

NOT IN MY NAME...

UKRAINE AND THE EMPIRE OF LIES

Without an ordered memory, civilization is impossible

John Ralston Saul, *Voltaire's Bastards*

The great enemy of communication is the illusion of it

William H. Whyte, in *Fortune Magazine* 1950

Introduction	1
1. Russia's Special Military Operation in Ukraine	4
2. Historical background	11
The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	12
WWII and the rise of Ukrainian ultra-nationalism	15
The Cold War and the rise of neo-conservative warmongering	17
Incorporating Ukraine into the American Empire	21
Post-Soviet Ukraine	23
Post-Maidan Ukrainian “democracy”	25
3. The elite, their media and the adulteration of the law	31
Law and justice <i>vs</i> legislation and policing	34
Intelligence <i>vs</i> rationality	35
Personal and corporate liability	38
4. The Empire of Lies	39
Corona and the global coordination of media propaganda	40
The lies that killed Ukraine	43
Lying as policy	46
5. Concluding remarks	51
Appendices	53
Appendix 1 (Oligarchy)	53
Appendix 2 (Roosevelt; the military-industrial complex)	56
Appendix 3 (Ethnic Ukrainians)	58
Appendix 4 (NordStream 2)	58
Appendix 5 (The Protocols of the Elders of Zion)	59
Appendix 6 (Bretton Woods)	61
Appendix 7 (Philanthropic foundations)	62
Appendix 8 (International courts)	62
Appendix 9 (Ursula von der Leyen, Young Global Leaders)	64
Appendix 10 (Gladio, the culture of fear)	64
Appendix 11 (Russia-hating Britain)	66
Appendix 12 (Sanctions, BRICS)	66
Appendix 13 (Georgia, FARA)	68
Appendix 14 (Plato)	68
Appendix 15 (The corona-pandemic, 2020-2022)	69
Appendix 16 (Syria)	70
Appendix 17 (Watergate scandal)	72

INTRODUCTION

The West's pouring money and weapons into the notoriously corrupt state of Ukraine is bad enough; its continual edging toward war with Russia and possibly a third World War is infinitely worse—except of course for the ultimate recipients of that largess: a coterie of politicians and generals in Ukraine, and on a far larger scale, the West's military-industrial complex.

Well, not in my name! I am far too old not to recognize persistent propaganda about “demon Putin¹, the new Hitler²” or about “the heroic struggle of Ukraine for our democracy against autocracy” for the absurd nonsense it is, even though it is staring me in the face in every edition of the daily papers and in countless documentaries on television. As the American journalist H.L. Mencken noted, “A newspaper is a device for making the ignorant more ignorant and the crazy crazier.”³ Television only exacerbates the problem—after all, it is a “medium, because it is neither rare nor well done” (comedian Fred Allen, 1894-1956). Newspapers and television are perfect propaganda vehicles for shaping the opinions of the convenience junkies that so many Westerners have become. Why go to the trouble of trying to produce your own considered opinion about a topic in the news, when you can get one that is ready-made and apparently shared by seemingly countless experts? (“Do you want some caviar? – What is caviar? – It's a delicacy, sturgeon eggs. – Fine, I'll have two; sunny-side up, please.”)

For all their pretensions as the leaders of “representative democracies”, I did not authorize any Belgian or European politicians to reduce Europe to little more than a tourist destination, littered with military bases, on the Atlantic coast of the Eurasian continent. Bear in mind that Russia is essentially a European country that stretches from Saint Petersburg on the Baltic Sea to Vladivostok on the western coast of the Pacific Ocean. By joining in the American economic sanctions war against Russia, the European Union cut itself (and its population) off from that vast hinterland, rich in natural resources of all kinds. I certainly did not authorize any of the current bunch of “really, really stupid”⁴ European politicians who claim to represent me to do “all it takes, for as long as it takes” to satisfy the lust of the corporate elite of

¹ Shortly after his inauguration, in January 2021, US President Biden called Putin “a killer without a soul” (edition.cnn.com/2021/03/18/europe/biden-putin-killer-comment-russia-reaction-intl/index.html). Previously he had accused his predecessor Donald Trump of lacking “diplomatic skills”. In an article in the Washington Post (March 6th, 2014, after the Maidan coup in Kiev), Henry Kissinger had stated: “For the West, the demonization of Vladimir Putin is not a policy: it is an alibi for the absence of one” – which, I would add, is what most policies are nowadays. For an assessment of Putin's place in Russian history, see e.g., Vladimir Brovkin, *From Vladimir Lenin to Vladimir Putin – Russia 1913-2023 in Search of Its Identity* (2023).

² E.g., youtube.com/live/bdYwX8AwD4A (Canadian shill for the Western oligarchy Diane Francis: “Hitler is the new Hitler”); admin.epp.eu/files/uploads/2024/05/Ursula-von-der-Leyen-Speech-at-European-Economic-Congress-Katowice-7-May-2024.pdf: “Putin wants a return of empires and authoritarians ruling our continent and its people. And this is not an imagined or theoretical threat – it is an open and stated aim” (EU Commission's Ursula von der Leyen in Katowice, May 2024.) Evidence for this outrageous claim? None—but Biden said it, so it must be true.

³ H.L. Mencken, *A Mencken Chrestomathy* (1949, reprint 1967), p.625

⁴ Internationally renowned policy advisor and economist Jeffrey Sachs's assessment of the likes of Ursula von der Leyen, Josep Borrell, Charles Michel, Jens Stoltenberg, Emmanuel Macron, Rishi Sunak, Annalena Baerbock, and Estonia's hysterical Kaja Kallas (the mouse that roared “Russia must be destroyed”): see youtube.com/watch?v=c-gIFpYWPuA&t=1192s

fabulously wealthy Western oligarchs⁵ for complete control of the Earth's natural resources. That – not Ukrainian independence or democracy – is ultimately what the war in Ukraine is all about: control of all reserves of oil, coal, gas, base and rare metals, and all fertile lands on the planet,⁶ even if it means getting rid of all principles of morality and international law, also democracy and free trade. In the now distant past, the opportunistic, centrifugal tendencies of democracy and trade, were hemmed in by commitments and moral obligations that precede choice: to family, community, homeland, ancestors and descendants, and beyond these, to God or some equivalent set of transcendent truths. But the “progressive West” has now completely repudiated these ancient obligations and commitments, thereby destroying any remaining link between people's private and public lives.⁷ Instead, the West's oligarchy demands unconditional commitment to its programme of “unipolar hegemony” – a concept that is wholly predicated on overwhelming, effectively irresistible force. Adulation of force, not reason, is now the West's official religion.

On April 9th 2024, during a press conference in Washington, British Minister of Foreign Affairs David Cameron congratulated his American host, Secretary of State Anthony Blinken, saying, “I argue that [the war in Ukraine] is extremely good value for money for the United States and for others. For about five or 10% of your defence budget almost half of Russia's pre-war military equipment has been destroyed, without the loss of a single American life. This is an investment in US security.”⁸ Of course, ‘US security’ is a euphemism for ‘US hegemony’. Is war-profiteering the bottom line of the West's Ukraine policy? Well, again, not in my name: The Dracula philosophy “More blood!” is not for me, even if it is made to rhyme with “More loot!”⁹

Already more than fifty years ago, the American economist and outstanding authority on international economics, Michael Hudson, had called attention to the policy he called ‘American super imperialism’¹⁰. At the time, the US was the undisputed “factory of the world”, as its industries had escaped the ravages of the Second World War. The dollar was the reserve currency of most industrial and trading nations. However, to meet the needs of its industries, the US needed control of far more natural resources (including human labour) than it actually had on its own soil. It also needed to make sure that it retained its virtual monopoly on global manufacturing by compelling other nations “to buy American” or at least to accept direct American capital investment (which gives American corporations ownership and the right to appropriate the profits of other nations' production capabilities). Imposing its doctrine of technological and industrial “intellectual property rights”, the US attempted to generate a

⁵ The likes of Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, Michael Bloomberg, David Rockefeller, Mark Zuckerberg, George Soros, Jamie Dimon, Larry Fink, the Koch brothers and countless less known global movers and shakers – see Appendix 1 (Oligarchy)

⁶ See Glenn Diesen, *The Ukrainian War and the Eurasian World Order* (2024)

⁷ See below, page 26

⁸ unherd.com/newsroom/david-cameron-ukraine-war-good-value-for-money-us/ That almost half of Russia's pre-war military equipment has been destroyed is, of course, a propagandistic fantasy.

