

The American Empire: Conquest Through NAFTA

By [Global Research](#)

Global Research, October 14, 2006

scoop.epluribusmedia.org 14 October 2006

Region: [Canada](#), [Latin America & Caribbean](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#)

by [XicanoPwr](#)

Sat Oct 14, 2006 at 07:40:19 AM EST

Soon after the Mexico's Electoral Tribunal declared Felipe Calderón President-elect on Sept 5, three of his advisers [met secretly](#) with Cabinet ministers, top military brass and North America's top corporate executives in Canada. The meeting focused on the national security, borders, immigration, military production and the control over North America's energy reserves.

Tres de los principales asesores del presidente electo, Felipe Calderón, participaron hace menos de dos semanas en un encuentro secreto realizado en Canadá, donde representantes de grandes corporaciones y del estamento militar estadounidense plantearon "profundizar la integración de América del Norte" y crear una "zona segura" de abasto de petróleo para la economía de Washington.

Just to name a few of those who attended the meeting; they were US Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld; Mexico's Secretary of Public Security, Eduardo Medina Mora; and General Rick Hilliers, Chief of Canadian Forces and representing the business sector were executives of Lockheed Martin, Chevron, Petroleos Mexicanos, Suncor Energy, according to [Michel Chossudovsky](#).

[Commentary](#)

In past few months there has been a lot of talk about how there is a secret plan to create a North American Union by dismantling of the borders between Canada, Mexico and the United States, and creating a deeper North American economic integration other wise known as "[Deep Integration](#)."

Deep integration is the dismantling of the border between Canada and the United States. It will affect everything – the economy, social structures, social programs, resources and the environment. It is the harmonization of policies and regulations that govern the foods we eat, the items we buy, and how we live. It is the formation of a new North America that effectively erases the border between Canada and the United States in the interest of trade north of the border and security concerns south of the border.

The idea behind "[deep integration](#)" originated from the current North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the United States, Canada and Mexico, which came into effect on January 1, 1994. Since the inception NAFTA, the three countries have been on an

irreversible path to economic integration.

Before last month's meeting between the business and political leaders, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) had already taken steps with its counterparts in Canada (Council of Chief Executives) and Mexico (Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales (Mexican Council of International Affairs - COMEXI) to study the possibility of integrating the three nations. Laying the foundation for the "deep integration," the CFR produced a report entitled [*Building a North American Community*](#).

The document called for the creation of a single economic space that expands economic opportunity for all people in the region, and the establishment of a security zone that protects the region from external threats while facilitating the legitimate passage of goods, people, and capital.

The task force was led by former Canadian Vice Prime Minister and Finance Minister John P. Manley; Mexican former Minister of the Treasury Pedro Aspe; and former Governor of Massachusetts and US Attorney General assistant William F. Weld.

On [March 23, 2005](#), the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP) agreement was signed formally by President Bush, President Vicente Fox of Mexico, and Prime Minister Paul Martin of Canada. Hass, notes:

The Task Force offers a detailed and ambitious set of proposals that build on the recommendations adopted by the three governments at the Texas summit of March 2005. The Task Force's central recommendation is establishment by 2010 of a North American economic and security community, the boundaries of which would be defined by a common external tariff and an outer security perimeter.

One year later, on [March 31, 2006](#), the three heads of state, Bush, Vicente Fox and Steven Harper, the new Prime Minister of Canada, resigned the agreement in Cancun.

The point of this accord was a safety measure to bind Mexico legally regardless of who became president of Mexico in the upcoming elections. Included in the "security and prosperity of North America" was a guarantee that Mexico's energy industry will meet the needs of the US market, as well as measures toward forging "a common theory of security," which means that Mexico will allow any of US Homeland Security measures to be implemented in Mexico.

On [Nov 2005](#), in Mexico City, before members of the US Chamber of Commerce, Felipe Calderón had won over the Bush administration when he told the Chamber of Commerce members that he was in favor of private investment in Pemex, and of weakening the labor unions. He also stated that he supported George Bush's guest worker program and that he agreed the border needed to be secured or militarized.

