

The Global Dominance Group: 9/11 Pre-Warnings & Election Irregularities in Context

By Peter Phillips, Bridget Thornton and Celeste Vogler

The leadership class in the US is now dominated by a neo-conservative group of people with the shared goal of asserting US military power worldwide. This global dominance group, in cooperation with major military contractors, has become a powerful force in world military unilateralism and US political processes. This research study is an attempt to identify the general parameters of those who are the key actors supporting a global dominance agenda and how collectively this group has benefited from the events of September 11, 2001 and irregularities in the 2004 presidential election. This study examines how interlocking public private partnerships, including the corporate media, public relations firms, military contractors, policy elites, and government officials, jointly support a US military global domination agenda. We ask the traditional sociological questions regarding who wins, who decides, and who facilitates action inside the most powerful military-industrial complex in the world.

A long thread of sociological research documents the existence of a dominant ruling class in the United States, which sets policy and determines national political priorities. The American ruling class is complex and inter-competitive, maintaining itself through interacting families of high social standing who have similar life styles, corporate affiliations and memberships in elite social clubs and private schools.¹

The American ruling class has long been determined to be mostly self-perpetuating² maintaining its influence through policy-making institutions such as the National Manufacturing Association, National Chamber of Commerce, Business Council, Business Roundtable, Conference Board, American Enterprise Institute, Council on Foreign Relations and other business-centered policy groups.³ These associations have long dominated policy decisions within the US government.

C. Wright Mills, in his 1956 book on the power elite, documents how World War II solidified a trinity of power in the US that comprised corporate, military and ~~government elites in a centralized~~ power structure motivated by class interests and working in unison through "higher circles" of contact and agreement. Mills described how the power elite were those "who decide whatever is decided" of major consequence.⁴

¹ G. William Domhoff, *Who Rules America?* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2006 [5th ed.] and Peter Phillips, *A Relative Advantage: Sociology of the San Francisco Bohemian Club*, 1994, (<http://libweb.sonoma.edu/>).

² Early studies by Charles Beard in the *Economic Interpretations of the Constitution of the United States* (1929), established that economic elites formulated the US Constitution to serve their own special interests. Henry Klien (1933) in his book *Dynastic America* claimed that wealth in America has power never before known in the world and was centered in the top 2% of the population owning some 60% of the country. Ferdinand Lundberg (1937) wrote *American's Sixty Families* documenting inter-marring self-perpetuating families where wealth is the "indispensable handmaiden of government. C.Wright Mills determined in 1945 (*American Business Elites, Journal of Economic History*, Dec. 1945) that nine out of ten business elites from 1750 to 1879 came from well to do families.

³ See R. Brady, *Business as a System of Power*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943) and Val Burris, *Elite Policy Planning Networks in the United State*, American Sociological Association paper 1991.

⁴ C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

These higher circle decision-makers tended to be more concerned with inter-organizational relationships and the functioning of the economy as a whole rather than advancing their particular corporate interests respectively.⁵

The higher circle policy elites (HCPE) are a segment of the American upper class and are the principal decision-makers in society. While having a sense of "we-ness", they tend to have continuing disagreements on specific policies and necessary actions in various socio-political circumstances.⁶ These disagreements can block aggressive reactionary responses to social movements and civil unrest as in the case of the Labor Movement in the 1930s and the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s. During these two periods the more liberal elements of HCPE tended to dominate the decision making process and supported passing the National Labor Relations and Social Security Acts in 1935, as well as the Civil Rights and Economic Opportunities Acts in 1964. These pieces of national legislation were seen as concessions to the ongoing social movements and civil unrest and were implemented without instituting more repressive policies.

However, during periods of external threats represented by US enemies in World War I and World War II, HCPE were more consolidated. It is in these periods that more conservative/reactionary elements of the HCPE were able to push their agendas more forcefully. During and after World War I the US instituted repressive responses to social movements through the Palmer Raids and the passage of the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Sedition Act of 1918. After World War II the McCarthy era attacks on liberals and radicals as well as the passage in 1947 of the National Security Act and the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act were allowed and encouraged by HCPE.

The Cold War led to a continuing arms race and a further consolidation of military and corporate interests. President Eisenhower warned of this increasing concentration of power in his 1961 speech to the nation.

"Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence — economic, political, even spiritual — is felt in every city, every Statehouse, every office of

⁵ Michael Soref, Social Class and Division of Labor within the Corporate Elite, *Sociological Quarterly* 17 1976 and Michael Useem, The Social Organization of the American Business Elite and Participation of Corporation Directors in the Governance of American Institutions, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 44, (1979). Michael Useem, *The Inner Circle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

⁶ T Koenig and R. Gobel, Interlocking Corporate Directorships as a Social network, *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. #40, 1981, Peter Phillips, The 1934-35 Red Threat and The Passage of the National Labor Relations Act, *Critical Sociology*, Vol. 20 Number 2 (1994).

the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."⁷

The HCPE support for the continuation of military expansion after WWII was significantly different than after WWI. In the 1920s HCPE were uncomfortable with war profits and the power of the arms industry. After WWII with the cold war, Korea and later Vietnam HCPE supported continued unprecedented levels of military spending.⁸

The top100 military contractors from WWII acquired over three billion dollars in new resources between 1939 and 1945 representing a 62% increase in capital assets. Five main interest groups: Morgan, Mellon, Rockefeller, Dupont and Cleveland Steel, controlled two-thirds of the WWII prime contractor firms and were key elements of HCPE seeking continued high-level military spending.⁹

Economic incentives, combined with Cold War fears, led the HCPE to support an unprecedented military readiness, which resulted in a permanent military industrial complex. From 1952 to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US maintained defense funding in the 25-40% range of total federal spending, with peaks during Korea, Vietnam and the Reagan presidency.¹⁰

The break-up of the Soviet Union undermined the rationale for continued military spending at high Cold War levels and some within the HCPE, while celebrating their victory over communism, saw the possibility of balanced budgets and peace dividends in the 1990s. In early 1992, Edward Kennedy called for the taking of \$210 billion dollars out of the defense budget over several years and spending \$60 billion on universal health care, public housing, and improved transportation.¹¹ However, by spring of 1992 it was clear that strong resistance to major cuts in the military budgets had widespread support in Washington. That year the Senate, in a 50-48 vote, was unable to close Republican and conservative Democrat debates against a proposal to shift defense spending to domestic programs.¹² In 1995 Defense Secretary Les Aspin — who during his tenure under Clinton

⁷ Public Papers of the Presidents, Military-Industrial Complex Speech, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1961, p. 1035-1040

⁸ For an understanding of the anti-military sentiment of the 1930s see: Smedley D. Butler, Major General U.S. Marines, *War is a Racket*, (New York: Round Table Press, 1935) and *The Washington Arms Inquiry*, *Current History*, November (1934).

⁹ *Economic Concentration and World War II*, A report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, US Senate, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 1946.

¹⁰ US Office of Management and Budget, Budget of the United States Government, Historical Tables, Fiscal Year 1995 (Washington Printing office, 1994). Page 36-43, 82-87.

¹¹ Michael Putzel, "Battle Joined in Peace Dividend," *The Boston Globe*, Jan.12, 1992, p. 1.

¹² Eric Pianin, "Peace Dividend Efforts Dealt Blow," *Washington Post*, March 27, 1992, p. A4.

made minor cuts to Pentagon budgets — argued that spending needed to remain high especially for intelligence on "targeting terrorism and narcotics"¹³ By 1999 editorials bemoaning the loss of the peace dividend were all that was left of major cuts to military spending.¹⁴

At the same time as liberal elements of the HCPE were pushing for a peace dividend, a neo-conservative group was arguing for using the decline of the Soviet Union as an opportunity for US military world dominance.

Foundations of the Global Dominance Group

Leo Strauss, Albert Wohlstetter and others at the University of Chicago working in the Committee on Social Thought have been widely credited for promoting the neo-conservative agenda through their students, Paul Wolfowitz, Allan Bloom and Bloom's student Richard Perle. *Adbuster* summed up neo-conservatism as:

"The belief that Democracy, however flawed, was best defended by an ignorant public pumped on nationalism and religion. Only a militantly nationalist state could deter human aggression ...Such nationalism requires an external threat and if one cannot be found it must be manufactured."¹⁵

The neo-conservative philosophy emerged from the 1960's era of social revolutions and political correctness, as a counter force to expanding liberalism and cultural relativism. Numerous officials and associates in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush Presidencies were strongly influenced by the neo-conservative philosophy including: John Ashcroft, Charles Fairbanks, Dick Cheney, Kenneth Adelman, Elliot Abrams, William Kristol and Douglas Feith.¹⁶

Within the Ford administration there was a split between cold war traditionalists seeking to minimize confrontations through diplomacy and détente and neo-conservatives advocating stronger confrontations with the Soviet "Evil Empire." The latter group became more entrenched when George H.W. Bush became director of the CIA. Bush allowed the formation of "Team B" headed by Richard Pipes along with Paul Wolfowitz, Lewis Libby, Paul Nitze and others, who formed the Committee on the Present Danger to raise awareness of the Soviet threat and the continuing need for a strong aggressive defense policy. Their efforts lead to strong anti-soviet positioning during the Reagan administration.¹⁷

¹³ Sam Meddis, "Peace Dividend is no Guarantee, Aspin Says," *USA Today*, December 6, 1994.