⁹ lewrockwell.com/2024/06/no_author/ukraine-is-a-gold-mine-us-senator/

¹⁰ Michael Hudson, *Super Imperialism – The Origin and Fundamentals of U.S. World Dominance* (1972, revised edition 2003, third edition, *Super Imperialism – The strategy of American Empire*, 2021); also *Killing the Host: How financial parasites and debt bondage destroy the global economy* (2015). The military-industrial complex had become the centrepiece of the American economy under Franklin D. Roosevelt (r.1933-1945), see Appendix 2 (Roosevelt; the military-industrial complex)

stream of income from “royalties” and “licence fees” on almost all advanced technologies in use anywhere in the world. Its dollar hegemony allowed the US to control international flows of trade and credit, to build up its redoubtable military-industrial complex to police its trade agreements to the advantage of American corporations, and to exclude non-compliant nations (the Soviet Union/Russia, Communist China/the People's Republic of China, later Democratic/Islamic Iran) from meaningful participation in the US-dominated “global market”. For the American media, a country's non-compliance with American designs is enough to include it in a fictional “Axis of Evil”. In this text, I shall focus on the US's relations with Russia, because they directly involve the future of Europe.

The policy of super-imperialism was never wholly successful. It could not avoid the trap of old-style colonizing imperialism-by-military-occupation: In the longer run, when military occupation and exploitation begin to give way to trade and democratic participation – the two most significant centrifugal forces in the world – then dependence on the periphery weakens the imperial centre. This is especially true, if a major source of income for the centre is the sale of advanced weaponry to the periphery—even today, the US and its European vassals still are the primary weapons factories of the world. However, as other nations began to develop their own industrial base and to resent the overbearing “ugly Americans”¹¹ and their disdain for international law, the overt or covert role of military power in the American foreign policy mix had to increase in order to defeat opponents before they would gain sufficient strength to openly defy American dictates. Still, with its impressive fleets of aircraft carriers, submarines and strategic bombers, all armed with nuclear weapons, American military hegemony seemed assured. No place on Earth, no trade route over the seas was out of range of American firepower. Moreover, the US counted on the examples of post-WWII Germany and Japan to spread the message “The best thing that can happen to your country is being defeated by the US”.¹²

Following the disappearance of the Soviet Union in 1991, the US tried to get access “on the cheap” to Russia's natural resources by turning the country into just another European vassal. However, from 1999 onward, the second Russian President, Vladimir Putin, had achieved remarkable success in restoring his country after the chaos it had descended into under his predecessor, Boris Yeltsin (r.1991-1999). Moreover, Putin had done so without selling out his country to Western corporations, thereby denying them control of Russia's vast stocks of natural resources. For the Americans, such defiance of the imperatives of super imperialism required a firm response – if not yet a direct war with Russia then a war-by-proxy on Russia's doorsteps. All they needed was an excuse. They got it in February 2022.

¹¹ The Ugly American is the title of a 1958 novel by Eugene Burdick and William Lederer about the ineptness of American diplomats in Southeast Asia. Hugely popular, it motivated President J.F. Kennedy to attempt to restore America's international prestige (e.g., by organizing a Peace Corps of idealistic youths). See also Graham Greene's *The Quiet American* (1955) and the movies it inspired (1958, with Audie Murphy and Michael Redgrave; 2002, with Brendan Fraser and Michael Caine); and strategic-culture.su/news/2024/06/18/usaid-velvet-glove-for-fist-us-global-power/

¹² This is the theme of Leonard Wibberley's delightful satire *The Mouse that Roared* (1955), and the eponymous film (1959, with Peter Sellers)

1. RUSSIA'S SPECIAL MILITARY OPERATION IN UKRAINE

On the 24th of February 2022, the Russian Federation began its “special military operation” (SMO) in Ukraine. Earlier in the month, the American media, informed by contacts in the Biden administration and its extensive national security complex, had predicted, “Putin will invade Ukraine on the 16th of February”. They got the date wrong. More importantly, they got the nature of the SMO wrong.¹³ Russian President Vladimir Putin had defined the aims of the SMO as “demilitarisation and de-Nazification of Ukraine, and putting an end to the eight-year long war waged by the regime in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, against the Russian-speaking people of the Donbas region in Ukraine”. Kiev had started its war against the Donbas provinces (Lugansk and Donetsk)¹⁴ in February 2014 to squash their opposition to the Maidan coup of February 2014. At that time, protests on Maidan Square in Kiev led to a sudden regime change in Ukraine. The change ended Ukraine's traditional status as a neutral country having good relations with both Russia and Western Europe. In protest, the Donbas provinces, which border on Russia, revolted and some units of the Ukrainian Army defected to defend the people of Lugansk and Donetsk against the new regime in Kiev.

By February 2022, Kiev's nearly continuous shelling, sometimes with cluster bombs¹⁵, of the Donbas, Donetsk city in particular, had killed already at least 14,000 people, more than 10,000 of them civilians. The shelling continues to this day. On at least one occasion, in August 2022, the centre of Donetsk was seeded with “petal mines” – small, butterfly-shaped mines that look like toys that children would be likely to pick up.¹⁶ On other occasions, the Ukrainian army used the double-tap tactic of bombing a location and then bombing it again half an hour later, when rescue workers have arrived on the scene. Such incidents were not reported in the Western media, although there was video evidence from local reports in English on alternative media. Such reports were invariably labelled ‘Russian propaganda’.¹⁷

The SMO was not an invasion of, or an attack on, Ukraine. Russia continued to supply oil and gas to the country, which acted as a major transit route for supplying energy to Western Europe. Moreover, Putin kept referring to the ethnic¹⁸ Ukrainians as brothers, not enemies. The reference left out the few traditionally Roman Catholic western parts of Ukraine where neither Ukrainian nor Russian was spoken before the rise of the Soviet Union in the wake of WWI (the First World War, 1914-1918). Putin is often quoted as saying that

¹³ Michael Hudson has called the SMO a “preemptive defense of the two Eastern Ukrainian provinces” against “a blitzkrieg Western Ukrainian attack organized by U.S. advisors and armed by NATO” (michael-hudson.com/2022/04/the-dollar-devours-the-euro/)

¹⁴ Western media coverage of the war in Donbas was slight. One had to turn to local social media to appreciate its impact on the people living in the region

¹⁵ nytimes.com/2014/10/21/world/ukraine-used-cluster-bombs-report-charges.html

¹⁶ See observers.france24.com/en/europe/20220817-ukraine-russia-donetsk-petal-butterfly-antipersonnel-mines;

¹⁷ Wikipedia has a page “Russian information war against Ukraine”; of course, it has no page “Western|American|British|NATO|EU information war against Russia”; it lauds the openly anti-Russian Bellingcat group, which claims to practice “open source journalism” (or, if you prefer, open source propaganda): selective, one-sided collages of texts, images, videos it finds on social-media. It is particularly adept at securing funding, endorsements and awards from Western media and political and military intelligence establishments (e.g., the Dutch “National Lottery”, NATO's Atlantic Council, the CIA).

¹⁸ I use the term ‘ethnic’ for convenience only, as there is neither a distinct original Russian nor a distinct original Ukrainian ethnicity – see Appendix 3 (Ethnic Ukrainians)

the dissolution of the Soviet Union (in 1991) was a mistake, but the quotes usually leave out that he added that one must be out of one's mind, if one believes that the Soviet Union could or should be restored. For Putin, the dissolution of the Soviet Union had been a mistake because it disturbed the balance of power, which had been essential to the world's long "Cold-War peace" after WWII (the Second World War, 1940-0945); also, because it left the largely autonomous Russian republics¹⁹ along the south-eastern border of the Russian Federation (in particular in the Northern Caucasus) hard to defend against intrusions. Russia shares borders with more countries than any other state (16 vs 2 for the US).²⁰ Accordingly, it focuses on diplomacy, not war. None of this mattered to Western blockheads posing as "public intellectuals". They could forgive Germany for having been Hitler's Third Reich, which was defeated by the Soviets; they could not forgive Russia for having been the Soviet Union, which was dissolved by its own people.