One serious effect of the globalization of the economy is the rise of new governing institutions that undeniably serve the interests of private transnational economic power. When truth is mixed in with disinformation, it is becoming hard to decipher who is actually telling the truth or who is spreading misinformation about the future of the North American Union (NAU).

The rationales made against the NAU by Nationalists are filled with extreme, reactionary anti-immigration rhetoric, particularly focusing on jobs taken away by immigrants and national security. What makes it worse; there are sprinklings of conspiracy theories from far right pundits like [Lou Dobbs](#), [Alex Jones](#), [Phyllis Schlafly](#), and [Jerome R. Corsi](#) among others.

Their rhetoric against the NAU ranges from paranoia to loosely base arguments. One of the most outspoken and often cited by [progressives](#) is [Jerome R. Corsi](#), who happens to be the co-author of the book *Unfit for Command* with John E. O'Neill. It is hard to take Corsi seriously particularly when he was helpful in keeping the current Administration in power. To make matters worse, Corsi is currently writing a book on the Minutemen Project with Jim Gilchrist as coauthor. [Corsi's argument](#) against the SPP is based on his antagonistic attitude towards undocumented immigrants.

Corsi and his ilk worry about the North American Union is about is the possibility that this country will be integrated with the very people they dislike, therefore, deflecting the legitimate problem of having these type of secret meetings - free-trade.

If there is an invasion, the invasion will come from the US, not Mexico. There is specific evidence in the National Archives that clearly indicate that the US had an eye for Mexico. In 1904, [Brig General Tasker Bliss](#), commander of the US War College, issued some directives to Admiral George Dewey and the Joint Board to invade Canada and Mexico and explained that the upcoming wars are considered acts of aggression but it would be masked as an act of defense:

I do not think that when the United States comes to fight it will be for the declared purpose of extension of trade, although that may be the real cause of war and its real object, concealed under an appeal to the Monroe Doctrine.

The only problem Gen Bliss had was trying to figure out how to go about this without having any of the existing super powers great enter into the war. Given his options, he deduced it would be better to invade Mexico:

That the intervention of the United States in Mexico may become necessary, with the least chance of any other foreign complication connected therewith.

Gen Bliss also recommended that the US prepare five contingency plans, the fifth one was the plan for the intervention of Mexico. On April 1912, a Joint Board plan for military intervention in Mexico was approved by the Secretary of Navy and in the next month, President Taft also signed off on the plan. However, an amended version was made that specifically recommended the "Seizure and temporary occupancy of Vera Cruz and Tampico by the naval forces of the United States", which was approved on February 13, 1913, by Acting Secretary of the Navy Winthrop, along with President Taft.

One year later, on [April 1914](#), naval forces seized and occupied Tampico and Vera Cruz. The American public was fed and continues to be fed that the Tampico invasion was a response to the Mexican federal forces for not apologizing to Marines who were detained because they landed in Tampico without permission. The excuse given for the invasion of Vera Cruz was to prevent a German ship violating the Monroe Doctrine by delivering military supplies purchased by the Mexican government.

Then, in April 1914, a group of U.S. Marines landed at Tampico to pick up supplies and were arrested by Mexican officials. Although the marines were soon released, Admiral Henry Ti Mayo demanded that the Mexican government apologize formally and honor the American flag with a twenty-one gun salute. President Wilson, who had not been consulted, felt compelled to back Admiral Mayo as a representative of the government. When Mexico's president, Victoriano Huerta, refused to salute the flag, Wilson ordered the fleet to Veracruz (the marines seized the city) and the army to march overland from Texas to join it.

The invasions had been pre-planned and pre-authorized. The invocation of the Monroe Doctrine was a prepared lie: the munitions carried by the German ship had been loaded in New York City. To provide some insight into on the state of affairs, in 1914, [Frederick Starr](#) notes:

It is impossible for us to march to Mexico City, seize it, appoint a provisional president, and withdraw. There is no use of trying to deceive ourselves and others. If we go to Mexico, we must occupy the whole republic. There is no possible alternative. To enter Mexico and occupy will take time, money and frightful toll of human life. It would be unjust aggression. Its final result would involve land grabbing. We would either hold the whole of the republic, or we would cut off the northern states and add them to our area. There are of course plenty who look upon this as our manifest destiny. It is unfortunate if it should prove manifest destiny, because it would spell our ruin.