¹⁴ Margaret Tauxe, "About that Peace Dividend: The Berlin Wall Fell, But a Wall of Denial Stands," *Pittsburgh Post Gazette*, November 12, 1999, p. A-27.

¹⁵ Guy Caron, "Anatomy of a Neo-Conservative White House," *Canadian Dimension*, May 1, 2005.

¹⁶ Alain Frachon and Daniel Vernet, "The Strategist and the Philosopher: Leo Strauss and Albert Wohlstetter," *Le Monde*, April 16, 2003, English translation: *Counterpunch* 6/2/03.

¹⁷ Anne Hessing Cahn, Team B; The Trillion-dollar Experiment, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, April 1993, Volume 49, No. 03

Journalist John Pilger recalled how he interviewed neo-conservative Richard Perle during the Reagan administration.

"I interviewed Perle when he was advising Reagan; and when he spoke about 'total war,' I mistakenly dismissed him as mad. He recently used the term again in describing America's 'war on terror'. 'No stages,' he said. 'This is total war.' We are fighting a variety of enemies. There are lots of them out there. All this talk about first we are going to do Afghanistan, then we will do Iraq . . . this is entirely the wrong way to go about it. If we just let our vision of the world go forth, and we embrace it entirely and we don't try to piece together clever diplomacy, but just wage a total war . . . our children will sing great songs about us years from now."¹⁸

The election of George H.W. Bush to the Presidency and the appointment of Dick Cheney as Secretary of Defense expanded the presence of neo-conservatives within the government and after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 allowed for the formal initiation of a global dominance policy.

In 1992 Dick Cheney supported Lewis Libby and Paul Wolfowitz in producing the "Defense Planning Guidance" report, which advocated US military dominance around the globe in a "new order." The report called for the United States to grow in military superiority and to prevent new rivals from rising up to challenge us on the world stage. Using words like "unilateral action" and military "forward presence," the report advocated that the US dominate friends and foes alike. It concluded with the assertion that the US can best attain this position by making itself "absolutely powerful."¹⁹

The Defense Policy Guidance report was leaked to the press and came under heavy criticism from many members of the HCPE. The New York Times reported on March 11, 1992 that,

"Senior White House and State Department officials have harshly criticized a draft Pentagon policy statement that asserts that America's mission in the post-cold-war era will be to prevent any collection of friendly or unfriendly nations from competing with the United States for superpower status."²⁰

¹⁸ John Pilger, "The World Will Know The Truth," *New Statesman* (London) (December 16 2002).

¹⁹ Peter Phillips, *The Neoconservative Plan for Global Dominance*, in *Censored 2006*, (New York: Seven Stories Press), (<http://www.projectcensored.org>).

Excerpts from the 1992 Draft "Defense Planning Guidance" can be accessed at (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/etc/wolf.html>).

²⁰ Patrick E. Tyler, "Senior U.S. Officials Assail Lone-Superpower Policy," *New York Times*, March 11, 1992P. A6.

One Administration official, familiar with the reaction of senior staff at the White House and State Department, characterized the document as a "dumb report" that "in no way or shape represents US policy. Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat of West Virginia, called the draft Pentagon document "myopic, shallow and disappointing."²¹ Many HCPE were not yet ready for a unilateral global-dominance agenda. So with Bill Clinton's election to the White House in 1992 most neo-conservatives HCPE were out of direct power during the next eight years.

The HCPE within both major political parties tend to seek to maintain US world military power. Both political parties cooperate by encouraging Congress to protect US business interests abroad and corporate profits at home. To better maintain defense contractors' profits, Clinton's Defense Science Board called for a globalized defense industry obtained through mergers of defense contractors with transnational companies that would become partners in the maintenance of US military readiness.²²

James Woolsey, Clinton's Director of the CIA from 1993 to 1995, described as a hard-liner on foreign policy, wanted to have a continued strong defense policy.²³ However the Clinton administration stayed away from promoting global dominance as an ideological justification for continuing high defense budgets. Instead, to offset profit declines for defense contractors after the fall of the Berlin Wall the Clinton administration aggressively promoted international arms sales raising the US share of arms exports from 16% in 1988 to 63% in 1997.²⁴

Additionally under Clinton the US Space Command's 1996 report *Vision for 2020* called for "Full Spectrum Dominance" by linking land, sea and air superiority to satellite supremacy along with the weaponization of space.²⁵

Outside the Clinton administration neo-conservative HCPE continued to promote a global dominance agenda. On June 4 1994, a neo-conservative 'Lakeside Chat' was given at the San Francisco Bohemian Club's summer encampment to some 2,000 regional and national elites. The talk, entitled "Violent Weakness," was presented by a political science professor from U.C. Berkeley. The speaker focussed on how increasing violence in society was weakening our social institutions. Contributing to this violence and decay of our institutions is bi-sexualism, entertainment politics, multi-culturalism, Afro-Centrism and a loss of family boundaries. The professor claimed to avert further deterioration, we need to recognize that, "elites, based on merit and skill, are important to society and any elite that fails to define itself will fail to survive... We need boundaries and values set and clear! We need an American-centered foreign policy... and a President who understands foreign policy." He went on to conclude that we cannot allow the

²¹ Ibid

²² Anna Rich & Tamar Gabelnick, "Arms Company of the Future: BoeingBAELockheedEADS, Inc," *Arms Sales Monitor*, January 2000.

²³ Guy Caron, "Anatomy of a Neo-Conservative White House," *Canadian Dimension*, May 1, 2005.

²⁴ Martha Honey, "Guns 'R' Us," *In These Times*, August 1997.

²⁵ See Carl Grossman, "US Violates World Law to Militarize Space," *Earth Island Journal*, Winter 1999, and Bruce Gagnon, "Pyramids to the Heavens," *Towards Freedom*, September 1999. The Original Document, *Vision for 2020* can be read at: (<http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/usspac/lrp/ch02.htm>).

"unqualified" masses to carry out policy, but that elites must set values that can be translated into "standards of authority." The speech was forcefully given and was received with an enthusiastic standing ovation by the members.²⁶

During the Clinton administration neo-conservatives within the HCPE were still active in advocating for military global dominance. Many of the Neo-conservatives and their global dominance allies found various positions in conservative think tanks and with Department of Defense contractors. They continued close affiliations with each other through the Heritage Foundation, American Enterprises Institute, Hoover Institute, Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), Center for Security Policy, and several other conservative policy groups. Some became active with right-wing publications such as the *National Review* and the *Weekly Standard*. In 1997, they received funding from conservative foundations to create the Project for the New American Century (PNAC).

HCPE advocates for a US led "New World Order," along with Reagan/Bush hard-liners, and other military expansionists, founded the PNAC in June of 1997. Their Statement of Principles called for the need to guide principles for American foreign policy and the creation of a strategic vision for America's role in the world. PNAC set forth their aims with the following statement:

- we need to increase defense spending significantly if we are to carry out our global responsibilities today and modernize our armed forces for the future;
- we need to strengthen our ties to democratic allies and to challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values;
- we need to promote the cause of political and economic freedom abroad;
- we need to accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles.
- Such a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity may not be fashionable today. But it is necessary if the United States is to build on the successes of this past century and to ensure our security and our greatness in the next."²⁷

The statement was signed by Elliott Abrams, Gary Bauer, William J. Bennett, Jeb Bush, Dick Cheney, Eliot A. Cohen, Midge Decter, Paula Dobriansky, Steve Forbes, Aaron Friedberg, Francis Fukuyama, Frank Gaffney, Fred C. Ikle, Donald Kagan, Zalmay Khalilzad, I. Lewis Libby, Norman Podhoretz, Dan Quayle, Peter W. Rodman, Stephen P. Rosen, Henry S. Rowen, Donald Rumsfeld, Vin Weber, George Weigel, and

²⁶ Peter Phillips, *A Relative Advantage: Sociology of the San Francisco Bohemian Club*, 1994, (<http://libweb.sonoma.edu/regional/faculty/phillips/bohemianindex.html>), p. 104, Note: While I heard this speech myself, a pre-agreement with my host required that the name of the speakers and others participants be kept confidential.

²⁷Project for a New American Century, *Statement of Principles*, June 3, 1997 (<http://www.newamericancentury.org>).

Paul Wolfowitz. Of the twenty-five founders of PNAC twelve were later appointed to high level positions in the George W. Bush administration.²⁸

Since its founding, the PNAC has attracted numerous others who have signed policy letters or participated in the group. Within the PNAC, eight have been affiliated with the number one defense contractor Lockheed-Martin, and seven were associated with the number three defense contractor Northrop Grumman.²⁹ PNAC is one of several institutions that connect global dominance HCPE and large US military contractors.³⁰

In September 2,000, PNAC produced a 76-page report entitled *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*.³¹ The report was similar to the *Defense Policy Guidance* document written by Lewis Libby and Paul Wolfowitz in 1992. This is not surprising in that Libby and Wolfowitz were participants in the production of the 2000 PNAC report. Steven Cambone, Doc Zakheim, Mark Lagan, and David Epstein were also heavily involved. Each of these individuals would go on to hold high-level positions in the George W. Bush administration.³²

Rebuilding America's Defenses called for the protection of the American Homeland, the ability to wage simultaneous theater wars, perform global constabulary roles, and the control of space and cyberspace. It claimed that the 1990s was a decade of defense neglect and that the US must increase military spending to preserve American geopolitical leadership as the world's superpower. The report claimed that in order to maintain a *Pax Americana*, potential rivals — such as China, Iran, Iraq, and North Korea — needed to be held in check. The report also recognized that: "the process of transformation ... is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event such as a new Pearl Harbor."³³ The events of September 11, 2001 were exactly the kind of catastrophe that the authors of *Rebuilding America's Defenses* theorized was needed to accelerate a global dominance agenda.

²⁸ Positions held by PNAC founders in the George W. Bush administration: Elliot Abrams, National Security Council, Dick Cheney, Vice-President, Paula Dobriansky, Dept. of State, Under Sec. of Global Affairs, Aaron Friedberg, Vice President's Deputy National Security Advisor, Francis Fukuyama, Presidents Council on Bioethics, Zalmay Khalilzad, US Ambassador to Afghanistan, Lewis Libby, Chief of Staff for the Vice President, Peter Rodman, DOD, Assist. Sec. Of Defense for International Security, Henry S. Rowen, Defense Policy Board, Comm. On Intelligence Capabilities of US regarding WMDs, Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, Vin Weber, National Commission Public Service, Paul Wolfowitz, Dep. Sec. Of Defense, Pres. World Bank.

²⁹ Ted Nace, *Gangs of America*, (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., 2003) P. 186.

³⁰ For a full review of the Global Dominance Group listing key advocates for military expansion and affiliates of the major defense contractors see appendix A.

³¹ The Project for a New American Century, *Rebuilding America's Defenses, Project for a New American Century: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*, September 2000 (www.newamericancentury.org).

³² David Epstein, Office of Sec. Of Defense, Steve Cambone, NSA, Dov Zakheim, CFO Dept. of Defense, Mark Lagan, Dep. Assist. Sec. Of State.

³³ The Project for a New American Century, *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*, (www.newamericancentury.org).

Before 9/11, the development of strategic global dominance policies were likely to be challenged by members of Congress and liberal HCPE, who continued to hold a détente foreign policy frame of understanding that had been traditionally advocated by the Council of Foreign Relations and the State Department. Liberal and moderate HCPE in various think tanks, policy councils, and universities still hoped for a peace dividend resulting in lower taxes and the stabilization of social programs, and the maintenance of a foreign policy based more on a balance of power instead of unilateral US military global domination. Additionally, many HCPE were worried that the costs of rapidly expanding the military would lead to deficit spending. These liberal/moderate HCPE were so shocked by 9/11 that they became immediately united in their fear of terrorism and in full support of the Patriot Act, Homeland Security, and legislation to support military action in Afghanistan and later Iraq. The resulting permanent war on terror led to massive government spending and the rapid acceleration of the neo-conservative HCPE plans for military control of the world.³⁴

Understanding Global Dominance Advocates within the HCPE

Benefiting significantly from expanded military spending after 9/11 were a group of Department of Defense (DoD) and Homeland Security contractors. For the purposes of this study, we included the top seven military contractors who derive at least one third of their income for DoD contracts in our study group. Additionally, we added in The Carlyle Group and Bechtel Group Inc. because of their high levels of political influence and revolving door personnel within the Reagan and Bush 1&2 administrations.³⁵ These corporations have benefited significantly from post-9/11 policies. Our goals are to identify the primary advocates for a global dominance policy within the HCPE and the principle beneficiaries of this policy. We believe that by identifying the most important policy advocates and those corporate heads who have the most to gain from a global dominance policy that we can begin to establish the parameters of the individuals involved in the Global Dominance Group (GDG) among the HCPE. Knowing the general parameters of the GDG will provide an understanding of who had means, opportunity and motive to have initiated a post-9/11 acceleration of neo-conservative military expansion towards the goal of assuming full spectrum military dominance of the world. Understanding the parameters of the GDG will also allow researchers to explore the possibilities of insider pre-knowledge of the 9/11 attacks. These are classic sociological questions of who wins and who loses within class structures, policy processes, and state decision-making. In this study, we are not seeking to identify people involved in specific acts before or after 9/11. Rather we seek to understand the sociological phenomena of how as collective actors the GDG within the HCPE had the theoretical circumstances of motive, means and opportunity to gain from such events.

To establish a GDG parameters list we included the boards of directors of the nine DoD contractors identified above as those corporations earning over one-third of their revenue from the government or having high levels of political involvement. Additionally

³⁴ William Rivers Pitt, The Root of the Bush National Security Agenda: Global Domination and the Pre-emptive Attack on Iraq First, *www.Truthout.org*, February 27, 2003.

³⁵ See Appendix A for listing of Top 20 DoD Contractors from 2004.

we have included members of sixteen leading conservative global-dominance-advocating foundations and policy councils.

Connections and associations listed in our GDG are not always simultaneous, but rather reflect links extending close to two decades inside an increasingly important group within the HCPE of the US. The list includes 236 names of people who have or recently held high-level government positions in the George W. Bush administration, sit on the boards of directors of major DoD contracting corporations, and/or are close associates of the above serving as GDG advocates on policy councils or advocacy foundations. Deciding on whom to include in such a list and how far to extend the links is difficult. We believe however, that in looking for the core of the GDG in the United States that the people listed in Appendix B are many of the principle participants. These people have been the some of the strongest advocates for military global dominance and/or are the primary beneficiaries of such a policy within the US. They tend to know each other through long periods of active involvement in policy circles, boards of directors, consulting positions, government agencies, and project specific activities.

Although far more research on the GDG needs to be done, we can begin to have an understanding of the parameters and operational methods involved by showing major defense contractor links with the GDG and the policy benefits to such companies as Lockheed-Martin, Halliburton, Carlyle, and Northrup Grumann

Who Profits from GDG Policies?

Lockheed Martin has benefited significantly from the post-9/11 military expansion promoted by the GDG. The Pentagon's budget for buying new weapons rose from \$61 billion in 2001 to over \$80 billion in 2004. Lockheed Martin's sales rose by over 30% at the same time, with tens of billions of dollars on the books for future purchases. From 2000 to 2004, Lockheed Martins stock value rose 300%.

New York Times reporter Tim Weiner wrote in 2004: "No contractor is in a better position than Lockheed Martin to do business in Washington. Nearly 80% of its revenue comes from the US Government. Most of the rest comes from foreign military sales, many financed with tax dollars."³⁶

As of August 2005 Lockheed Martin stockholders had made 18% on their stock in the prior twelve months.³⁷ Northrup-Grumann has seen similar growth in the last three years with DoD contracts rising from \$3.2 billion in 2001 to \$11.1 billion in 2004.³⁸

Halliburton, with Vice-President Dick Cheney as former CEO, has seen phenomenal growth since 2001. Halliburton had defense contracts totaling \$427 million in 2001. By 2003, they had \$4.3 billion in defense contracts, of which approximately a

³⁶ Tim Weiner, "Lockheed and the Future of Warfare," *New York Times*, November 28, 2004, Sunday Business p. 1.