In any case, Putin's great concern was, and is, that modern Ukraine, a product of Soviet times, would become a vassal state of the US and – as all American vassal states are – a military base and tool for securing American hegemony. Still, he did not want war with Ukraine. The size of the Russian forces that crossed the Ukrainian border on the 24th of February 2022, less than 200,000 soldiers²¹, was not nearly enough to conduct an invasion, let alone an occupation of the vast territory of the by then heavily militarized Ukraine with an at least 400,000 men strong army.²² Moreover, the manner in which they were deployed – e.g., long lines of tanks, with no protection of their flanks and no air support – defied almost every rule in the manuals of warfare. In fact, with the SMO, Moscow was sending a clear message to Kiev: "If you want to avoid a war, now is the time to negotiate about a solution to the deteriorating security situation of the Russian-speaking Ukrainians and the accelerating radicalization and militarization of Ukraine at the behest of the United States of America." For Putin, those developments had gone too far. They had crossed the red lines that he had laid down already in 2007²³ and insisted on ever since – only to be ignored by his "American partners"²⁴.

The Russian stratagem seemed to work. Kiev panicked and the Ukrainian President, Volodymyr Zelensky agreed to negotiations with Russia. Mediated by the Israeli Prime Minister, Naftali Bennett, they were to be held in Istanbul,

¹⁹ In some respects, the republics of the Russian Federation have more autonomy from Moscow than the American states have from Washington, D.C. or EU states from Brussels. In other respects, they have less autonomy. "Federation" comes in many forms and shapes.

²⁰ Total land-border length of Russia: ca 22,467 km (ca 12,002 for US)

²¹ In 1941, Nazi Germany deployed 200,000 soldiers to take just one fortified military base in Sevastopol (on Crimea). It is a generally accepted rule of thumb that a successful attempt to invade and conquer requires a force that is roughly three times as numerous as the defending force is. By that rule, Russia would have had to deploy more than a million troops, if it had the intention to invade and occupy Ukraine.

²² At the time, the US was already training Ukrainian ultranationalist militias to fight the Russians (see [yahoo.com/news/cia-trained-ukrainian-paramilitaries-may-take-central-role-if-russia-invades-185258008.html](https://www.yahoo.com/news/cia-trained-ukrainian-paramilitaries-may-take-central-role-if-russia-invades-185258008.html): "January 13th, 2022 – One person familiar with the program [of training Ukrainian paramilitary forces] put it more bluntly. 'The United States is training an insurgency,' said a former CIA official, adding that the program has taught the Ukrainians how 'to kill Russians'.")

²³ Putin's February 10th speech at the 2007 Munich Conference on Security in Europe: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hQ58Yv6kP44>

²⁴ Putin, who had always sought good political and economic relations with the West, even to the point of considering Russian membership in NATO, would cease to use the term 'Western partners' in 2022, when he finally had to admit that good relations with Russia were not on the American agenda.

Turkey. Accordingly, the Russian troops stopped their advances, outside the Donbas and Crimea. They had accomplished their mission—or so Moscow thought. Whether the Russian General Staff agreed with this assessment, I have no way of knowing. It took Putin some time to come round to the Western view that the conflict would be decided on the battlefield, not by diplomacy.

While preparations for the meetings in Turkey were in progress, the Biden administration in Washington decided to step up America's long-standing military and financial support to the rabidly anti-Russian, post-Maidan regime in Kiev and to order NATO to play an active role in an undeclared war on Russia. The United Kingdom, the most heavily militarized European NATO member, was to spearhead Operation Ukraine. Accordingly, on April 9th 2022, Boris Johnson, the British prime minister, flew to Kiev²⁵ and promised Zelensky unlimited military and financial support from NATO countries on the condition that Kiev fight the Russians to the end – as observers noted, “to the last Ukrainian”²⁶. Boris Johnson's message to the leaders in Kiev was unambiguous: “Sacrifice your country, its population and economic infrastructure, and we'll make you stupendously rich.” It was an offer the opportunistic, money-grabbing Zelensky²⁷ and his entourage of former colleagues in the entertainment business, Ukrainian oligarchs and ultranationalist militia leaders in Kiev could not refuse. They were prepared to suspend whatever remained of the rule of law and democracy, and to sell the entire population of Ukraine as cannon fodder to their Western allies. For the latter, the Ukraine crisis was the ultimate opportunity to bring about regime change in Moscow (“Get rid of Putin”) and turn Russia into yet another vassal state of Washington. The Western media chose not to mention that internal Russian opposition to Putin came mostly from those who reproached him for being “too soft on the West”; and that “pro-West” opposition was virtually non-existent. In other words, the West's ultimate goal was not to bring an existing opposition party to power in Russia, but to impose a regime of Western stooges on the country (as it was in the process of doing in Ukraine by supporting Kiev's persecution of its substantial internal opposition).

A year later, in April 2023, Jens Stoltenberg, the Secretary-general of NATO, conceded that Ukraine was the scene of a war between NATO and Russia. This was meant to convince sceptical populations in the West that the rapidly increasing NATO involvement in the conflict was justified: “Russia is a threat to Western Europe”. This blatant lie was also an admission of the fact that, for NATO, Ukraine was but a tool, a weapon, to be used against Russia. It did not justify the refusal to negotiate with Russia—but NATO had never been meant to negotiate; its mission was to take orders from Washington. The war in Ukraine stood revealed as an undeclared war of the US and its European NATO lapdogs against Russia.

The West still hoped to achieve its aims without becoming an actual boots-on-the-ground belligerent, mainly by imposing extensive economic sanctions on Russia and whoever continued to trade with Russia in defiance of those

²⁵ [bbc.com/news/uk-61052643](https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-61052643)

²⁶ [cato.org/commentary/washington-will-fight-russia-last-ukrainian](https://www.cato.org/commentary/washington-will-fight-russia-last-ukrainian)

²⁷ According to a message on Telegram (22/2/2022, 12:28) by Illia Kyva, a Ukrainian opposition parliamentarian, Zelensky had amassed a personal fortune of more than a billion dollars (off-shore accounts and real estate abroad). It confirmed what had been known about Zelensky's finances since the publication of the Pandora Papers by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists in late 2021.

sanctions. It thought the operation would be a cinch, given that Russia's GDP was only about 4% of the GDP of the NATO countries and its defence budget about 7% of the defence budget of the entire NATO bloc. Of course, Russia's GDP consists mostly of the value of real-goods-producing industrial and agricultural activities, whereas Western GDP is mostly financial wealth (i.e. “wealth on paper”, from transactions in the financial and other service sectors, which do not produce but consume real – mostly imported – goods). On a purchasing-power-parity basis, Russia is the second largest (and growing) economy in Europe, after Germany (which is declining).²⁸

Acknowledging that its gambit of forcing Ukraine to the negotiation table had failed, Russia withdrew its troops from the area around Kiev to the eastern parts of the country – to regroup and reorganize for a long campaign of attrition to wear down the Ukrainian military and ultimately de-militarize Ukraine – a major goal of the SMO. The Western media reported this withdrawal as a Russian defeat, a sign that Russia was weak, and that Ukraine was bound to win. This utterly ridiculous interpretation of the events on the ground served to make the Western public believe that Western financial aid to Ukraine and sanctions against Russia were effective and justified, because they would quickly end the war. In reality, they would prolong it, cost hundreds of thousands of lives, and convince Moscow that negotiations with Kiev were useless, because Kiev stood revealed as a mere puppet of the US-led NATO bloc. To the Russians, only negotiations with Washington made sense—but Washington refused to negotiate. To make matters worse, US foreign policy was officially in the hands of a mentally less than acute gerontocrat (President Joe Biden), his Secretary of State (Anthony Blinken) and his National Security Advisor (Jacob Sullivan).²⁹ Also the EU's chief of diplomacy, the Spanish neo-socialist Josep Borrell, constantly called for escalating the war. It is likely that he was given that important post, because of his hatred of Russia.³⁰

Thus, from April 2022 onward, the West took the lead in escalating the conflict in Ukraine by adamantly refusing negotiations with Russia, imposing ever more “economic sanctions” on Russia and its allies, and delivering increasingly advanced weaponry (and the “advisors” to operate and maintain them) to the war hawks in Kiev. At the same time, it condoned Kiev's curtailments of basic civil rights (freedom of the press and association³¹, due process, the right to migrate³²) and cheered its attacks on Russian territory (e.g., on the city of Belgorod³³, where the attacks started already on April 1st 2022).