To add Mexico to our republic or to add the northern tier of states would be infinitely bad for us. It would be the greatest of misfortunes for Mexico and the Mexicans. We are fond of talking of assimilation. We have never assimilated anything. We have not assimilated Arizona and New Mexico after sixty-five years of ownership. We have not assimilated the millions of negroes in the South. We have not assimilated the Filipino, nor the Hawaiian, nor the Puerto Rican. We have not only not assimilated them, we are nationally today the weaker for their presence.

The war for the conquest of Mexico has been much discussed. Some claim that it would require 600,000 soldiers and a period of ten years; others claim that it could be done with 150,000 men and two years' time. This is not the actual question, but only selfish and commercial features of the problem. It is not the size of the army, nor the expense, nor the time involved which are significant. Far more important is the fact that such a war of conquest is unjust in itself. There is nothing in the conditions of the moment to excuse it. The price of war is not a mere question of dollars and time, — it is more seriously a question of blood and brutalizing. A nation which issues from a war of conquest against a smaller, poorer nation suffers far more than it inflicts. Its ideals, its character, its life are lowered. How heavily has our nation paid for its inglorious war with Spain. Not only did it cost money and time and blood. Its toll of disease and weakened moral fiber is a far more serious matter; and by it we lost those ideals for which our nation stood through more than a century of independent life. This last was the heaviest part of the price.

Between 1918 and 1939 – the US had developed and approved as official national policy three major war plans: a War Plan ORANGE against Japan, [War Plan GREEN](#) against Mexico, and a [War Plan RED](#) against Canada.

The plan for invading Mexico shows the US attitude towards Mexico with a focus on their oil. The plan states:

“The oil fields of Tampico and Tuxpan are important not only to the commerce of the United States and of the world, but to that of Mexico... The fields are largely owned by American and British interests and are susceptible to great damage by the Mexicans. It is therefore important to seize these fields at once...”.

“The period of active operations will be short, as compared to the period of guerilla operations. The early disbandment of temporary [U.S.] troops is highly desirable. It is the testimony of all well acquainted with Mexican character that any number of Mexicans can be hired to fight against anyone and for any one who will regularly pay and feed them. The Mexican soldier will be cheaper and more efficient against banditry than the American and the cost can be more easily charged against the Mexican government”.

“In addition, an Army can be established that will not be anti-American and which may, for many years in the future, exercise on the Mexican government an influence favorable to the United States”.

George Orwell once wrote, “He who controls the present, controls the past. He who controls the past, controls the future.” Many do not realize how history can influence our thinking and our behavior, especially political behavior. Since we identify ourselves through history, many governments find it important to control school history curriculums and textbooks. Knowing that psychological methods are used overtly to alter what is known about our history, it does provide insight as to the psychological development of certain individuals or groups of people. The relation between the US and Mexico has never been stable, especially between it comes to migration. In the US history books, Mexico is always displayed as the villain and the reasons for westward expansion have always been romanticized.

Many may now consider this as a moot point since Mexico has entered into a trade agreement, but a conquest does not have to be accomplished through conventional warfare. Three years before NAFTA took effect, [José Luis Calva](#) of the National University of Mexico, predicted:

“If the governments and legislatures of the three countries agree to liberalize trade in agricultural goods, U.S. citizens should be prepared to receive some 15 million Mexican migrants. The Border Patrol will be unable to detain them, and even a new iron curtain, rising on the border at a moment when the Cold War has given way to economic warfare among nations, will buckle under the weight of millions of Mexicans thrown off their lands by free trade.”

The essence of the American empire is not territorial control but wresting of economic control from another country and dominating that nation economically. How long will this “peaceful conquest” of Mexico continue to go unnoticed?

The original source of this article is scoop.epluribusmedia.org
Copyright © Global Research, scoop.epluribusmedia.org, 2006

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **Global Research**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca