore, in "Energy: The Pain Which China Cannot Overcome" ("能源 - 中国无法逾

越的痛": MacroChina.com communication, Nov. 3 2005) the author comments:

The reason for which the United States attacked Sadam Hussein lies in the oil-energy in Iraq's possession; and United States in its strategic planning concerning oil-energy on the global scale has clearly expressed the view that it will occupy the leading position in the control of world's oil-energy supply. Hence it is for now difficult to predict the quantity of oil Chinese companies can obtain from Iran....

The energy security of the United States depends upon the global petroleum distribution system which the United States has built up and which is governed by market economics. The difficulty which China is facing with regard to the supply of oil is its over-dependence on the Middle East and the United States. United States can use oil as a weapon to restrain and to impose embargo and sanction upon China, but China cannot in return impose sanction against the United States.

(美国打击萨达姆的重要原因在于伊拉克的石油能源, 而美国在全球范围内围绕石油能源的战略布局清楚地表明美国需要在全世界石油能源的控制上占据主导地位, 因此中国公司在伊朗所能够获得的石油量尚难预测....

美国的能源安全战略依赖的是美国帮助建立起来的, 由市场支配的全球石油分配体系。中国在石油问题上面临的难题是过于依赖中东和美国。美国可以用石油作为武器制裁和封锁中国, 而中国却很难实行反封锁。)

That the war in Afghanistan has something to do with China can be discerned by considering the establishment in June 2001 of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, by which Russia and China attempted "to seal [a] strategic... dominance over Central Asia while engaging in friendly relations with their Central Asian neighbors.... [H] owever, unlike their smaller fellow members, Moscow and Beijing desired to directly confront American hegemony, especially in a region they long considered their natural sphere of influence. No matter how alluring the possibility of the SCO becoming a model forum for regional cooperation, the reality seems to be that Russia and China wish to use the SCO to eventually build a new regional security architecture that reinforces each other's territorial integrity while retrenching Western influence at the same time". Coincidentally (!) three months afterwards 9/11 happened which provided the U.S. with the golden opportunity to break up this Sino-Russian regional dominance by having now a pretext to occupy the SCO Central Asia nations in addition to Afghanistan. "The US holds two primary interests in the area: first, it has long eyed the region's rich oil and gas reserves, as American companies eagerly wish to develop this energy wealth; second, it desires tactical ground to observe nearby political developments, especially in South Asia." (Sean L. Yom, The Future of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.)

As China (together with other Asian nations) has become after this more and more dependent on oil-supply from the Persian Gulf (c.f. "The U.S., World and Persian Gulf Oil"), it is then no surprise that the U.S. would wish to occupy Iraq to control the oil-shipment from the Persian Gulf to Asia. And now as China has begun a significant trading relationship with Iran, mostly for the sake of securing oil-import, not only has it gotten a warning from the U.S. about not meddling too much with the Iranians, but it consciously awaits the U.S. bombardment of Iran -- under the pretext of prevention of nuclear proliferation or otherwise -- which would halt this emergent trade partnership

weapon

("Energy: The Pain Which China Cannot Overcome"). That China indeed has a great stake still in the oil reserve of Central Asia is indicated by its recent acquisition (Aug. 2005), after its failed buy-out of UNOCAL, of PetroKazakhstan, a petroleum company registered in Canada but having operations solely in Kazakhstan. This in addition to China's aggressive acquisition of oil companies and assets in Africa and the Americas (often outbidding its rival, India, such as in the previous case and in the case of another Canadian company Encana.)

Consequently, a seemingly inevitable collision between China and the U.S. over the control of world's energy seems on the offing (c.f. Pinkerton, *ibid.*), which is much like a replay of that between Japan and the U.S. during World War II: the Pacific War in effect was started because of oil, i.e. because, forming their empire in response to their need for autarky (i.e. supraorganismic self-reliance), the Japanese needed to take over the oil fields in Southeast Asia and the Dutch Indies after the U.S. imposed oil-embargo on Japan: thus the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. (C.f. Meirion and Susie Harries, *The Soldiers of the Sun*, Random House, N.Y., 1991.) The current intensification of competition for oil between powers is the function of the "peak oil" phenomenon, which would not be a problem if the emergent powers (China and India) did not try to emerge (the transformation of their supraorganismic metabolism) and the entrenched power (United States) were not so addicted to suburban consumerism (the maintenance of its metabolic mode). (C.f. James H. Kunstler's End of the Binge, *The American Conservative*, Sept. 12, 2005.) Such competition is perfectly analogous to the *biospheric* scene of organisms (e.g. a group of chimpanzees) fighting over, say, the meat of a dead small animal.

The left-wing protestors, insofar as their activist spirit is based entirely on the "politics of resentment" – i.e. displaying defiance toward whoever is in power and protesting against whichever manifestation of power: despising power-figures simply for being power-figures – need to reflect on this situation. When their vice-president Dick flexes nation's muscle and invades other countries, he is in a sense trying to protect the interests of these war protestors: how would they feel when they discover that they have to now pay 5 USD for one gallon of gas because the Chinese supraorganism has gobbled up too much of Middle-Eastern and Central Asian oil? The ultimate losers, it is sure, are the Muslims of these two regions, who have been reduced to mere pawns in the game of superpowers showdown because, well, they have been living on top of a lot of dead trees and organisms.

The American invasion of Iraq in particular has other secondary and tertiary reasons. C.f. Footnote 28, "The American Civil Religion and Consumerism", Epilogue 1.

| [previous section](#) | [Table of Content](#) | [next section](#) |

The "Democratic Peace"

A skeptic's view of a popular theory.

Bush Bumper Stickers

anti-Bush pro-Democracy Stickers
12 New Stickers! Free Shipping

Foreign Policy 101

Global politics, economics, & ideas
at discounted academic rates!

Minaret of Freedom

Muslims who love liberty
Libertarians seeking truth

Ads by C