Moscow's aim was to demilitarize Ukraine, not to wage war on its population. Accordingly, the Russian army was extremely careful not to hit

²⁸ IMF report, April 2024: imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2024/04/16/world-economic-outlook-april-2024

²⁹ Blinken and Sullivan are typical “Washington insiders” with no real-world diplomatic achievements at all

³⁰ See politico.eu/article/josep-borrell-europe-undiplomatic-envoy/, an article dated June 30th 2019, nearly three years before the start of the SMO.

³¹ newsweek.com/zelensky-accused-censorship-over-ukraine-media-law-1770958 ; also npr.org/2022/07/08/1110577439/zelenskyy-has-consolidated-ukraines-tv-outlets-and-dissolved-rival-political-parties

³² See e.g., visitukraine.today/blog/4067/men-permanently-residing-abroad-can-no-longer-leave-ukraine-as-of-june-1-details

³³ In May 2024, the freely distributed English tabloid Metro.co.uk claimed that most missiles that hit Belgorod were fired by Russia itself. The message: Russia is a gang that can't shoot straight (except, of course, when it “deliberately targets” civilian infrastructure in Ukraine). See (metro.co.uk/2024/05/14/putin-keeps-bombing-citizens-mistake-20839607/)

civilian targets, until these had been turned into command posts of or zones occupied by Ukrainian divisions, or into “human shields” (e.g., in Mariupol, in the first year of the SMO). Russia's war of attrition against the Ukrainian military was unexpectedly helped by Kiev's policy of continually sending troops to defend indefensible positions on the frontline – a policy that cost tens of thousands of mainly Ukrainian lives and could only be rationalized as a means to get more financial and military aid from the West.³⁴ Meanwhile, Kiev continued to shell urban centres in Donetsk from its heavily fortified frontline – with no protest from Washington, Brussels or the Western media.

Policy makers in the West committed virtually all of their debt-ridden countries³⁵ to deliver billions of dollars and thousands of tons of weapons and ammunition to ensure that the notorious gangs of politicians and oligarchs in Kiev would use the Ukrainian population as cannon fodder in an effort to destabilize and bring about regime change in Russia – or at least, to enable the US to station nuclear and, perhaps, bioweapons³⁶ on the Russian-Ukrainian border, within a few minutes of flying time to Moscow.³⁷ Let us not forget that, twenty years earlier, in September 2002, British prime minister, Tony Blair, had enticed his country into participation in the second American onslaught on Iraq, in 2003, by spreading the lie that Saddam Hussein had “weapons of mass destruction that would be ready to be used (against British troops in Cyprus) within 45 minutes of being ordered to do so”. Let us also not forget that, sixty years earlier, in 1962, the “Cuban missile crisis” had erupted, when the Soviet leader, Nikita Khrushchev, began to send nuclear weapons to Cuba in response to the US's placement of nuclear weapons in Turkey. The Cuban missile crisis was quickly resolved in negotiations between Khrushchev and President John F. Kennedy over strong objections of the American military and their friends in the Congress.³⁸ It is widely believed that Kennedy was murdered, in 1963, for his willingness to negotiate rather than to deploy the full strength of America's formidable military arsenal. Khrushchev was luckier; he was deposed in 1964 but allowed to live out his natural life. He died in 1971.

³⁴ Eventually, the policy caused a rift between the politicians in Kiev and the military command which led to the dismissal of General Zaluzhny.

³⁵ At the end of April 2024, the US government debt alone stood at more than 34.4 *trillion* dollars, i.e. more than \$100,000 per capita (children included), and more than \$250,000 per taxpayer (usdebtclock.org/). This debt cannot be repaid. Inevitably, liquidation of the debt burden will wipe out either the debtor (the US Government) or the entire class of its domestic and foreign creditors – unless of course the big debtors and creditors figure out a way to make third parties pay. To ensure the latter outcome, the US is increasingly engaging in overt and covert wars to acquire control of natural resources all over the globe to appease friendly nations, which its policies threaten to bankrupt, if they do not go along with US adventurism.

³⁶ In June 2022, the US Department of Defense admitted US funding and other collaborative support for 46 “peaceful Ukrainian biological labs”—but what does the Pentagon mean by ‘peaceful’? ([defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3057517/fact-sheet-on-wmd-threat-reduction-efforts-with-ukraine-russia-and-other-former Soviet Republics](https://defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3057517/fact-sheet-on-wmd-threat-reduction-efforts-with-ukraine-russia-and-other-former-Soviet-Republics)) – see also lewrockwell.com/2022/03/no_author/kyev-regime-sought-to-scrub-evidence-of-pentagon-backed-biowarfare-programme-russian-mod-reveals/; greenwald.substack.com/p/victoria-nuland-ukraine-has-biological/; greatgameindia.com/list-americans-bioweapons-biolabs-ukraine/; globaltimes.cn/page/202203/1254330.shtml; and ibetimes.sg/hunter-bidens-emails-show-he-actually-helped-fund-bioweapons-lab-ukraine-63594

³⁷ At the same time, the political class in Finland was seeking NATO membership, which could mean American weapons of mass destruction ca 200km from Saint Petersburg.

³⁸ See M.J. Sherwin, *Gambling with Armageddon* (2020); pages 22–28 of Sherwin's book provide details of the action of Captain Vasily Alexandrovich Arkhipov that forestalled actual nuclear war in October 1962. Another Russian, Lt. Col. Stanislav Petrov, prevented nuclear war in 1983 (see globalresearch.ca/event-41-years-ago/5860515; also the film *The Man Who Saved the World*, 2014, with Petrov himself and Kevin Costner)

So far, the US is the only state that has actually used nuclear weapons against civilian targets (Hiroshima, Nagasaki, 1945). When President Obama abandoned the post-WWII commitment “to use nuclear weapons only in retaliation to a nuclear attack”, the US launched a new arms race in developing “tactical” nukes: “Biden has decided not to follow through on his 2020 pledge to declare that the sole purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter a nuclear attack against the United States or its allies. Instead, he approved a version of a policy from the Obama administration that leaves open the option to use nuclear weapons not only in retaliation to a nuclear attack, but also to respond to non-nuclear threats.”³⁹ Also in the post-WWII period, the US used chemical weapons on a large scale (“Agent Orange”, in Vietnam, 1961-1971; “white phosphorous ammunition”, in Fallujah, Iraq, 2004). In this, the US followed the British example set during the UK's campaign against Malaysian independence (1948-1960): use herbicides to defoliate entire regions, destroy food crops – never mind the health effects on the local populations. Earlier, Winston Churchill (then head of the War office), had launched a chemical-weapons program for use against rebel forces in Iraq, in 1920, but the program ran into severe technical difficulties. It is a matter of debate whether the weapons were actually used.⁴⁰

The USA may be – as Gore Vidal put it – the *Unites States of Amnesia*. Certainly, amnesia is an affliction that has become endemic also in the Western media. However, only a complete idiot will assume that Russian diplomacy is fooled by the West's addiction to constantly re-writing and sanitizing its long, long history of lies, atrocities and war crimes.

It is essential to remember that one word – one! – from the Kievan government would have eliminated the need for the SMO. That word was ‘neutrality’. If Ukraine had been prepared to guarantee continuation of its neutral military status then that would have satisfied Moscow. Diplomacy and trade would have remained the basic modes of interaction between the two countries. However, a neutral Ukraine was not what Washington wanted. On March 10th 1952, the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin, proposed to reunify East and West Germany under a policy of neutrality, with no conditions on economic policies and with guarantees for the rights of man (basic freedoms of speech, press, religious persuasion, political conviction and assembly, and regular free elections).⁴¹ The NATO powers declined the proposal. They wanted West-Germany inside the NATO bloc, to use it as a strategic asset in their ideological war on the Communist USSR. NATO was never about defending Western Europe against a military attack. From the start, it was an offensive alliance to extend Washington's sphere of influence.

Already during the eight years between the Maidan coup in Kiev in February 2014 and the start of the SMO in February 2022, Russia had consistently sought to resolve the Donbas question by diplomatic means (the so-called Minsk agreements of 2014 and 2015⁴²), only to be thwarted at each step by the policies of the regime in Kiev and its backers, the US and its

³⁹ armscontrol.org/act/2022-04/news/biden-policy-allows-first-use-nuclear-weapons :

⁴⁰ See Güneş Murat Tezcür & Doreen Horschig, “A conditional norm: chemical warfare from colonialism to contemporary civil wars”. *Third World Quarterly* (2020), 42 (2): 366–384.

⁴¹ See e.g., Rolf Steininger, *The German Question: the Stalin Note of 1952 and the Problem of Reunification* (1990).

⁴² Full text in Financial Times: ft.com/content/21b8f98e-b2a5-11e4-b234-00144feab7de

European vassals. Kiev chose to believe the West's promise of money and weapons and its assertion that Moscow was too weak to dare to oppose Ukrainian actions with anything more than words. So, the leaders in Kiev, misled by the West⁴³, thought neutrality was beneath their dignity. But Moscow was not nearly as weak the Western propaganda proclaimed it was. As independent military experts and experienced former diplomats and ambassadors⁴⁴ had warned from the start, Ukraine was embarking on the road to perdition. No matter which party would win the West's war against Russia, Ukraine would lose – and lose badly. By the end of 2022, Ukraine was a failed state, totally dependent on foreign financial and material support, which in turn depended on the most intensive campaign of war propaganda in the Western media since the two world wars of the twentieth century.

In December 2021, Russia had made a final proposal for comprehensive negotiations with the West to provide a stable “security architecture” in Europe, in the form of a *Treaty between the USA and the RF on security guarantees*.⁴⁵ Although Russia underlined the urgency of the proposal by organizing joint Russian-Belorussian military manoeuvres near the Ukrainian border, Washington ignored it just as it had ignored all previous Russian requests for a diplomatic settlement of the lingering security concerns in Europe. With their rejection of the proposal, the Americans knew full well that they would precipitate a Russian military operation against Ukraine. They did not care. American policy makers stuck to their conviction that Putin is all talk and no action; that Russia is not even a country but “a gas station masquerading as a country”⁴⁶ – an obvious and deliberate affront to the Russians' sense of pride in their own history as the saviours of the West, first, by stopping (as did the Hungarians) the Mongol assaults of the thirteenth century⁴⁷; then, in the fifteenth century, in saving Christianity, when the Ottoman Turks conquered Constantinople (the last capital of the Roman Empire and the seat of Christianity's main Patriarchate east of Rome); and ultimately in defeating Nazi Germany.

On February 7th 2022, more than two weeks before the start of the SMO, the

⁴³ Jacques Baud, *The Russian art of war: How the West led Ukraine to defeat* (2024)

⁴⁴ To name just a few of the best known: former UN Weapons inspector in Iraq, Scott Ritter; Lt. Colonel Daniel Davis; former advisor to the President Colonel Douglas MacGregor; CIA veterans Larry C. Johnson and Ray McGovern; Andrei Martyanov, an expert on Russian military affairs; Swiss Army Colonel Jacques Baud—just make sure to view their many articles and interviews on the WWW, not their biographies on Wikipedia (which is part of the Western mainstream media and a leader in the inane policy of labelling critics of oligarch-friendly US policy as “conspiracy theorists” or “Putin lovers”). However, reputable establishment academics (e.g., political scientist John Mearsheimer, economist Jeffrey Sachs ([brighteon.com/b8cf1a8d-ff17-4e79-b874-ad5f17ca715b](https://www.brighteon.com/b8cf1a8d-ff17-4e79-b874-ad5f17ca715b)), historian Emmanuel Todd (*La Défaite de l'Occident*, 2024) have also harshly criticized the West's Ukraine policy and castigated its leadership (from Biden and his neo-conservative entourage down to the foreign policy establishments of the UK and the EU) for its ineptness, arrogance and lack of understanding of geopolitical realities. Former US Congressman Ron Paul speaks of the Vietnamization of Ukraine: Ron Paul: ronpaulinstitute.org/the-vietnamization-of-ukraine/

⁴⁵ mid.ru/ru/foreign_policy/rso/nato/1790818, also on comw.org/pda/fulltext/Russian-Dec-2021-Draft-Treaty-on-security-issues.pdf; Moscow was well aware that negotiations with the European Union were useless, because the EU had become a supine lackey of the US in military geopolitical affairs

⁴⁶ US Senator John McCain, after a visit to post-Maidan Ukraine in 2014

⁴⁷ The Mongol invasion was the last attack on Russia from the East. All later assaults came from Western empire builders (Napoleon I, Adolf Hitler, and now the American policy establishment, using NATO and the EU as vehicles of aggression)

Biden White House announced that the NordStream 2 pipeline (NS2) from Russia through the Baltic Sea to Germany would be destroyed, if the Russians attacked Ukraine.⁴⁸ The announcement was a direct, intentional provocation of Russia. The American plan, approved by the notoriously weak German Chancellor, Olaf Scholz, was to continue the weaponization of Ukraine. It pretended that Russia would be unable and unwilling to stop this, because she was supposed to have a greater interest in the pipeline than in her national security. However, that was a gross miscalculation. When in September 2022 the pipeline was indeed blown up (according to veteran investigative journalist Seymour Hersch⁴⁹ by a taskforce of American secret agents and elements within the Norwegian navy), it was already clear that Russia depended much less on NS2 than Germany did.

While the media constantly repeated the lie that the Russian SMO was “an unprovoked attack”, practically all independent observers and analysts of international and geopolitical affairs agreed that the West was to blame for the war in Ukraine. However, some continued to pander to the West's claim that Russia's action on February 24th 2022 was “inexcusable”. That claim would have some plausibility, if those who made it would explain what else Putin could have done that he had not done countless times before: shake his head in resignation, bear the West's arrogant aggressiveness with equanimity and hope for a return to sanity, or at least a sense of reality, in the Western capitals.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

From the beginning of the SMO in late February 2022, it was obvious that the Western mainstream media – newspapers, magazines, radio and television, also Wikipedia and the Big Tech social-media platforms (Google, Youtube, Facebook) – were committed to an extremely partisan and skewed view of a country, Ukraine, that until then was known mostly for its systemic corruption, its tumultuous political scene and the prominence of an extremely nationalistic and xenophobic Nazi-like ideology among large segments of its population. By then, the anti-Russian bias of the Western media had been well-established in its repeated publication of never substantiated accusations of “Putin ordering the murder of political opponents”.⁵⁰ While the media hysterically castigated populist movements in the West as manifestations of “right-wing extremism”, they studiously avoided applying that label to the regime in Kiev, even though it was a textbook example of right-wing extremism (as the term was understood before 2014).

