Mondialisation.ca
Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation

Are Americans Too Insouciant To Survive?

Par Dr. Paul Craig Roberts
Mondialisation.ca, 12 février 2016

Région : USA
Thème: Media Disinformation
Analyses: U.S. Elections

When one looks at the deplorable state of the world, one cannot help but wonder at the insouciance of the American people. Where are they? Do they exist or are they a myth? Have they been put to sleep by an evil demon? Are they so lost in The Matrix that they cannot get out?

Ever since Clinton's second term the US has been consistently acting internationally and domestically as a criminal, disregarding its own laws, international laws, the sovereignty of other countries, and the US Constitution. A worse criminal government has never existed. Yet, Americans remain subservient to the criminals that they have placed in power over themselves.

According to polls, Hillary Clinton and Senator Bernie Sanders are splitting the Democratic vote 50-50 as preferred Democratic presidential candidate. This is extraordinary.

Hillary Clinton represents the interests of Wall Street and the mega-banks, the Israel Lobby, and the interests of the military/security complex. These interests are totally opposed to the interests of the American people.

In his book, *What's the Matter with Kansas*, Thomas Frank raised the question of why Americans vote against their own interests? Why do

Americans go to the voting both and do themselves in?

Whether you agree with Thomas Frank's answer or not, Americans do, on a regular basis, harm themselves by voting for people who are agents of vested interests diametrically opposed to the interests of American citizens.

How is it possible, if Democrats are informed people, that half of them prefer Hillary Clinton? Between February 2001 and May 2015 Bill and Hillary collected $153 million in speaking fees. The fees averaged $210,795 per speech.

I can remember when Bill and Hillary were in public office when their speeches were free. No one wanted to listen to them when the speeches were free. Clearly, Bill is being paid off for his past services to the powerful interest groups that control the United States, and Hillary is being paid off for her future service to the same groups.

How then is it possible that half of Democrats would prefer Hillary? Is it because she is a woman and women want a woman president more than they want their civil liberties, peace, and employment for themselves, their spouses and their children?

Or is it because, given the presstitute character of the American media, the people haven't a clue?

If you vote for Hillary, you are voting for someone who has been paid off to the tune of $153 million by powerful vested interests who have no concern whatsoever for your interests. In addition, Hillary has the necessary campaign funds from the powerful interest groups for her presidential nomination campaign. As if this isn't damning enough, Hugh Wharton writes that the National Democratic Committee is in league with Hillary to steal, if necessary, the nomination from Sanders and the voters.

In contrast, the interest groups who rule America are not contributing to Sanders.

Therefore, the choice of Sanders is obvious, but 50% of Democrats are too braindead to see it.

Although Hillary is a substantial threat to America, the threat of nuclear war is much greater, and the Democratic Obama regime in the hands of neoconservatives has just greatly amplified the threat of nuclear war.

The United States government, or perhaps we should say the exploiter and deceiver of the American people, has announced a three-fold increase in its military presence on Russia's borders. The excuse for this great boost in the profits and power of the US military-security complex is "Russian aggression."

But there is no sign of this aggression. So Washington and its servile presstitutes in the Western media make it up. They proclaim a lie.

"Russia invaded Ukraine" proclaims the propaganda. No mention is made of Washington's coup in Ukraine that overthrew a democratically elected government and began a war against the Russian populations of eastern and southern Ukraine, former provinces of Russia added to the Ukrainian Soviet Republic by Soviet leaders. In the presstitute media, no mention is made of Washington's intention of seizing Russia's only warm water port in Crimea on the Black Sea.

Having created a nonexistant Russian invasion in place of the real US coup in Ukraine in the minds of the indoctrinated Americans, Washington now claims that Russia is going to invade the Baltics and Poland. Nothing could be further from the truth, but this lie from the Obama regime now determines that the US military presence on Russia's borders will increase three-fold.

The escalation of the US/NATO threat on Russia's borders forces a Russian response. Considering that the Russophobic governments in Poland and the Baltic States have unstable judgement, military buildups bring risks of miscalculations.

There is a limit to the level of threat that the Russian government can tolerate. The impotent Obama is in the firm grip of the neoconservatives and the military-security complex. The neoconservatives are motivated by their ideology of American world hegemony. The military-security complex is motivated by power and profit. These motives bring the United States and its vassals into conflict with Russia's (and China's) sovereign existence.

Within the councils of American foreign policy there is not sufficient weight to counter the

neoconservative drive to war with Russia and China. In conventional war, the US is not a military match for the Russian/Chinese strategic alliance. Therefore, the war would be nuclear. The power of hydrogen bombs is immensely more powerful that the atomic bombs that the US dropped on Japan. Nuclear war means the end of life on earth.

Americans can know that democracy has failed them, because there is no check on the neoconservatives' ability to foment war with Russia and China.

The neocons control the press, and the press portrays Russia as "an existential threat to the United States." Once this fiction is drilled into the brains of Americans, it is child's play for propagandists to create endless fears that deplete taxpayers of income in order to create profits for the military-security complex by relaunching the Cold War and an armaments race.

That is what is currently going on. The inability of Americans to realize that they are being taken into a conflict that benefits only the profits and power of the military-security complex and the ideology of a small group of crazies demonstrates the impotence of American democracy.

Universities and think tanks are replete with ambitious people who, chasing grants and influence, fuel the Russophobic hysteria. For example, on February 9 the Washington Post published an article by Michael Ignatieff, the Edward R. Murrow professor at Harvard University's Kennedy School, and Leon Wieseltier, the Isaiah Berlin Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington. The article is a complete misrepresentation of the facts in Syria and called for US measures that would result in military conflict with Russia. It was irresponsible for the Washington Post to publish the article, but the decision is consistent with the Post's presstitute nature.

The propaganda line maintained by the US government, the neoconservatives, the military/security complex, the presstitutes, and fiction-writers such as Ignatieff and Wieseltier is that Russia is not bombing the Islamic State jihadists who are attempting to overthrow the Syrian government in order to establish a jihadish state that would threaten the Middle East, Iran, and Russia herself. The official line is that the Russians are bombing the democratic "rebels" who are trying to overthrow an alleged "brutal Syrian dictator." The conflict that the US government started by sending ISIS to Syria to overthrow the Syrian government is blamed on the Russian and Syrian governments.

Ignatieff and Wieseltier say that the US has put its "moral standing" at risk by permitting the Russians to bomb and to starve innocent women and children, as if the US had any moral standing after destroying seven countries so far in the 21st century, producing millions of dead and displaced persons, many of whom are now overrunning Europe as refugees from Washington's wars.

The recently retired head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Michael Flynn, has said that the Obama regime made a "willful decision" to support ISIS and use ISIS against the Assad government in Syria. That the violence in Syria originated in a US/ISIS conspiracy against Syria is ignored by Ignatieff and Wieseltier. Instead, they blame Russia despite the fact that it is Russia's air support for the Syrian Army that has rolled back ISIS.

Where were Ignatieff and Wieseltier when Washington and its vassals destroyed Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Afghanistan, Yemen, much of Pakistan, overthrew the first democratically elected

government in Egypt, overthrew the government in Ukraine and started a war against the Russian population, and supplied Israel with the weapons and money to steal Palestine from the Palestinians? Where were they when Clinton destroyed Yugoslavia and Serbia? Where are they when ISIS murders Syrians and eats the livers of its executed victims?

It would be interesting to know who financed the professorship in Edward R. Murrow's name and the fellowship in Isiah Berlin's name and how these positions came to be staffed with their current occupants.

Reagan and Gorbachev brought the Cold War to an end. The George H.W. Bush administration supported the end of the Cold War and gave further guarantees to Russia. But Clinton attacked Serbia, a Russian ally and broke the agreement that NATO would not expand into Eastern Europe to Russia's border. When the neoconservatives' plans to invade Syria and to attack Iran were frustrated by Russian diplomacy, the neocons turned on Russia with fury.

In 1961 President Eisenhower warned the American people of the threat posed by the military-security complex. That was 55 years ago. This complex is so strong today that it is able to divert massive taxpayer resources to its coffers while the living standard and economic prospects of the American people decline.

The military/security complex requires an enemy. When the Cold War ended, the "Muslim Threat" was created. This "threat" has now been superceded by the "Russian Threat," which is much more useful in keeping Europe in line and in scaring people with prospective invasions and nuclear attacks that are far beyond the power and reach of jihadists.

Superpower America required a more dangerous enemy than a few lightly armed jihadists, so the "Russian threat" was created. To drive home the threat, Russia and her president are constantly demonized. The conclusion is unavoidable that the insouciant American people are being prepared for war.

Paul Craig Roberts has had careers in scholarship and academia, journalism, public service, and business. He is chairman of The Institute for Political Economy.

La source originale de cet article est Mondialisation.ca
Copyright © Dr. Paul Craig Roberts, Mondialisation.ca, 2016

Articles Par : Dr. Paul Craig Roberts

A propos :

Paul Craig Roberts, former Assistant Secretary of the US Treasury and Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal, has held numerous university appointments. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research. Dr. Roberts can be reached at http://paulcraigroberts.org

Avis de non-responsabilité : Les opinions exprimées dans cet article n'engagent que le ou les auteurs. Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation se dégage de toute responsabilité concernant le contenu de cet article et ne sera pas tenu responsable pour des erreurs ou informations incorrectes ou inexactes.

Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation (CRM) accorde la permission de reproduire la version intégrale ou des extraits d'articles du site Mondialisation.ca sur des sites de médias alternatifs. La source de l'article, l'adresse url ainsi qu'un hyperlien vers l'article original du CRM doivent être indiqués. Une note de droit d'auteur (copyright) doit également être indiquée.

Pour publier des articles de Mondialisation.ca en format papier ou autre, y compris les sites Internet commerciaux, contactez: media@globalresearch.ca

Mondialisation.ca contient du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur, dont le détenteur n'a pas toujours autorisé l'utilisation. Nous mettons ce matériel à la disposition de nos lecteurs en vertu du principe "d'utilisation équitable", dans le but d'améliorer la compréhension des enjeux politiques, économiques et sociaux. Tout le matériel mis en ligne sur ce site est à but non lucratif. Il est mis à la disposition de tous ceux qui s'y intéressent dans le but de faire de la recherche ainsi qu'à des fins éducatives. Si vous désirez utiliser du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur pour des raisons autres que "l'utilisation équitable", vous devez demander la permission au détenteur du droit d'auteur.

Contact média: media@globalresearch.ca