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Why worst case? Because of hard lessons from history – that’s why. The Romans did not consider the worst case scenario when Hannibal crossed the Alps with his elephants and routed them; or when Hannibal encircled and annihilated the numerically superior Roman army at the Battle of Cannae. The French did not consider the worst case scenario at Dien Bien Phu and when they built the Maginot Line, and the French suffered disastrous defeats. The Americans did not consider the worst case scenario at Pearl Harbor or in September 11, and the results were disastrous for the American people. Again, American planners did not consider the worst case scenario in its latest war in Iraq, but instead delved on the “best case scenario” such as considering the Iraq invasion as a “cake walk” and that the Iraqi people will be parading in the streets, throwing flowers, and welcoming American soldiers as “liberators”, only to discover the opposite.

Scenario One: America Launches “Preventive War” vs. China

"Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia."

— Paul Wolfowitz, former U.S. undersecretary of defense for policy and currently the President of World Bank

- Since 1978, China has averaged 9.4% annual GDP growth
- 5-fold increase in total output per capita from 1982-2002
- $61 billion in Foreign Direct Investment in 2004 alone
- Foreign trade of $851 B; third largest in the world
- U.S. trade deficit with China exceeded $200 billion in 2005
- $750 Billion in Foreign Exchange Reserves
- Second biggest oil importer
- 442,000 new engineers a year; with 48,000 graduates with masters’ degrees and 8,000 Ph.D’s annually (Howard French); compared to only 60,000 new engineers a year in the U.S.
China for the first time (2004) has surpassed America to export the most technology wares around the world. China enjoyed a $34B trade surplus w/US in advanced technology products in 2004 (The Economist, Dec 17, 2005). In 2005, the surplus has increased to $36 B

- 20,000 new manufacturing facilities a year
- Low cost, vast manpower reserves combined with financial and technological strengths of rich neighbors
- Holds $252 Billion in U.S. Treasury Bonds (plus $48 B held by Hong Kong)

“Among the five basic food, energy, and industrial commodities – grain and meat, oil and coal, and steel – consumption in China has eclipsed that of U.S. in all but oil.” (Lester Brown)

- China has also gone ahead of U.S. in consumption of TV sets, refrigerators and mobile phones
- In 1996 China had 7 m cell phones & the U.S. had 44 m. Now “China has more mobile phone users than the U.S. has people.” (Jeff Sloan)
- China has about $1 trillion in personal savings and a savings rate of close to 50%; U.S. has about $158 billion in personal savings and a savings rate of about 2% (The Wall Street Journal, Nov 19, 2005)
- Shanghai boasts 4,000 skyscrapers – double the number in New York City (The Wall Street Journal, Nov 19, 2005)
- Songbei, Harbin City in North China is building a city as big as New York City
- Goldman Sachs predicts that China will surpass U.S. economy by 2041.

Before China’s economy catches up with America, and before China builds a military machine that can challenge American superpower status and world dominance, American top strategic planners ("Project for the New American Century") decide to launch a “preventive war” against China. As a pretext for its “preventive war”, the U.S. instigates Taiwan to declare independence.

Taiwan declares independence!

China has anticipated and long prepared itself for this event. After observing “Operation Summer Pulse – 04” when seven U.S. aircraft carrier battle groups converged in the waters off China’s coast in mid-July through August of 2004, Chinese planners began preparing to face its own worst-case scenario: the possibility of confronting a total of fifteen carrier battle groups composed of twelve from America and three from its close British ally. China’s strategists refer to its counter-strategy to defeat 15 or more aircraft carrier battle groups as the “assassin’s mace”. 
After proper coordination with Russia and Iran and activating their previously agreed strategic plan, involved troops and weapon systems are pre-positioned. China then launches a missile barrage on Taiwan. Command and control nodes, military bases, logistics centers, vital war industries, government centers, and air defense installations are simultaneously hit with short and medium range ballistic missiles armed with conventional, anti-radar, thermo baric, and electro-magnetic pulse warheads.

At the North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD) Command and Control Center, ranking defense officials watch huge electronic monitor screens show seven U.S. and two British aircraft carrier battle groups converging towards China Sea with another three U.S. carrier battle groups entering the Persian Gulf, while the remaining two U.S. and one British battle groups remain in the Indian Ocean to serve as strategic reserve.

As the aircraft carrier battle groups advance, China draws out one of its “trump cards” by leaking to the world media that it is dumping its holdings of U.S. treasury bonds and shifting to gold and euro currency.