The media portrayal of the conflict obfuscated the fact that, except for a few months at the end of WWI⁵¹, the historic region now called ‘Ukraine’ had never been an independent entity before 1991. It had been a part of the Russian Empire ever since the days of the Empress Catherine the Great (*r.*1762-1796), a German princess who had acceded to the throne in Moscow and continued and intensified the policy of Westernization begun under the Emperor Peter the Great (*r.*1682-1725). About a third of the territory of what is now considered the Republic of Ukraine had been known as Novorossiia (“New Russia”) from

⁴⁸ See [reuters.com/world/biden-germanys-scholz-stress-unified-front-against-any-russian-aggression-toward-2022-02-07/](https://www.reuters.com/world/biden-germanys-scholz-stress-unified-front-against-any-russian-aggression-toward-2022-02-07/)

⁴⁹ See Appendix 4 (NordStream 2)

⁵⁰ E.g., the case of Sergei and Yulia Skripal; see Appendix 11 (Russia-hating Britain)

⁵¹ Under Pavlo Skoropadskiy: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pavlo_Skoropadskiy

1764 to 1917.⁵² In 1917, the communist Bolsheviks took power in Russia and created the Soviet Union by imposing the Western ideology of Marxism on the whole of the former Tsarist Empire. Novorossiia included most of Ukraine's large urban centres.⁵³ Consequently, by the early twentieth century, Russia and Ukraine had come to share a common religion (Eastern Orthodox Catholicism⁵⁴), a common language (Russian) and a common, typically Western bourgeois “high culture” of art, literature, music and science. However, in the predominantly rural areas of central Ukraine and among Ukrainians residing in Roman Catholic Poland, the Russian influence was far less pronounced. Those were the areas where Ukrainian ultra-nationalism would flourish.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

For the greater part of the twentieth century, Ukraine had been a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (the USSR, a.k.a. the Soviet Union, capital city: Moscow). Like the Soviet Union as a whole, it was committed to a political system with a purely Western ideology, Marxist-Leninist Communism. The map of Ukraine that is ubiquitous in today's media coverage is, in fact, the map of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (hereafter UkrSSR, capital city: Kiev). The UkrSSR had been concocted in the 1920s, in the wake of the First World War, by V.I. Lenin out of debris of the collapsed Austro-Hungarian and Russian (Tsarist) Empires. The eastern part (Donbas, “the basin of the Don river”) had been the territory of the Don Cossacks. The Cossacks had been defeated by Bolshevik revolutionary forces, who assigned Donbas to the UkrSSR. Under the Joseph Stalin, the successor of Lenin, the 1939 partition of Poland between Germany and the USSR added new territories to the UkrSSR. After WWII, the Soviet Union – then an ally of the US, England and France – acquired more territories on its western Ukrainian flank. Stalin incorporated the Crimean SSR into the Russian SSR, but in 1954, his successor, Nikita Khrushchev (r.1953-1964), transferred the civil administration of the Crimea to the Ukrainian SSR.⁵⁵ Thus, geographically, the entire UkrSSR was a creation of the Soviet leadership in Moscow – and so was the Republic of Ukraine, the successor-state of the UkrSSR after the dissolution of the USSR in 1991.

The USSR itself was founded toward the end of WWI by V.I. Lenin after the successful 1917 Bolshevik uprising (“the October Revolution”) against

⁵² At the time, other European nations already had their “New England”, “New France” and “New Spain”—but these were overseas, not neighbouring territories.

⁵³ All the major cities in eastern and southern Ukraine were founded by Russia (a.o. Kherson, Mariupol, Melitopol, Zaporizhzhia, Odessa, Sevastopol). Within the cities, Russians and Jews were by far the two largest ethnic groups.

⁵⁴ In the year 800, Charlemagne, the King of the Franks, had himself crowned Emperor in Rome by the Roman pontiff, Leo III, promising to act as the defender of the Church in the West. His coronation meant a repudiation of the claims of the Byzantine emperors as the sole defenders of the Christian faith. It drove a wedge between Rome and Constantinople, not only politically but eventually also theologically. The tensions between Eastern and Western Orthodox Catholicism mounted until, in 1054, they led to a rupture, the Great Schism. When Constantinople fell to Turks, in 1453, Moscow became the capital of Eastern Orthodox Christianity.

⁵⁵ Also in 1954, Khrushchev (himself a Ukrainian) began his program of de-Stalinizing the USSR. The program was eventually completed under Mikhail Gorbachev (r.1985-1991), the last leader of the Soviet Union. However, his ambitious reforms (glasnost or openness, and perestroika or restructuring) quickly proved counterproductive. The Soviet system could not function as a unity without Stalin's methods of secrecy, total surveillance and brutal repression.

Nicholas II, the last Tsar of Russia. Nicholas was an ally of England and France in their war against the Second German Reich (1870-1918). Germany had arranged to smuggle Lenin from his exile in Zurich to Russia to foment social unrest, weaken the Tsar's war effort and so secure the German eastern front.⁵⁶ The Western allies of Russia declined to come to the aid of the Tsar. They sent a few expeditionary forces into Russia in an attempt to salvage some of their investments there, but these military expeditions were ineffective and quickly called back. As for the Tsar, they left him, his wife and children to be murdered by the Bolsheviks in a cellar in Yekaterinburg. They abandoned him for an alliance with the US.

Woodrow Wilson, President of the US from 1913 to 1921, had entered the war against Germany in 1917. Wilson then declared his intention to wipe out all old-style, dynastic, monarchical empires (Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary), and “to make the world safe for democracy”, i.e. for Western “democratic” states engaging in building up overseas empires (the established British, Dutch and French empires⁵⁷ – also, of course, the budding American empire, which was at first directed mainly against the scattered remains of the Spanish Empire). In 1898, the US started the Spanish-American War in an effort to achieve control over Cuba. In the same year it acquired Puerto Rico. Then the US began the American-Philippine war (1899-1902), which led to American dominance over the Philippine islands and a series of gruesome conflicts (with an estimated death toll of 200,000 to more than half a million victims). That war was not the first American venture into the Pacific area. Already in 1893, the US had taken possession of the independent Kingdom of Hawaii.

In a sense, the American Empire was to be a continuation of the British Empire by other means. A common central – and highly successful – plank of both Anglophone imperial agendas was to make English the *lingua franca* of political, economic and intellectual elites all over the world. It was supposed to – and did – give American and English media and educational institutions an unequalled advantage in shaping the world's “public opinion”.⁵⁸ After WWII, and apart from Japan and South Korea, the most successful conquest of the US Empire was Western Europe, which it succeeded to govern through supranational constructions such as the European Economic Community and later the European Union in an effort to homogenize (and neutralize) the cultural diversity of Europe. Such constructions were designed to create the conditions for the emergence of compliant bureaucratic and technocratic elites that would welcome American economic, political and military dominance without having to worry too much about local democratic controls and trade preferences.⁵⁹ The US is currently trying to repeat its European success story in

⁵⁶ The Brest-Litovsk Treaty of March 1918 with the Bolsheviks

⁵⁷ The main instruments of British and Dutch imperialism had been their West and East India Companies, vast public-private partnerships of governmental and commercial interests, intended to colonize and exploit far-away overseas territories. Eventually, Western overseas colonies comprised territories in the Americas, Africa, the Middle East, India, Indonesia, Indochina, the Middle East – even China (in the period that included the so-called opium wars, 1839-1842 and 1856-1860, and the Chinese “Boxer Rebellion” in 1900) up to 1949.

⁵⁸ The idea that “public opinion” is the firm basis of political power is one of the greatest “discoveries” of the Age of Enlightenment – e.g., the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and David Hume. Adopted by political rulers, it launched a renewed attack on religion (especially Roman Catholicism), because religion was seen as a formidable but fortunately unarmed competitor in the struggle for control of men's minds.

⁵⁹ Europe's way of meeting what Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber would call “le défi américain”

Latin America and Africa. As seen from Washington, it is far more efficient to bribe a handful of local oligarchs (magnates, warlords) than to try to gain the trust of the local *hoi polloi*.

The West quickly reconciled itself to the new Communist regime in Moscow but worried about the appeal it had among the populations of Western and Central Europe, not the least in circles of intellectuals who began to praise Soviet Communism as an enlightened, progressive ideological system that should be implemented throughout the industrialized world. Because of these worries, Western governments and ruling classes were rather sympathetic⁶⁰ to fascist parties and movements, which had made militant anti-Communism a central part of their political programs. In fact, fascists and communists were equally opposed to the competitive nature of Western-style capitalism, free markets, free trade and parliamentary and local democracy, which they considered incompatible with their idea of a centralized, rational economic and political technocratic order that would coordinate, in top-down fashion, the systematic use of scientific expertise to solve “the problems of society”. In that respect, fascism and communism were birds of a feather—but they were also fierce competitors in the struggle for leadership of the revolutionary movement toward a new world order.

However, in the West, ‘Communism’ was perceived as standing for International or Global Socialism – and therefore, a threat to other nations – and ‘Fascism’ as standing for National Socialism (“socialism in one country”) and as such a matter of any nation's internal politics. The distinction became moot, when 1) the USSR under Stalin began to focus on its internal affairs rather than on the “global revolution” advocated by his main rival, Leon Trotsky, and 2) National Socialist Germany under Hitler began to attempt to re-unify territories that had been allocated to other nations⁶¹ under the Treaty of Versailles (1919), although these territories (e.g., Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia, Gdansk in Poland) were home to predominantly German-speaking populations. In 1939, the USSR and Nazi Germany concluded the Molotov-Ribbentrop non-aggression pact to give one another a free hand in carrying out their designs within their respective spheres of influence. However, Hitler broke the pact already in 1941 with his invasion of the USSR (“Operation Barbarossa”). That event would prove a decisive moment in the history of the UkrSSR, as a large segment of ethnic Ukrainians in the UkrSSR and Poland allied with the German invaders against the Soviet Union.

The UkrSSR had a heterogeneous population of ethnic Ukrainians, Russians, Poles (Volhynia, Eastern Galicia), Hungarians (Zakarpattia region) and a few other minorities (e.g., Lemkos or Rusins in the borderland with Poland; Tatars in Crimea). As became clear in every election in the post-Soviet era (from 1991 onward), Ukraine was an internally divided state, its north-western part voting predominantly for the anti-Russian nationalists, its eastern and southern parts

(1967) consisted in aping the US's “corporate capitalism” and its turn toward a financialized, increasingly de-materialized “service economy” (with deteriorating real services as an unintended consequence).

⁶⁰ Susan Ronald, *Hitler's Aristocrats: The Secret Power Players in Britain and America Who Supported the Nazis, 1923–1941*, 2023; earlier: Anthony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, 1976

⁶¹ Ever since the concept of national borders was invented, Europeans have not been good at respecting national borders. One needs to have a decent historical atlas at hand to make sense of the “national histories” of most of most European nations..

for parties that sought to continue good relations with Russia. However, many ethnic Ukrainians took the view that the whole of the former UkrSSR belonged exclusively to them: “Ukraine to the Ukrainians!” Extreme nationalism and xenophobia became potent ingredients of their political outlook. Ethnic Russians bore the brunt of that xenophobia. This hatred of all things Russian had its roots in Stalin's policies. The harm done to the states and peoples that fell under the Soviet yoke should not be underestimated. But the Soviets/Russians never adopted the Western doctrine of national or racial superiority. In contrast, the states that became independent from the USSR after the Cold War often did so. Ukraine is an extreme example. Many ethnic Ukrainians consider Russians *Untermenschen*, a subhuman people.

Stalin had begun an intensive process of industrialization of the UkrSSR, which entailed a large influx of ethnic Russian engineers and workers. Moreover, following years of reckless cultivation and poor land-management on the collectivized farms, the extended droughts of the 1930s brought famine to the agricultural parts of the UkrSSR. The droughts were not an exclusively Ukrainian or even Soviet phenomenon.⁶² However, in the UkrSSR, drought-caused misery was exacerbated by Stalin's policy of prioritizing food supply to industrial areas. As a result, anti-Soviet sentiment grew explosively in large parts of the UkrSSR. Consequently, when, in 1941, the Hitler-regime broke its non-aggression pact with the USSR and invaded the UkrSSR in an attempt to reach Moscow from the south-west, many ethnic Ukrainians (especially Ukrainian Romanians in Bukovina) collaborated intensively with the invading Nazis, even to the point of adopting the ultra-nationalistic and racial creeds of Nazism as justifications for genocidal campaigns against Polish and other non-Ukrainian⁶³ ethnicities.

WWII and the rise of Ukrainian ultra-nationalism

In 1942, Ukrainian nationalists and Nazi-sympathizers – followers of the prominent agitator and notorious anti-Semite Stepan Bandera (1909-1959), a leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (based in Poland) – started a genocidal campaign that killed ca 50,000 ethnic Poles (civilians, women, children) in Volhynia alone, and ca 130.000 Poles in Eastern Galicia and other regions. For Bandera and his ilk, the Poles were foreign occupiers of Ukrainian territory, even though they had been there for hundreds of years. Already in 1934, Bandera, a Polish citizen, had been sentenced to death for the murder of a Polish government minister. He was released by the Nazis, when they invaded Poland in 1939. After their invasion of the USSR, the Nazis imprisoned him for being an inveterate troublemaker, despite his enduring support of their *Weltanschauung*. Following the failure of Operation Barbarossa, Bandera fled to the West. After the war, he was fêted (together with other Ukrainian nationalists such as Mykola Lebed) by the American policy establishment for his fight against the Russian Soviets. Ironically, he settled in supposedly denazified West Germany (in Munich, where Hitler had

⁶² During the same period, extended droughts wreaked havoc in the US: the 1930-36 period of the Dust Bowl in Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas and New Mexico – c.f. John Steinbeck's 1939 Nobel Prize winning novel, *The Grapes of Wrath*.

⁶³ As in Germany, Jews were a primary target. Analysts of the infamous anti-Semitic hoax, *The Protocols of the Enders of Zion* (1903), have traced several of the so-called protocols to anti-Semitic organizations in the Ukrainian region of Tsarist Russia. See Appendix 5 (*The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*).

begun his rise to power), where he was assassinated by an agent of the Soviet secret service, the KGB. In 2010, Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko proclaimed Bandera a national hero, but this proclamation was annulled in 2011 on the ground that Bandera never formally held Ukrainian citizenship. To this day, hard-core Ukrainian nationalists (including prominent members of the political elite in the Kiev Government⁶⁴) continue to consider Bandera a national hero.

The failure of Operation Barbarossa re-established Soviet control and forced the Ukrainian ultranationalists and Nazis to go underground. To avoid Soviet reprisals, Ukrainian Nazi collaborators fled or surrendered to the West—that was the extent of their “pro-Western attitudes”. Millions of them settled in the West, especially in Canada⁶⁵, where they could vent their hatred of the Soviet Union, even though the Soviets had been the West's allies in the fight against Hitler and the major force in defeating the German *Wehrmacht*. While the US won the war in the Pacific Ocean (against Japan), the Soviet Union won the war in Europe (against Germany) – unless you believe the Hollywood version of the Second World War. For the Russians, WWII was a war against the Nazis in which up to thirty million Russians died. Every year, the Russian “Victory Day” (May 9th) celebrates the Red Army's capture of Berlin, Hitler's last bulwark. No other European country suffered more at the hands of the Nazis than Russia. Moreover, with most of the Wehrmacht tied up on the Eastern Front, the Western Allies (USA, Canada, England) could land in Italy and Normandy without having to fear strong, well-organized resistance. Most of the major Nazi “death camps” were liberated by the Soviets. There was a post-war West Berlin (an enclave in the Soviet-occupied part of Germany) only as a courtesy of Stalin, a “Thank you” for Roosevelt's wartime aid to the USSR.

However, the vitriolic animosity of Ukrainian refugees against the Soviets had been noticed by the Americans intelligence service, which deemed it very useful in the planned Cold War against the Soviet Union, their former ally. Beginning in 1938, under President Franklin D. Roosevelt (r.1933-1945), the US had invested billions in developing an enormous military-industrial complex. At least its intelligence service was intelligent enough to understand that the military-industrial complex would need a fearsome enemy to remain viable after the demise of Germany and Japan. The Soviet Union was the only credible candidate to play the part.