³⁷ Jerry Knight, "Lockheed Rules Roost on Electronic Surveillance," *The Washington Post*, August 29, 2005, p. D-1.

³⁸ See: The Center for Public Integrity, "Pentagon Contractors: Top Contractors by Dollar," (www.publicintegrity.org)

third were sole source agreements.³⁹ Cheney, not incidentally, continues to receive a deferred salary from Halliburton. According to financial disclosure forms, he was paid \$205,298 in 2001; \$162,392 in 2002; \$178,437 in 2003; and \$194,852 in 2004 and his 433,333 Halliburton stock options rose in value from \$241,498 in 2004 to \$8 million in 2005.⁴⁰

The Carlyle Group, established in 1987, is a private global investment firm that manages some \$30 billion in assets. Numerous high-level members of the GDG have been involved in The Carlyle Group including: Frank Carlucci, George H. W. Bush, James Baker III, William Kennard and Richard Darman. The Carlyle Group purchased United Defense in 1997. They sold their shares in the company after 9/11, making a \$1 billion dollar profit.⁴¹ Carlyle continues to invest in defense contractors and is moving into the homeland security industry.⁴²

GDG advocacy continues into the present. Tom Donnelly — a PNAC participant, American Enterprise Institute resident scholar, and former director of communications for Lockheed-Martin — published a book in May of 2005 advocating increasing the DoD budget by a third to \$600 billion and adding 150,000 active duty military personnel. Donnelly calls for the continuation of today's "Pax Americana," a GDG euphemism for US global military domination of the world."⁴³

Public-Private Partnerships

While it is important not to underestimate the profit motive within the top military defense contractors, the promotion of a global dominance agenda includes both neo-conservative ideological beliefs, and the formation of extremely powerful permanent public-private partnerships at the highest levels of government to create interlocking networks of global control. The continuing privatization of military services is but one example of this trend.⁴⁴

Another example is the recent appointment of Paul Wolfowitz, formerly Deputy Secretary of Defense, to head the World Bank. His appointment gives the GDG strong control of another major institutional asset in the drive for full global dominance.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Raw Story, "Cheney's Halliburton stock options rose 3,281% last year, senator finds," October 11, 2005 (www.rawstory.com).

⁴¹ M. Asif Ismail, "Investing in War: The Carlyle Group profits from government and conflict," November 18, 2004 (www.publicintegrity.org).

⁴² M. Asif Ismail, *The Sincerest Form of Flattery: Private Equity Firms Follow in Carlyle's Footsteps*, November 18, 2004 (www.publicintegrity.org).

⁴³ Matrin Walker, *Walker's World: Neo-con Wants More Troops*, UPI, May 31, 2005.

⁴⁴ Greg Guma, *Privatizing War*, July 8, 2004, United Press International, *Pentagon Increases Private Military Contracts*, Josh Sisco, In *Censored 2004*, Peter Phillips, (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2003) p. 98.

A global dominance agenda also includes penetration into the boardrooms of the corporate media in the US. A research team at Sonoma State University recently finished conducting a network analysis of the boards of directors of the ten big media organizations in the US. The team determined that only 118 people comprise the membership on the boards of director of the ten big media giants. These 118 individuals in turn sit on the corporate boards of 288 national and international corporations. Four of the top 10 media corporations in the US have GDG-DoD contractors on their boards of directors including:⁴⁵

William Kennard: New York Times, Carlyle Group
Douglas Warner III, GE (NBC), Bechtel
John Bryson: Disney (ABC), Boeing
Alwyn Lewis: Disney (ABC), Halliburton
Douglas McCorkindale: Gannett, Lockheed-Martin.

Given an interlocked media network, it is safe to say that big media in the United States effectively represent the interests of corporate America. The media elite, a key component of the HCPE in the US, are the watchdogs of acceptable ideological messages, the controllers of news and information content, and the decision makers regarding media resources. Corporate media elites are subject to the same pressures as the higher circle policy makers in the US and therefore equally susceptible to reactionary response to our most recent Pearl Harbor.

An important case of Pentagon influence over the corporate media is CNN's retraction of the story about US Military use of sarin (a nerve gas) in 1970 in Laos during the Vietnam War. CNN producers April Oliver and Jack Smith, after an eight-month investigation, reported on CNN June 7 1998 and later in *Time* magazine that sarin gas was used in Operation Tailwind in Laos and that American defectors were targeted. The story was based on eyewitness accounts and high military command collaboration. Under tremendous pressure from the Pentagon, Henry Kissinger, Colin Powell, and Richard Helms, CNN and *Time* retracted the story by saying, "The allegations about the use of nerve gas and the killing of defectors are not supported by the evidence." Oliver and Smith were both fired by CNN later that summer. They have steadfastly stood by their original story as accurate and substantiated. CNN and *Time*, under intense Pentagon pressure, quickly reversed their position after having fully approved the release of the story only weeks earlier. April Oliver feels that CNN and *Time* capitulated to the Pentagon's threat to lock them out of future military stories.⁴⁶

Public Relations Companies and the GDG

A popular and arguably effective means of controlling public support for global dominance initiatives exists in the use of public relations firms. In recent years, PR corporations increased their profits through U.S and foreign contracts. While direct propaganda campaigns are generally illegal in the United States, governments and PR

⁴⁵ Peter Phillips, *Censored 2006*, (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2005) p. 248.

⁴⁶ Peter Phillips, "The Censored Side of CNN Firings over Tailwing, April Oliver," In *Censored 1999*, (New York: Seven Stories Press, 1999) p. 158.

firms creatively shape public opinion domestically by planting news in foreign papers that will instantly reach American readers.⁴⁷ While the government relies on these firms to generate a specific, ideological response from the masses, the PR firms focus on profits. The concentration of power and capital at the top is not unique to the military defense contractors or to the government. It is also evident in the power public relations and crisis management agencies hold over public opinion.

The images that have shaped support for a permanent war on terror include the toppling of the statue of Saddam, Private Jessica Lynch's heroic rescue and dramatic tales of weapons of mass destruction.⁴⁸ During the first Gulf War, the world witnessed testimony to Congress about babies taken from incubators and left on cold hospital floors and the heartfelt plea by the Kuwaitis to help liberate them from a ruthless Iraqi dictator. In truth, the CIA, using taxpayer money funded these images, which were fabricated and disseminated by The Rendon Group, Hill and Knowlton and other private public relations and crisis management companies.⁴⁹

The corporations responsible for disseminating and shaping information are so interconnected that most public relations firms in the United States and Europe fall under the umbrella of three huge corporations. The big three, WPP, Omnicom Group and Interpublic, have board members who also sit on the boards of the major media conglomerates, military contracting companies and government commissions, including direct relationships in the executive and legislative branches of government.⁵⁰

The public relations company Rendon Group is one of the firms hired for the PR management of America's pre-emptive wars. In the 1980's, The Rendon Group helped form American sentiment regarding the ousting of President Manuel Noriega in Panama.⁵¹ They shaped international support for the first Gulf War, and in the 1990s created the Iraqi National Congress from image, to marketing, to the handpicking Ahmed Chalabi.⁵²

Rendon and similar firms follow the money, shaping public opinion to meet the needs of their clients. The conglomeration and corporatization of the PR industry, in service to the GDG, hinders public discourse and allows those with the most money to dominate news and information in the US and increasingly the world.

⁴⁷ Treasury, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President, and General Government Appropriations Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-58 § 632, 113 Stat. 430, 473 (1999) ("General Government Appropriations Act of 2000"), which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for "publicity or propaganda purposes."

⁴⁸ Jack Shafer, "The Times Scoops That Melted, Cataloging the wretched reporting of Judith Miller," *Slate Magazine*, July 25, 2003.

⁴⁹ Ian Urbina, "A Grad Student Mimicked Saddam Over the Airwaves Broadcast Ruse," *Village Voice*, November 13 - 19, 2002.

⁵⁰ Bill Berkowitz, "Tapping Karen Hughes," *Working for Change*, April 18, 2005.

⁵¹ James Bamford, "The Man Who Sold the War Meet John Rendon, Bush's general in the propaganda war," *Rolling Stone*, December, 2005.

⁵² "India/Iraq: Worldspace Bids for Contract to Rebuild Iraqi Media Network," *Global News Wire - Asia Africa Intelligence Wire BBC Monitoring International Reports*, December 17, 2003.

The ease with which the American population accepted the invasion of Iraq was the outcome of a concerted effort involving the government, DoD contractors, public relations firms, and the corporate media. These institutions are the instigators and main beneficiaries of a permanent war on terror. The importance of these connections lies in the fact that powerful segments of the GDG have the money and resources to articulate their propaganda repeatedly to the American people until those messages become self-evident truths and conventional wisdom.

Election Irregularities

In the fall of 2001, after an eight-month review of 175,000 Florida ballots never counted in the 2000 election, an analysis by the National Opinion Research Center confirmed that Al Gore actually won Florida and should have been President. However, coverage of this report was only a small blip in the corporate media as a much bigger story dominated the news after September 11, 2001.⁵³

The 2004 election was even more fraudulent. The official vote count in 2004 showed that George W. Bush won by three million votes. But exit polls projected a victory margin of five million votes for John Kerry. This eight-million-vote discrepancy is much greater than any possible margin of error. The overall margin of error should statistically have been under one percent. But the official result deviated from the poll projections by more than five percent—a statistical impossibility.⁵⁴

Edison Media Research and Mitofsky International were the two companies hired to do the polling for the Nation Election Pool (a consortium of the nation's five major broadcasters and the Associated Press). They refused to release their polling data until after the inauguration.

Election Systems & Software (ES&S), Diebold, and Sequoia are the companies primarily involved in implementing the new electronic voting stations throughout the country. All three have strong ties to the Bush Administration. The largest investors in ES&S, Sequoia, and Diebold are government defense contractors Northrup-Grumman, Lockheed-Martin, Electronic Data Systems (EDS) and Accenture. Diebold hired Scientific Applications International Corporation (SAIC) of San Diego to develop the software security in their voting machines. Many of the officials on SAIC's board (identified in our GDG data) are former members of either the Pentagon or the CIA. They include: Army General Wayne Downing, formerly on the National Security Council, Bobby Ray Inman, former CIA Director, Retired Admiral William Owens, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Robert Gates, another former director of the CIA.⁵⁵

⁵³The National Opinion Research Center (NORC), University of Chicago, "The Florida Ballot Project: Frequently Asked Questions" (<http://www.norc.uchicago.edu>).

⁵⁴ Peter Phillips, "Another Year of Distorted Election Coverage, and Dennis Loo's chapter in the same book "No Paper Trail Left Behind," In *Censored 2006*, (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2005) p. 48 & p. 185.

⁵⁵ Peter Phillips, "The Sale of Electoral Politics," *Censored 2005*, (New York: Seven stories Press, 2004) p. 57.

Black Box Voting has reported repeatedly that the voting machines used by over 30 million voters were easily hacked by relatively unsophisticated programs and that post-election audits of the computers would not show evidence of tampering. Irregularities in the vote counts indicate that something beyond chance happened in 2004.⁵⁶

Conspiracy theories abound in America and are directly related to the lack of investigative reporting by the corporate media. Corporate media are principally in the entertainment business, therefore the public knows more about the 2004 murder case of California wife-killer Scott Peterson than possibilities of national voter fraud.

GDG and 9/11

A significant portion of the GDG had every opportunity to know in advance that the 9/11 attacks were imminent. Many countries warned the US of imminent terrorist attacks: Afghanistan, Argentina, Britain, Cayman Islands, Egypt, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Morocco, and Russia. Warnings from within the United States intelligence community included communications intercepts regarding al-Qaeda's specific plans. Some of the 9/11 pre-warnings include:

- 1993: An expert panel commissioned by the Pentagon raised the concern that an airplane could be used to bomb national landmarks. [Washington Post, 10/2/01]
- 1996-2001: Federal authorities knew that suspected terrorists with ties to bin Laden received flight training at schools in the US and abroad. An Oklahoma City FBI agent sent a memo warning that "large numbers of Middle Eastern males" were getting flight training and could have been planning terrorist attacks. [CBS, 5/30/02] One convicted terrorist confessed that his planned role in a terror attack was to crash a plane into CIA headquarters. [Washington Post, 9/23/01]
- Dec. 1998: A *Time* magazine cover story entitled "The Hunt for Osama," reported that bin Laden may be planning his boldest move yet — a strike on Washington or possibly New York City. [Time, 12/21/98]
- June of 2001: German intelligence warned the CIA, Britain's intelligence agency, and Israel's Mossad that Middle Eastern terrorists were planning to hijack commercial aircraft and use them as weapons to attack "American and Israeli symbols which stand out." [Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 9/11/01; Washington Post, 9/14/01; Fox News, 5/17/02]
- June 28, 2001: George Tenet wrote an intelligence summary to Condoleezza Rice stating, "It is highly likely that a significant al-Qaeda attack is in the near future, within several weeks." [Washington Post, 2/17/02]
- June-July 2001: President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and national security aides were given briefs with headlines such as "Bin Laden Threats Are Real" and "Bin Laden Planning High Profile Attacks." The exact contents of these briefings remain classified, but according to the 9/11 Commission, they consistently predicted upcoming attacks that would occur "on a catastrophic level, indicating that they would cause the world to be in

⁵⁶ www.blackboxvoting.org. For recent updates on voting machine hacking see: 12-13-05: Devastating hack proven, <http://www.bbvforums.org/cgi-bin/forums/board-auth.cgi?file=/1954/15595.html>

turmoil, consisting of possible multiple—but not necessarily simultaneous—attacks.”
[9/11 Commission Report, 4/13/04 (B)]

—July 26, 2001: Attorney General Ashcroft stopped flying commercial airlines due to a threat assessment. [CBS, 7/26/01] The report of this warning was omitted from the 9/11 Commission Report [Griffin 5/22/05]

—Aug 6, 2001: President Bush received a classified intelligence briefing at his Crawford, Texas ranch, warning that bin Laden might be planning to hijack commercial airliners. The memo was titled “Bin Laden Determined to Strike in US.” The entire memo focused on the possibility of terrorist attacks inside the US and specifically mentioned the World Trade Center. [*Newsweek*, 5/27/02; *New York Times*, 5/15/02, *Washington Post*, 4/11/04, White House, 4/11/04, Intelligence Briefing, 8/6/01]

—August, 2001: Russian President Vladimir Putin warned the US that suicide pilots were training for attacks on US targets. [*Fox News*, 5/17/02] The head of Russian intelligence also later stated, “We had clearly warned them” on several occasions, but they “did not pay the necessary attention.” [*Agence France-Presse*, 9/16/01]

—September 10, 2001: a group of top Pentagon officials received an urgent warning that prompted them to cancel their flight plans for the following morning. [*Newsweek*, 9/17/01] The 9/11 Commission Report omitted this report. [Griffin, 5/22/05]⁵⁷

Foreknowledge of 9/11 enabled the GDG to act quickly to accelerate their global dominance agenda. People in the GDG wanted an Invasion of Afghanistan long before 9-11. The US government Sub-committee on Asia and the Pacific of the International Relations Committee of the House of Representatives met in February of 1998 to discuss removing the government of Afghanistan from power. The U.S government told India in June of 2001 that a planned invasion of Afghanistan was set for October and *Janes Defense News* reported in March of 2001 that the US planned to invade Afghanistan later that year. BBC reported that the U.S told the Pakistani Foreign Secretary prior to 9/11 of a planned invasion of Afghanistan in October.⁵⁸

At the beginning of 2006 the Global Dominance Group's agenda is well established within higher circle policy councils and cunningly operationalized inside the US Government. They work hand in hand with defense contractors promoting deployment of US forces in over 700 bases worldwide.

There is an important difference between self-defense from external threats, and the belief in the total military control of the world. Many people in the US are having serious doubts about the moral and practical acceptability of financing world domination, and the dangers to personal freedoms permanent war implies.

Ken Cunningham from Penn State University writes, "...current War-on-Terror levels [of expenditures] surpass the Cold War averages by 18% ...9/11 and the War on Terror have enabled the assertion of an aggressive, preemptive, militarist bloc within the

⁵⁷ See Jessica Froiland's, 9/11 Pre-warnings in *Censored 2006*, Peter Phillips, (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2005) p. 205.

⁵⁸ *Indiareacts.com*, India in Anti-Taliban Military Plan, 6/26/01, *BBC News*, 9/18/01, by George Arney. *Janes Defense News*, 3/15/01, India Joins Anti-Taliban Coalition, by Rahul Bedi.

government and the National Security State...The gravity of the current militarism is the nebulous, potentially limitless (permanent war)."⁵⁹

Resistance to the GDG within HCPE

An important question remains. Can we see any evidence of moderates or liberals within the HCPE asserting resistance the GDG agenda? Certainly the indictments of key neo-cons within the Bush administration is a hopeful sign. But there is little evidence that the higher circle policy elites have any interest in addressing questions regarding 9/11 pre-warnings or national voter fraud.