Meanwhile, strategic planners at NORAD watch with glee as they observe on the screen as monitored by their radar satellites that Chinese surface ships make a hasty retreat as nine allied carrier battle groups advance toward the Philippine Sea and Chinese waters near Taiwan.

The “Assassin’s Mace”

China’s anti-satellite weapons - Glee and ecstasy soon turn to shock as monitor screens suddenly go blank! Then all communication via satellites goes dead! China has drawn its second “trump card” (the “assassin’s mace”) by activating its maneuverable “parasite” micro-satellites that have unknowingly clung to vital (NORAD) radar and communication satellites and have either jammed, blinded, or physically destroyed their hosts. This is complemented by space mines that maneuver near adversary satellites and explode. Secret Chinese and Russian ground-based anti-satellite laser weapons also blind or bring down U.S and British satellites used for C4ISR (command, control, communication, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance). And to ensure redundancy and make sure that the adversary C4ISR system is completely “blinded” even temporarily, hundreds of select Chinese and Russian information warriors (hackers) specifically trained to attack their adversary’s C4ISR systems simultaneously launch their cyber offensive.
For a few precious minutes, U.S. and U.K. advancing carrier battle groups are stunned and blinded by the “mace” i.e., a defensive weapon used to temporarily blind a stronger opponent. But the word “mace” has another meaning; one which is deadlier and used in combination with the first. The other meaning of “mace” is a spiked war club used in olden times to knock out an opponent. Applied in modern times, the “spikes” of the “assassin’s mace” refer to currently unstoppable supersonic cruise missiles capable of sinking aircraft carriers that are in China’s inventory; complemented by equally unstoppable “squall” or SHKVAL rocket torpedoes and regular 65 cm.-diameter wake-homing torpedoes, bottom-rising rocket-propelled mines, and “obsolete” warplanes converted into unmanned combat aerial vehicles (UCAVs) firing anti-ship missiles from standoff positions and finally dive-bombing into the heart of the U.S. and U.K. aircraft carrier battle groups armada.

Missile Barrage on Advancing Carrier Battle Groups - A few seconds after the “blackout”, literally hundreds of short and medium range ballistic missiles (DF7/9/11/15s, DF4s, DF21X/As) pre-positioned in the China mainland, and stealthy, sea-skimming and highly-accurate cruise missiles (YJ12s, YJ22s, KH31A/Ps, YJ83s, C301s, C802s, SS-N-22s, SS-NX-26/27s, 3M54s & HN3s) delivered from platforms on land, sea, and air race toward their respective designated targets at supersonic speed. Aircraft carriers are allotted a barrage of more than two dozen cruise missiles each, followed by a barrage of short and medium range ballistic missiles timed to arrive in rapid succession.

Supersonic cruise missiles constitute China’s third deadly “trump card” against the United States – part of the so-call “assassin’s mace” (or spiked war club of old used to bludgeon the adversary). These unstoppable cruise missiles may be armed with 440-lb to 750-lb conventional warheads (or 200-kiloton tactical nuclear warheads ten times stronger than Hiroshima) traveling at more than twice the speed of sound (or “faster than a rifle bullet”). The cruise missiles, together with the SRBMs and MRBMs (short & medium range ballistic missiles) may also be armed with radio frequency weapons that can simulate the electro-magnetic pulse of nuclear explosions to fry computer chips, or fuel-air explosives that can annihilate the personnel in aircraft carriers and battleships without destroying the platforms. Their effective range varies from less than 100 to 1800 kilometers from stand-off positions. Delivered by long-range fighter-bombers and submarines, their range can be extended even further. In fact, stealthy Chinese and Russian submarines can deliver such nuclear payloads to the U.S. mainland itself.
No U.S. Defense versus Supersonic Cruise Missiles - The U.S. and U.K. aircraft carrier battle groups do not have any known defense against the new supersonic missiles of their adversaries. The Phalanx and Aegis ship defense systems may be effective against subsonic cruise missiles like the Exocets or Tomahawks, or exo-atmospheric ballistic missiles, but they are inadequate against the sea-skimming and supersonic Granits, Moskits and Yakhonts or similar types (Shipwreck, Sunburn and Onyx NATO codenames) of modern anti-ship missiles in China’s inventory. Not only China and Russia have these modern cruise missiles, but Iran, India and North Korea have them too. These missiles can be delivered by SU 27 variants, SU30s, Tu22M Blackjacks, Bears, J6s, JH-7/As, H-6Hs, J-10s, surface ships, diesel submarines, or common trucks.

China’s Rocket Torpedoes - Adding to the problem of aircraft carriers are the “SHKVAL” or “squall” rocket torpedoes installed in some Chinese and Russian submarines and surface ships. At 6,000 lbs. apiece, these rocket torpedoes travel at 200 knots (or 230 mph) with a range of 7,500 yards and guided by autopilot. They are designed to sink aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines. Again, it is unfortunate for the U.S. and U.K. to have no known or existing defense against this new generation of rocket torpedoes.

China’s Sea Mines – Complicating matters for the U.S. aircraft carrier battle groups are the hundreds of hard-to-detect, rocket-propelled, bottom-rising sea mines that are anchored and hidden in the sea bottom covering the pre-selected battle site in the China Sea and Philippine Sea designed to home in on submarines and surface ships, particularly aircraft carriers. These sophisticated sea mines (EM-52s) have been deployed by Chinese and Russian submarines before the missile attack on Taiwan in anticipation of the major event that is to follow.

Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles – Finally, on top of all these asymmetric weapons, the U.S. and U.K. aircraft carrier battle groups will have to contend with the thousands of “obsolete” Chinese fighter planes converted into Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles (UCAVs) launching missiles at stand-off positions and finally diving “kamikaze” style into the heart of the carrier battle groups.

Submarines Complete Encirclement - Chinese and Russian submarines fire their inventory of anti-ship cruise missiles (ASCMs) and “squall” rocket torpedoes at the aircraft carriers and submarines of the
U.S. and U.K. as the carrier battle groups come within range. As the battle progresses, the Chinese and Russian submarines maneuver to the rear of the carrier battle groups to complete the encirclement.

In less than an hour after the launching of the saturation barrage of missiles that rained on the U.S. and U.K. naval armada, all the aircraft carriers and their escorts of cruisers, battleships, and several of the accompanying submarines are in flames, sinking, or sunk, turning the China Sea and Philippine Sea into a modern-day “Battle of Cannae”.

Meanwhile, the Chinese fleet that conducted a strategic retreat forms a phalanx along the forward positions of China’s coast, ready to augment the hundreds or thousands of land-based long-range surface-to-air missiles of China (SA-10s, SA-15s, & SA-20s) with their own short, medium, and long-range air defense missile systems.

Applying its long-held military doctrine of “active defense”, China also launches simultaneous missile attacks on the forces-in-being and logistics-in-place of the U.S. and its allies in Japan, South Korea, Guam, Okinawa, Diego Garcia, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan, hitting these U.S. bases with missiles armed with radio frequency weapons, fuel-air explosives, and conventional warheads. As another Chinese military doctrine states: “Win victory with one strike”.

**Chinese/Russian ICBMs/SLBMs are Cocked** – Both Chinese and Russian inter-continental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), and the two countries’ extensive air defense systems have been coordinated and ready to respond in the event that the U.S. and U.K. decide to retaliate with a nuclear attack.

China’s deadly “trump cards” (i.e., the huge holdings of U.S. treasury bonds, the anti-satellite weapons system, the supersonic anti-ship cruise missiles, SRBMs, MRBMs, “squall” rocket torpedoes, sea mines, UCAVs, DF31A and DF41 road-mobile ICBMs, JL2 SLBMs, air defense system, IO/EW/IW, and other RMA weapons) are the key ingredients of the “assassin’s mace”. China may not possess any of those expensive aircraft carriers of the superpower, but it can wipe out those carrier battle groups with a “single blow” of its so-called “assassin’s mace” – its major tool for conducting asymmetric warfare to defeat the United States in a major confrontation over the Taiwan issue or other issues in the future. The United States may possess the most powerful war machine in the world, but it can be defeated by an inferior force by avoiding the superpower’s strength and exploiting its weaknesses. Again, an integral
part of Chinese doctrine is: "Victory through inferiority over superiority". One famous Chinese strategist, Chang Mengxiong, compared asymmetric warfare to "a Chinese boxer with a keen knowledge of vital body points who can bring a stronger opponent to his knees with a minimum of movement."

The sad part is that even if U.S. planners come to realize that the aircraft carrier battle groups (which are the mainstay of the U.S. Navy and the main instrument of U.S. power projection worldwide), have been rendered vulnerable or obsolete by China’s “assassin’s mace”, the U.S. cannot simply change strategy or discard such weapons system. To change strategy or “retool” would mean the loss of hundreds of billions of dollars invested into those highly sophisticated systems; the strong lobbying of influential defense contractors making those systems would make change extremely difficult; for defense authorities to admit the strategic blunder would also be a big barrier to change of strategy; and the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs related to those systems may be politically and economically unbearable for any U.S. sitting administration to bear if the program for the aircraft carrier battle groups is scrapped. Because of these factors, America may be stuck with an obsolete system that is too expensive to maintain but will lose the war for the U.S. when employed in a major conflict.

Middle East Front

Meanwhile, in another major front, upon previously coordinated signals with China and Russia, Iran lets loose her own barrage of supersonic Granit, Moskit, Brahmos, and Yakhont cruise missiles carried by common trucks or hidden in man-made tunnels all along the mountainous shoreline of Iran fronting the Persian Gulf. The three U.S. aircraft carrier battle groups that entered the Persian Gulf to ensure the unhindered flow of Arab oil are likened to helpless “sitting ducks” against the bottom-rising sea mines and low-flying, supersonic anti-ship cruise missiles in Iranian hands. In the process, a couple of U.S. oil tankers about to exit the Strait of Hormuz are also hit, thus effectively blockading the narrow strait and blocking U.S. oil supply coming out of the Middle East with the aid of rocket-propelled sea mines.

A “weak” nation like China or Iran, without a single aircraft carrier in their respective navies, can thus obliterate the carrier battle groups of a superpower. Here, one can see the hidden and often unnoticed power of
asymmetric warfare, which may well spell the end of “gunboat diplomacy” in the not so distant future.

Central Asian Front

Also, in yet another major front, this time in Central Asia, Russian troops lead the other member countries of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO - Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan) into a major offensive against U.S. military bases in Central Asia. The target bases are first subjected to a simultaneous barrage of missiles with fuel-air explosives and EMP warheads before they are overrun and occupied by the SCO coalition forces. The missile attack on the U.S. bases is followed by a lightning “blitzkrieg” attack by 4 mechanized armored divisions coming from the “Yili Korgas Pass” of China’s Xinjiang province, linking up with Russia’s own armored divisions in a pincer offensive against U.S. forces in Central Asia and the Middle East.

America Crippled in Three Major Fronts

In just a few hours (or days) after the outbreak of general hostilities, America, the world’s lone superpower, finds itself badly crippled militarily in three major regions of the world: Southeast Asia, Central Asia, and the Middle East.

Impossible? Unfortunately the answer is: NO. China now has the know-how and the financial resources to mass-produce hundreds, if not thousands of Moskit, Yakhont, and Granit-types of supersonic anti-ship cruise missiles and “squall”-type rocket torpedoes against which U.S. and U.K. aircraft carriers and submarines have no known defense. Iran, on the other hand, is already in possession of the same supersonic cruise missiles that can destroy any ship in the Persia Gulf, including U.S. aircraft carriers. Russia and China, meanwhile, are operating on familiar grounds close to its territory, compared to the U.S. that needs to cross the Atlantic and Pacific to replenish troops and logistics.

A Geopolitical Reality America has to Face

An important consideration in a U.S.-China conflict is the geopolitical reality that the U.S. and its allies will be operating on
exterior lines while China will operate on interior lines. This gives China a huge advantage in a major war in Asia against U.S allied forces.

Consider the long sea lanes of communication (10,000 kilometers) that the U.S. alliance will be forced to cross each time its forces will re-supply and you get an idea of the huge logistics problem that the US will face in its confrontation with China. Such lengthy sea lanes of communication (SLOC) are highly vulnerable to a gauntlet of Chinese and Russian submarines lying in ambush along the route laden with underwater sea mines. This will make the transport of personnel and equipment by the United States over the Pacific or the Atlantic extremely dangerous and expensive.

Compare this U.S. handicap with troop movement by Chinese troops using heavy-lift aircraft, railways and highways within the China mainland. China’s interior lines of communication are shorter and protected, with little chance for enemy interdiction. Chinese troops can concentrate numerically superior forces rapidly at any given point to defeat the invading U.S. forces one by one with much shorter and less vulnerable lines of communications.

And in the event that the U.S. forces and its allies are lucky enough to land their forces on the Chinese mainland, they will be faced not only with a conventional People’s Liberation Army of more than two million strong, but also with a people’s militia conducting asymmetric warfare and people’s war in their teeming millions! U.S forces and their allies will be likened to a raging bull charging and goring a hive of killer bees. U.S. forces may be able to set foot in China, but it is highly doubtful if they can come out of it alive.