Greg Palast reported on the split between the neo-cons in the Pentagon and the State Department and oil companies over the privatization of the oil fields in Iraq. The GDG neo-cons were pushing for the US oil companies to purchase Iraq's oil fields outright and the oil companies balked, preferring to simply buy the oil from a stable pro-American Iraqi regime.⁶⁰

Another sign of resistance was a full-page ad in the *New York Times* November 10, 2005 placed by a new policy advocacy group called the Partnership for a Secure America. The ad openly challenged the US policy of torture and was signed by numerous HCPE including Lee Hamilton, Warren Christopher, Gary Hart, and Richard Holbrooke.

Still another sign of resistance is the fact that traditionally powerful long-term lobbying groups such as US Chamber of Commerce, the National Associations of Manufacturers, and the National Association of Realtors have become concerned about the confidentiality of private files that "could too easily be reviewed" under the Patriot Act.⁶¹

These oppositional responses to GDG from higher circle policy elites are hopeful but hardly significant in light of the extent of the global dominance agenda. Many in the HCPE are still fearful of terrorist attacks — a fear the corporate media constantly reinforces.

Many in the HCPE believe in holding the course in Iraq out of concern for greater unrest in the region should we pull out. Without broad social movements and citizen unrest that threatens the stability of HCPE's socio-economic agendas and corporate profits there will be little if any serious challenge to the GDG. Should the 2006 election bring Democratic control to the House or Senate, we would likely see only a slight slowing of the GDG agenda, but certainly not a reversal.

The events over the past couple of decades and especially the first five years of this century suggest that something some would call fascism has taken root in the US and there is little indication that a reversal is evident.

Vice President Wallace wrote in *The New York Times* on April 9, 1944, "The really dangerous American fascist,... is the man who wants to

⁵⁹ Ken Cunningham, Permanent War? The Domestic Hegemony of the New American Militarism, *New Political Science*, Volume 26, Number 2, December 2004.

⁶⁰ Greg Palast, "OPEC and the Economic Conquest of Iraq," *Harpers*, October, 2005.

⁶¹ "Business groups want to limit Patriot Act," San Francisco Indy Media, October 17, 2005 (www.sf.indymedia.org).

do in the United States in an American way what Hitler did in Germany in a Prussian way. The American fascist would prefer not to use violence. His method is to poison the channels of public information. With a fascist the problem is never how best to present the truth to the public but how best to use the news to deceive the public into giving the fascist and his group more money or more power.”

Wallace then added,

“They claim to be super-patriots, but they would destroy every liberty guaranteed by the Constitution. They demand free enterprise, but are the spokesmen for monopoly and vested interest. Their final objective toward which all their deceit is directed is to capture political power so that, using the power of the state and the power of the market simultaneously, they may keep the common man in eternal subjection.”⁶²

We are past the brink of totalitarian fascist-corporatism. Challenging the Neo-cons and the GDG agenda is only the beginning of reversing the long-term conservative reactions to the gains of the 1960s. Re-addressing poverty, the UN Declaration of Human Rights and our own weapons of mass destruction is a long-term agenda for progressive scholars and citizen democrats.

Peter Phillips is a Professor of Sociology at Sonoma State University and director of Project Censored, a media research organization. Bridget Thornton and Celeste Vogler are senior level research assistants at Sonoma State University with majors in History and Political Science, respectively.

Appendix A

Company:	Defense Contracts 2004	Total Revenue 2004	% from DOD
Lockheed Martin Corporation	\$20,690,912,117	\$35,526,000,000	58%
General Dynamics Corporation	\$9,563,280,236	\$19,178,000,000	50%
Raytheon Company	\$8,472,818,938	\$20,245,000,000	42%
Northrop Grumman Corporation	\$11,894,090,277	\$29,853,000,000	40%
Halliburton Company	\$7,996,793,706	\$20,464,000,000	39%
Science Applications International	\$2,450,781,108	\$7,187,000,000	34%
The Boeing Company	\$17,066,412,718	\$52,457,000,000	33%
The Carlyle Group	\$1,442,680,446	N/A	N/A
Bell Boeing Joint Program	\$1,539,815,440	(Boeing)	NA

Note: Figures in Appendix A courtesy of Mergent Online Database.

⁶² Cited from Davidson Loehr “*Living Under Fascism* Unitarian Universalist Church, November 7, 2004 (http://www.uua.org/news/2004/voting/sermon_loehr.html).

Appendix B

GLOBAL DOMINANCE GROUP ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS

PNAC Project For New American Century
HO Hoover Institute
AEI American Enterprise Institute
HU Hudson Institute
NSC National Security Council
HF Heritage Foundation
DPB Defense Policy Board
CPD Committee on Present Danger
JINSA Jewish Institute of National Security Affairs
MI Manhattan Institute
CLI Committee for the Liberation of Iraq
CSP Center for Security Policy: Institute for Strategic Studies
CSIS Center for Strategic and Int'l Studies
NIPP National Institute for Public Policy
AIPAC American Israel Public Affairs Committee
Team B Presidents Foreign Advisory Board

Important Agencies and Other Organizations

CIA Central Intelligence Agency
DoD Department of Defense
DoS Department of State
CFR Council on Foreign Relations
DoJ Department of Justice
DoC Department of Commerce
WHOMB White House Office of Management and Budget
DoE Department of Energy
DPB Defense Policy Board
DoT Department of Transportation
NSA National Security Agency

Note: In selecting the sixteen important neo-conservative GPG advocacy organizations we relied mostly on the International Relations Center website: <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/>, The Center for Public Integrity at: www.publicintegrity.org and other sources cited in this paper.

1. Abramowitz Morton I.; PNAC, NSC, Asst. Sec. of State, Amb. to Turkey, Amb. To Thailand, CISS, Carlyle
2. Abrams, Elliott; PNAC, Heritage, DoS, HU, Special Asst. to President Bush, NSC
3. Adelman, Ken; PNAC, CPD, DoD, DPB, Fox News, CPD, Affairs, Commander in Chief Strategic Air Command, Northrop Grumman, Arms Control Disarmament Agency
4. Aldrige, E.C. Jr.; CFR, PNAC, NSA, HU, HF, Sec. of the Air Force, Asst. Sec. of State, Douglas Aircraft, DoD, LTV Aerospace, WHOMB, Strategic Systems Group, Aerospace Corp.

5. Allen, Richard V.; PNAC, HF, HO, CFR, CPD, DPB, CNN, US Congress, CIA Analyst, CSIS, NSC
6. Amitay, Morris J.; JINSA, AIPAC
7. Andrews, D.P.; SAIC
8. Andrews, Michael; L-3 Communications Holdings, Deputy Asst. Sec. of Research and Technology, Chief Scientist for the US Army
9. Archibald, Nolan D.; Lockheed Martin
10. Baker, James, III, Caryle, Sec. of State (Bush), Sec. of Tres. (Reagan)
11. Barr, William P.; HF, HO, PNAC, CFR, NSA, US Congress, Asst. to the President (Reagan), Carlyle,
12. Barram, David J.; Computer Sciences Corporation, US DoC
13. Barrett, Barbara; Raytheon
14. Bauer, Gary; PNAC, Under Sec. of Ed.
15. Bechtel, Riley; Bechtel
16. Bechtel, Steve; Bechtel
17. Bell, Jeffrey; PNAC, MI
18. Bennett, Marcus C.; Lockheed Martin
19. Bennett, William J.; PNAC, NSA, HU, Sec. of Education
20. Bergner, Jeffrey; PNAC, HU, Boeing
21. Berns, Walter; AEI, CPD
22. Biggs, John H.; Boeing, CFR
23. Blechman, Barry; DoD, CPD
24. Bolton, John; JINSA, PNAC, AEI, DoS, DoJ, Amb. to UN, WH Legis. Council, Agency Int'l Devel, Under Sec. State Arms Control-Int'l Security
25. Boot, Max; PNAC, CFR
26. Bremer, L. Paul; HF, CFR, Administrator of Iraq
27. Brock, William; CPD, Senator, Sec. of Labor
28. Brooks, Peter; DoD, Heritage, CPD
29. Bryen, Stephen; JINSA, AEI, DoD, L-3 Network Security, Edison Int'l, Disney
30. Bryson, John E.; Boeing
31. Bush, Jeb; PNAC, Governor of Florida
32. Bush, George H. W., President, Carlyle, CIA Dir.
33. Bush, Wes; Northrop Grumman
34. Cambone, Stephen; PNAC, NSA, DoD, Los Alamos (specialized in theater nuclear weapons issues), Ofc. Sec. Defense: Dir. Strategic Def., CSIS, CSP
35. Chabraja, Nicholas D.; General Dynamics
36. Chain, John T. Jr. Northrup Grumman, Sec. of the Air Force, Dir. of Politico-Military Affairs, DoS, Chief of Staff for Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, Commander in Chief Strategic Air Command
37. Chao, Elaine; HF, Sec. of Labor, Gulf Oil, US DoT, CFR
38. Chavez, Linda; PNAC, MI, CFR
39. Cheney, Lynne; AEI, Lockheed Martin
40. Cheney, Richard; JINSA, PNAC, JINSA, AEI, HU, Halliburton, Sec. of Defense, VP of US
41. Cohen Eliot A.; PNAC, AEI, DPB, DoD, CLI, CPD
42. Coleman, Lewis W.; Northrop Grumman
43. Colloredo-Manfeld, Ferdinand; Raytheon
44. Cook, Linda Z.; Boeing
45. Cooper, Dr. Robert S.; BAE Systems, Asst. Sec. of Defense
46. Cooper, Henry; CPD, DoD, Heritage, Deputy Asst. Sec. Air Force, US Arms Control Disarm. Strategic Def. Initiative, Applied Research Assoc, NIPP

47. Cox, Christopher; CSP, Senior Associate Counsel to the President, Chairman: SEC.
48. Crandall, Robert L.; Halliburton, FAA Man. Advisor Bd.
49. Cropsey, Seth; PNAC, AEI, HF, HU, DoD, Under-Sec. Navy
50. Cross, Devon Gaffney; PNAC, DPB, HF, CPD, HO
51. Crouch, J.D.; CSP, Depty. National Security Advisor, DoD, Amb. to Romania
52. Crown, James S.; General Dynamics, Henry Crown and Co.
53. Crown, Lester; General Dynamics, Henry Crown and Co.
54. Dachs, Alan; Bechtel, CFR
55. Dahlburg, Ken; SAIC, DoC, Asst. to Reagan, WHOMB
56. Darman, Richard G.; Carlyle, Dir. of the US Office of Management and Budget, President Bush's Cabinet, Asst. to the President of the US, Deputy Sec. of the US Treasury, Asst. US Sec. of Commerce
57. Dawson, Peter; Bechtel
58. Decter, Midge; HF, HO, PNAC, CPD
59. Demmish, W.H.; SAIC
60. DeMuth, Christopher; AEI, US Office of Management and Budget, Asst. to Pres. (Nixon)
61. Derr, Kenneth T.; Halliburton
62. Deutch, John; Dir. CIA, Deputy Sec. of Defense, Raytheon
63. Dine, Thomas; CLI, US Senate (Church, Ed. Kennedy), AIPAC, US Agency Int'l Development, Free Radio Europe/Radio Liberty, Prague, Czech Rep., CFR
64. Dobriansky, Paula; PNAC, HU, AEI, CPB, DoS, Army, NSC European/Soviet Affairs, USIA, ISS
65. Donnelly, Thomas; AEI, PNAC, Lockheed Martin
66. Downing, Wayne, Ret. Gen. US Army, NSA, CLI, SAIC
67. Drummond, J.A.; SAIC
68. Duberstein, Kenneth M.; Boeing, WH Chief of Staff
69. Dudley, Bill; Bechtel
70. Eberstadt, Nicholas; AEI, CPD, PNAC, DoS (consultant)
71. Ebner, Stanley; Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, Northrop Grumman, CSP
72. Ellis, James O. Jr.; Lockheed Martin, Retired Navy Admiral and Commander US Strategic Command
73. Epstein David, PNAC, Office of Sec. Defense
74. Everhart, Thomas; Raytheon
75. Falcoff, Mark; AEI, CFR
76. Fautua, David; PNAC, Lt. Col. US Army
77. Fazio, Vic; Northrup Grumman, Congressman (CA)
78. Feith, Douglas; JINSA, DoD, L-3 Communications, Northrup Grumman, NSC, CFR, CPS
79. Feulner, Edwin J. Jr.; HF, HO, Sec. HUD, Inst. European Def. & Strategy Studies, CSIS
80. Foley, D.H.; SAIC
81. Fradkin, Hillel; PNAC, AEI,
82. Frank, Stephen E.; Northrop Grumman
83. Fricks, William P.; General Dynamics
84. Friedberg, Aaron; PNAC, CFR, NSA, DoD, CIA consultant
85. Frost, Phillip (M.D.); Northrop Grumman
86. Fukuyama, Francis; PNAC, CFR, HU
87. Gates, Robert, CIA-dir. NSA, SAIC
88. Gaffney, Frank; CPD, PNAC, Washington Times, DoD
89. Gaut, C. Christopher; Halliburton
90. Gedmin, Jeffrey; AEI, PNAC, CPD
91. Gerecht, Reuel Marc; PNAC, AEI, CIA, CBS

92. Gillis, S. Malcom; Halliburton, Electronic Data Systems Corp
93. Gingrich, Newt; AEI, CFR, HO, DPB, U.S House of Reps., CLI, CPD
94. Goodman, Charles H.; General Dynamics
95. Gorelick, Jamie S. United Technologies Corporation, Deputy attorney general, DoD, Asst. to the Sec. of Energy, National Com. Terrorist Threats Upon the US, DoJ, Nat'l Security Adv., CIA, CFR
96. Gouré, Daniel; DoD, SAIC, DoE, DoS (consultant), CSP
97. Haas, Lawrence J.; Communications WHOMB, CPD
98. Hadley, Stephen; NSA advisor to Bush, Lockheed Martin
99. Hamre, John J. ITT Industries, SAIC, U. S. Dep. Sec. of Defense, Under Sec. of Defense, Senate Armed Services Committee
100. Hash, Tom; Bechtel
101. Haynes, Bill; Bechtel
102. Hoerber, Amoretta; CSP, Defense Industry consultant, CPD, CFR, DoD
103. Horner, Charles; HU, CSP, DoS, Staff member of Sen. Daniel Patrick Moyihan
104. Howell, W.R.; Halliburton, Dir. Deutsche Bank
105. Hunt, Ray L.; Halliburton, Electronic Data Systems Corp, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board
106. Inman, Bobby Ray; Ret. Adm. US Navy, CIA-Dir, CFR, NSA, SAIC
107. Ikle, Fred; AEI, PNAC, CPD, HU, DPB, Under Sec. DoD, Def. Policy Board
108. Iorizzo, Robert P.; Northrop Grumman
109. Jackson, Bruce; PNAC, NSA, AEI, CFR, Office of Sec. of Def., US Army Military Intelligence, Lockheed Martin, Martin Marietta, CLI, CPD
110. Jennings, Sir John, Bechtel
111. Johnson, Jay L.; General Dynamics, Retired Admiral, US Navy
112. Jones, A.K.; SAIC, DoD
113. Joseph, Robert; Under Sec. of State for Arms Control and Int'l Security Affairs, DoD, CSP, NIPP
114. Joulwan, George A.; General Dynamics, Retired General, US Army
115. Kagan, Frederick PNAC, West Point Military Academy
116. Kagan, Robert; PNAC, CFR, DoS (Deputy for Policy), Washington Post, CLI, editor Weekly Standard
117. Kaminski, Paul G. General Dynamics, Under Sec. of US Department of Defense
118. Kaminsky, Phyllis ; JINSA, CSP, NSC, Int'l Pub. Rel. Society,
119. Kampelman, Max M.; PNAC, JINSA, CPD, Sec. Housing and Urban Development, CPD
120. Keane, John M. General Dynamics, Retired General, US Army, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, DoD Policy Board
121. Kennard, William, Carlyle, NY Times, FCC
122. Kemble, Penn; PNAC, DoS, USIA
123. Kemp, Jack; JINSA, HF, Sec. of HUD, US House of Reps., CPD
124. Keyworth, George; CSP, HU, Los Alamos, General Atomics, NSC
125. Khalilzad, Zalmay; PNAC, Amb. to Iraq
126. King, Gwendolyn S.; Lockheed Martin
127. Kirkpatrick, Jeane; AEI, JINSA, CFR, CPD, NSA, Sec. of Defense Commission, US Rep. to UN, CLI, CPD, Carlyle
128. Kramer, H.M.J., Jr.; SAIC
129. Kristol, Irving; CFR, AEI, DoD, Wall Street Journal Board of Contributors
130. Kristol, William; PNAC, AEI, MI, VP Chief of Staff '89, CLI, Domes. Policy Adv. To VP, '89
131. Kupperman, Charles; CPD, Boeing, NIPP

132. Lagon, Mark; PNAC, CFR, AEI, DoS
133. Lane, Andrew; Halliburton
134. Larson, Charles R.; Retired Admiral of the US Navy, Northrop Grumman
135. Laspa Jude; Bechtel
136. Ledeen, Michael; AEI, JINSA, DoS (consultant), DoD
137. Lehman, John; PNAC, NSA, DoD, Sec. of Navy
138. Lehrman, Lewis E.; AEI, MI, HF, G.W. Bush Oil Co. partner
139. Lesar, Dave; Halliburton
140. Libby, I. Lewis; PNAC, Chief of Staff to Dick Cheney, DoS, Northrup Grumman, RAND, DoD, House of Rep., Team B
141. Livingston, Robert; House of Rep., CSP, DoJ
142. Loy, James M., Lockheed Martin, Retired US Navy Admiral
143. Malone, C.B.; SAIC, Martin Marietta, DynCorp, Titan Corp., CLI, CPD
144. Martin, J. Landis; Halliburton
145. McCorkindale, Douglas H.; Lockheed Martin
146. McDonnell, John F.; Boeing
147. McFarlane, Robert; National Security Advisor (Reagan), CPD, Bush's Transition Advisory Committee on Trade
148. McNerney, James W.; Boeing, 3M, GE
149. Meese, Edwin; HF, HO, US Attorney General, Bechtel, CPD
150. Merrill, Philip; CSP, DoD, Import-Export Bank of US
151. Minihan, Kenneth A.; Ret. General US Air Force, BAE Systems, DoD, Defense Intelligence Agency
152. Moore, Frank W.; Northrop Grumman
153. Moore, Nick; Bechtel
154. Moorman, Thomas S.; CSP, Aerospace Corporation, Rumsfeld Space Commission, US Air Force: Former vice chief of staff
155. Mundy, Carl E. Jr.; General Dynamics, Retired General, US Marine Corps Commandant
156. Muravchik, Joshua; AEI, JINSA, PNAC, CLI, CPD
157. Murphy, Eugene F.; Lockheed Martin, GE
158. Nanula, Richard; Boeing
159. Novak, Michael; AEI, CPD
160. Nunn, Sam; GE, US Senator, Chairman Senate Armed Services Committee
161. O'Brien, Rosanne; Northrop Grumman, Carlyle
162. Odeen, Philip A.; Defense and Arms Control Staff for Henry Kissinger, TRW, Northrop Grumman
163. Ogilvie, Scott; Bechtel
164. Owens, William, Ret. Adm. US Navy, DPB, Joint Chiefs of Staff, SAIC
165. Perle, Richard; AEI, PNAC, CPD, CFR, NSA, JINSA, HU, DoD, DPD, CLI, Carlyle
166. Peters, Aulana L.; Northrop Grumman, SEC
167. Pipes, Daniel; PNAC, CPD, Team B
168. Podhoretz, Norman; PNAC, CPD, HU, CFR
169. Poses, Frederic; Raytheon
170. Precourt, Jay A.; Halliburton
171. Quayle, Dan; PNAC, VP US
172. Ralston, Joseph W.; Lockheed Martin, Retired Air Force Gen., Vice Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff
173. Reed, Deborah L.; Halliburton, Pres. Southern CA. Gas & Elec
174. Ridgeway, Rozanne; Boeing, Asst. Sec. of State- Europe and Canada, Amb. German Democratic Republic, Finland, DoD
175. Riscassi, Robert; L-3 Communications Holdings, UN Command/Korea, Army vice chief

- of staff; Joint Chiefs of Staff
176. Roche, James; Sec. of the Air Force, CSP, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, DoS
 177. Rodman, Peter W.; PNAC, NSA, Asst. Sec. of Defense for Int'l Security Affairs, DoS,
 178. Rowen, Henry S.; PNAC, HO, CFR, DPB, DoD
 179. Rubenstein, David M.; Carlyle, Deputy Asst. to the President for Domestic Policy (Carter)
 180. Rubin, Michael; AEI, CFR, Office of Sec. of Defense
 181. Rudman, Warren; US Senator, Raytheon
 182. Ruettgers, Michael; Raytheon
 183. Rumsfeld, Donald; PNAC, HO, Sec. of Defense, Bechtel, Tribune Co.
 184. Sanderson, E.J.; SAIC
 185. Savage, Frank; Lockheed Martin
 186. Scaife, Richard Mellon; HO, HF, CPD, Tribune Review Publishing Co.
 187. Scheunemann, Randy; PNAC, Office of Sec. of Defense (consultant), Lockheed Martin, CLI Founder /Dir., CPD
 188. Schlesinger, James ; DoE, Atomic Energy Commission, Dir. CIA, CSP
 189. Schmitt, Gary; PNAC, CLI, DoD (consultant), CLI
 190. Schneider, William, Jr.; BAE Systems, PNAC, DoS, House of Rep./Senate staffer, WHOMB, CSP, NIPP
 191. Schultz, George; HO, AEI, CPD, CFR, PNAC, Sec. of State, Sec. of Treasury, Bechtel, CLI, CPD
 192. Shalikashvili, John M.; Boeing, Retired Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, DoD, Ret. Gen. US Army, CFR
 193. Sharer, Kevin; Northrup Grumman, US Naval Academy, Ret. Lt. Com. US Navy
 194. Sheehan, Jack, Bechtel, DPB
 195. Shelman, Thomas W.; Northrup Grumman, DoD
 196. Shulsky, Abram; PNAC, DoD
 197. Skates, Ronald L.; Raytheon
 198. Slaughter, John Brooks; Northrup Grumman
 199. Sokolski, Henry; PNAC, HF, HO, CIA, DoD
 200. Solarz, Stephen; PNAC, HU, DoS, CPD, Carlyle
 201. Spivey, William; Raytheon
 202. Statton, Tim; Bechtel
 203. Stevens, Anne; Lockheed Martin
 204. Stevens, Robert J.; Lockheed Martin
 205. Stuntz, Linda; Raytheon, US DoE
 206. Sugar, Ronald D.; Northrup Grumman, Association of the US Army
 207. Swanson, William; Raytheon, Lockheed Martin
 208. Tkacik, John; PNAC, HF, US Senate
 209. Turner, Michael J.; BAE Systems
 210. Ukropina, James R., Lockheed Martin
 211. Van Cleave, William R.; Team B, HO, CSP, CPD, DoD, NIPP
 212. Waldron, Arthur; CSP, AEI, PNAC, CFR
 213. Walkush, J.P.; SAIC
 214. Wallop, Malcolm; Heritage, HU, CSP, PNAC, Senate
 215. Walmsley, Robert; General Dynamics, Retired Vice-Admiral, Royal Navy, Chief of Defense Procurement for the UK Ministry of Defense
 216. Warner, John Hillard; SAIC, US Army/Airforce Assn.
 217. Watts, Barry; PNAC Northrop Grumman
 218. Weber, John Vincent (Vin); PNAC, George W. Bush Campaign Advisor, NPR
 219. Wedgewood, Ruth; CLI, DoD, DoJ, DoS, CFR

220. Weldon, Curt; House of Rep, CSP
221. Weyrich, Paul; HF, PNAC, US Senate
222. White, John P.; L-3 Communications, Chair of the Com. on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces, DoD
223. Wieseltier, Leon; PNAC, CLI
224. Williams, Christopher A.; PNAC, DPB, Under Sec. for Defense, Boeing (lobbyist), Northrop Grumman (lobbyist), CLI
225. Winter, Donald C; Northrop Grumman
226. Wolfowitz, Paul; PNAC, HF, HU, Team B, Under-Sec. Defense, World Bank, Northrop Grumman, DoS
227. Wollen, Foster; Bectel
228. Woolsey R. James; PNAC, JINSA, CLI, DPB, CIA (Dir.), Under Sec. of Navy, NIPP
229. Wurmser, David; AEI, Office of VP Middle East Adviser, DoS
230. Yearly, Douglas C.; Lockheed Martin
231. Young, A.T.; SAIC
232. Zaccaria, Adrian; Bechtel
233. Zafirovski, Michael S.; Boeing
234. Zakheim, Dov S.; PNAC, HF, CFR, DoD, Northrup Grumman, McDonnell Douglas, CPD
235. Zinni, Anthony C.; Retired General US Marines, BAE Systems, Commander in Chief US Central Command
236. Zoellick, Robert; PNAC, US Trade Representative, DoS, CSIS, CFR, DOJ