**Grimmer Scenarios**

There is a scenario grimmer than described above, however, and that is if strategic planners belonging to that elite group called the “Project for the New American Century” (or PNAC) decide to launch a nuclear “first strike” against China and Russia and risk a mutually-assured destruction: 1) in defense of Taiwan... or 2) in launching a “preventive war” to prevent China from catching up economically and militarily. Or, if China decides to start the offensive against Taiwan with a one-megaton nuclear burst 40 kilometers above the center of the island. Or, if China and Russia decide to arm a number of their short and medium range ballistic missiles and supersonic cruise missiles with tactical nuclear
warheads in defending themselves against the U.S. and U.K. aircraft carrier battle groups. Land-attack versions of these supersonic cruise missiles armed with nuclear warheads carried by stealthy Chinese and Russian submarines can also put American coastal cities at great risk to nuclear devastation. Strategic planners must also consider these worst-case possibilities.

**Scenario Two: America versus a Medium Power**

“In the Middle East and Southwest Asia, our overall objective is to remain the predominant outside power in the region and preserve U.S. and Western access to the region's oil.” - Paul Wolfowitz

“I cannot think of a time when we have had a region emerge as suddenly to become as strategically significant as the Caspian. But the oil and gas there is worthless until it is moved. The only route which makes both political and economic sense is through Afghanistan.” – Dick Cheney in 1998 as Chief Executive of a major oil services company

History is replete with vivid examples where a much stronger and larger force was defeated by a weaker and smaller force. The French were defeated by Vietminh Guerrillas in Dien Bien Phu. The Soviet Union forces, still a superpower at that time, were defeated in Afghanistan. And another superpower, the United States, was defeated by “ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-armed” Vietcong guerrillas in Vietnam.

**Asymmetric Warfare**

If the United States will push through its plan of world domination in what is called the “Project for the New American Century”, then it should expect all the smaller and weaker countries that do not wish to be pushed around to fight back using a method of fighting called asymmetric warfare. Asymmetric warfare is a form of warfare that allows the weak to fight and defeat a much stronger foe by “attacking the enemy’s weakness while avoiding his strength”.

The United States, for instance, may possess the most sophisticated weapons system on earth. They may have the most modern planes, helicopters, ships, guns, precision-guided weapons, sophisticated sensors, and command and control systems, but if they cannot see their adversary, if they are fighting a shadowy and “invisible” enemy (like what the American and British forces are now experiencing in Iraq), such advanced and sophisticated weapons systems are rendered useless.
In asymmetric warfare, most of the fighting will be conducted at the team level. Thousands of agile and elusive teams consisting of 2 -5 members equipped with man-portable surface-to-air missiles, portable anti-tank guided weapons, .50 cal sniper rifles, man-portable mortars, anti-tank mines, anti-personnel mines, sea mines, C4 explosives (for making car bombs, booby-traps, and improvised explosive devices or IEDs) riding in bicycles, motorcycles, tricycles and fast boats will make the lives of any invading or occupying forces extremely miserable and deadly.

These “invisible” agile teams merge with the population most of the time and come out only when there is a vulnerable target to strike at. Then, they disappear again into the shadows. They communicate via runners bringing coded written messages, so there are no electronic signals to track down. They operate semi-autonomously, so there are no centers of gravity that can be targeted. And since they are indigenous to the area and united with the local people, their human intelligence (HUMINT) is far more superior to the hated foreign invaders. They will also enjoy a tremendous advantage in psychological operations (PSYOPS), for it is much easier to mobilize the nationalist sentiments against a foreign occupier than for an aggressor to justify occupation.

Asymmetric warfare may be compared to a fierce lion invading the territory of a school of piranhas; or a king cobra encroaching into a colony of fire ants. The lion may be the king of beasts, mighty and strong but it is no match against the tiny piranhas in their own territory. The sharp fangs and claws of the lion are rendered useless. The same is true with the cobra’s venom. The analogy applies to the French in Dien Bien Phu, the Soviets in Afghanistan, and the Americans in Vietnam and now in Iraq.

**Asynchronous Warfare**

Aside from asymmetric warfare, weak nations fighting the strong can also avail of asynchronous warfare. If a strong nation invades or occupies a weak one, the weak bides its time to strike back. And it strikes at a time and place when and where the adversary least expects and least prepared. An example is Iraq. The underground resistance movement in Iraq may recruit Iraqi scientists or sympathetic scientists of other nationalities to infiltrate the United States (via the Mexican border, for instance) and manufacture dirty bombs as well as chemical and biological weapons inside the U.S. borders. Such weapons may be
brought to Washington D.C. and detonated in or near the U.S. Congress during the U.S. President’s State of the Union address, for example.

They can also hire a private plane, or buy one themselves, and use it to spread biological or chemical weapons they have manufactured in-country over New York or Washington D.C. They can mail letters containing anthrax to key offices of vital services all over the U.S. and paralyze utilities and other government functions nationwide. Or they can smuggle, say, the components of a hundred portable surface-to-air missiles, assemble them in the U.S., and employ them simultaneously in all of the major airports in America. Or they can employ those portable surface-to-air missiles to simultaneously target American airlines taking off or landing in different international airports all over the world.

Some major powers may pass on their research on RMA (revolution in military affairs) to the Iraqi resistance movement to be tested inside the U.S. mainland. These weapons include laser weapons, ultrahigh frequency weapons, ultrasonic wave weapons, stealth weapons, high-powered microwave weapons, and electromagnetic guns. They include miniature robot ants that infiltrate computers, stay dormant, and then activate on signal to destroy their hosts.

The Iraqi underground can also recruit hackers who can work inside and/or outside the United States to hack the U.S. banking system, financial system, stock exchange, airport tower control systems, train control system, power supply system, water control system, dam control system, ballistic missile system, C4ISR system, and other key systems critical to the U.S. economy. At a given signal, assigned hackers simultaneously do their thing. The U.S., which is considered the most advanced country when it comes to Information Technology, has become too dependent on computers and related high-tech equipment that its inherent strength has, ironically, turned into its own “Achilles heel”.

Here, we are talking only of Iraq. What if the U.S. tries to impose its will and dominance on 5 or 10 other sovereign nations? Can the U.S. hope to “fight and win” an asymmetric war against smaller nations fighting against hegemony? Can America afford or survive 10 Iraqs ... or 10 Vietnams? Can America win an asymmetric war against an “invisible” army even in Iraq alone?

**American Crossroad**
As the sole remaining superpower in the world today, the United States stands at a critical crossroad. One road leads to world domination. Using its pre-eminent military war machine with no equal in the world, it can strike at any perceived threat, change foreign sovereign regimes at will, grab precious mineral resources anywhere in the world, and control local economies with its hosts of transnational corporations. It can also sabotage the economy of up-coming rivals, or launch preventive wars to preempt prospective competitors and try to defeat them militarily while they are still weak compared to America.

Such a course of action is very tempting indeed, especially to leaders with global ambitions of becoming “Lords of the Earth”. But such a road is full of risks and what is planned on paper, as what was done in Iraq, may not turn out as planned. And such path will necessarily ignite the outrage of most right-thinking people. America will earn for itself the enmity and hatred of people all over the world.

America had outlined its blueprint for world domination, by force if necessary, in the following documents:

- President George W. Bush’s speech at the Graduation Ceremony at West Point, June 1, 2002;
- “Defense Planning Guidance” written by then Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz in Feb 18, 1992

In these documents, the U.S. outlined some of its new doctrines and policies such as: preventive war, pre-emptive military actions, unilaterism, regime change, acting as the world’s constabulary or “cavalry”, establishment of military bases and spreading U.S. forces all over the world, control of outer space and the global commons of cyberspace, and control of the world’s oil resources.

The alternate road, on the other hand, leads to world leadership. The U.S. can choose to use its power, wealth, and influence to sincerely do good for the people on this planet. It can lead in easing or obliterating
the debt burden of poor nations, or in promoting the spread of quality education through distance learning in remote villages of developing countries. It can focus in the fight against poverty, or the fight against drugs, or the effort to save the deteriorating environment of planet earth. It can lead the fight against HIV/AIDS, or malaria, and other deadly diseases. The whole world is waiting for the U.S. to lead in these important battles.

If the U.S. chooses to focus its huge resources on the latter, I am confident that it will gain the hearts and minds of people all over the world. Then it can be a true world leader. Then, it can maintain its preeminent world status. By gaining the world’s sympathy and support, terrorism directed against Americans and the U.S. mainland will be greatly minimized. The alternate road, in fact, is the key to defeating the phenomenon of “terrorism” gripping the world today.

Let us pray that God or Allah will guide America as it decides what road to take for the 21st century.
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