⁶⁴ Zelensky's ambassador to Germany, Andriy Melnyk, caused uproar with his frequent expressions of Banderite ideology. A few months after being recalled (in October 2022), he was promoted by Zelensky to the office of Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs (politico.eu/article/zelenskyy-dismisses-controversial-ambassador-to-germany/). As of June 2023, he serves as Ukraine's Ambassador to Brazil.

⁶⁵ On the 22nd of September, 2023, the Canadian Parliament gave a standing ovation to its invited guest, Yaroslav Hunka, a 98-year old Ukrainian and former volunteer in the 14th Grenadier Waffen SS Division in Ukraine in 1942. for being “a Ukrainian hero. a Canadian hero. and we thank him for all his service” (i.e. collaboration with the Nazis against the USSR). This occurred immediately after Ukrainian President Zelensky had addressed the Parliament. The named division of the Waffen SS was implicated in various war crimes (mass murders of Jews and others) according to the Friends of The Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies. After indignant reactions from all over the world. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and his Deputy, Chrystia Freeland (of Ukrainian descent), professed ignorance of Hunka's past and, laying all the blame on their party member. Anthony Rota, the Speaker Of Canada's House of Commons (lower chamber), forced him to step down.

The Cold War and the rise of neo-conservative warmongering

Not only Ukrainian Nazi collaborators, also German soldiers and scientists⁶⁶ preferred surrendering to the West to being captured by the Soviets. Already at the end of the Second World War, in 1945, the American secret service (OSS) had bought the allegiance of top-ranking officers of the German Military Intelligence, who had close contacts with Ukrainian ultranationalists and Nazis. Elements within the American secret service were anticipating the emergence of the Soviet Union as the principal obstacle to American global hegemony. They were interested in using Ukrainian nationalists and Nazi collaborators as strategic assets in their planned war on the USSR. After all, the Ukrainians had valuable “inside information” on the Soviet Union.

The American policy elite's ambition to make the USA the global hegemon – as they put it, “the world's policeman and Good Samaritan” – had been spelled out early in WWII, even before the attack on Pearl Harbour, by media magnate Henry Luce⁶⁷. The idea was embraced by Allen Welsh Dulles (1893-1969)⁶⁸, when he was serving as an intelligence officer operating in Italy in 1944. Dulles was a primary contact for high-ranking German officers who were seeking to surrender to the US on condition of favourable treatment in return for valuable information. The biggest catch of the OSS was General Reinhard Gehlen, chief of the *Wehrmacht's* anti-Soviet espionage division.. Following a long career in the American CIA, on behalf of which he re-activated his Nazi spy networks in the UkrSSR, Central and Eastern Europe and the Baltic States, Gehlen ended up as the founding President and Chief of the West-German⁶⁹ Intelligence Service (BND, *Bundesnachrichtendienst*), from 1956 to 1968.

After the war, Dulles became the principal architect of the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) as a nearly autonomous branch of government, specializing in espionage and covert operations, and as the centrepiece of the Five Eyes network that involves the intelligence services of the US, Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. From 1953 until shortly before his death in 1959, Allen's brother, John Foster Dulles, was Secretary of State in the Eisenhower Administration. Prominent Wall Street lawyers, the brothers never neglected the interests of their corporate clients, even as they worked hard to impress their concept of a Cold War against the Soviet Union on America's foreign policy. Their efforts created an intellectual environment within which the so-called neo-conservative movement would flourish and eventually come to dominate US foreign policy.

⁶⁶ The CIA's Operation Paperclip arranged the settlement of prominent Nazi scientists in the US, where they could pursue their work, mostly in the military-industrial and intelligence complex. The most famous of them was Werner von Braun, the rocket designer who helped to develop the technology for the American space-programs and landings on the moon.

⁶⁷ Henry R. Luce, “The American Century”, *Life Magazine*, February 17, 1941, p.61-65

⁶⁸ David Talbot, *The Devil's Chessboard* (2015), an extensive account of A.W.Dulles's career

⁶⁹ West Germany (Bundesrepublik Deutschland, capital city: Bonn) was a state, created in 1949 on the German territories that were occupied by the USA and its allies (France, England). Soviet-occupied German territories were incorporated in East Germany (Deutsche Demokratische Republik or DDR), until they were absorbed into West Germany in 1990 as the Soviet quid pro quo for the West's promise not to expand NATO after the USSR disbanded the Warsaw Pact (in 1991) and allowed its remaining members (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania) to go their own ways. The West never kept its promise.

The neo-conservative movement was a spin-off of the managerial revolution that had swept through the American business world in the 1930s. Its first manifesto was James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* (1941). Burnham (1905-1987) described the rise of managers as the principal power holders in the age of corporatism, especially in the American system of "corporate capitalism". Burnham, originally a Trotskyite communist, later a consultant to the CIA, is often cited as a founding father of "neo-conservatism", the ideology that substituted global American "unipolar hegemony" for the original Trotskyite idea of a revolution of "the workers of the world" as a means to bring the whole world under a single government or management. "One world, one government" was the principal common goal of Trotsky and the neo-conservatives. However, having found it impossible to rally the workers, disillusioned American Trotskyites switched to rallying the political and business elites.⁷⁰

The premise of neo-conservatism was the belief that American elites will never accept a socialist system, unless they have the assurance that they will be in a position to run it, as the oligarchic vanguard of the Revolution that will create a New World Order. The projected New World Order should emerge from the transformation of American big businesses into international and multinational corporations, able to amass economic power and, consequently, decisive political influence in all other countries. It should dispense with international law and replace it with a "rule-based international order" – an order the rules of which would be dictated by the American political establishment to further the interests of the American corporate elite of managers and major shareholders of large industrial and financial corporations: "What's good for General Motors is good for the United States."⁷¹

The basic model for this rule-based order was the Bretton Woods system. Established in 1944 as an effort to reconstitute a sound international monetary order after the disastrous disruptions caused by WWII, the Bretton Woods treaty made the US dollar the reserve currency of the world.⁷² This fact allowed the managers of the American Federal Reserve System (FRS)⁷³ to exert pressure on monetary and financial policy-making institutions, including nominally sovereign governments, all over the world. However, despite the enormous losses it had suffered in the war, the Soviet Union opted out of the Bretton Woods system, unwilling to surrender sovereign control of its monetary and financial affairs to the Americans for a few dollars more of foreign aid and international credit. This Soviet rejection of American monetary hegemony strengthened major elements within the American policy establishment in their conviction that the Soviet Union had to be defeated by

⁷⁰ They chose the label "neo-conservatism" to hide their socialist-communist origins. Until his murder in 1940, Leon Trotsky (1879-1940) had been the most vocal "internationalist" opponent of Stalin's nationalist "socialism in one country" in the Communist camp. For American Trotskyists, an alliance with the fiercely anti-Stalin CIA of the late 1940s and 50s was therefore an appealing strategic option. Of course, by the 1990s, the younger generations of neocons had completely forgotten about the Trotskyite origin.

⁷¹ Charles Wilson, Chairman Of General Motors Inc. (statement in Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, 83rd Congress, 1st Session on Nominee Designates, #34, p.26).

⁷² See Appendix 6 (Bretton Woods)

⁷³ The FRS is a coalition of private banking groups in several regional divisions. It had been legally empowered in 1913, under the Woodrow Wilson Administration, to act as the de facto central or national bank of the USA. The FRS is dominated by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

all means. That is to say, by all means, short of open war – for, as it had shown in the war, the USSR was a mighty military force. Moreover, the USSR was quick to break the American monopoly on the possession of nuclear weapons (“atom bombs”), thereby squashing American hopes of basing a new world order on military supremacy alone.

As long as a hot war between the two nuclear powers meant “mutual assured destruction”, a “cold war” was the only option. Consequently, the Cold War⁷⁴ was primarily a matter of covert operations, deception, insurrectionist coups, and a race to develop new technologies that would be useful in psychological and later also in electronic warfare. In these domains, the alliance of the American national security complex with large corporations in the military, media, medical and financial industries and their professional organizations and research institutions (including university departments) paid off handsomely. The American national security complex was engineered by Allen Dulles's CIA and coordinated by the National Security Council (NSC).

In line with the managerial revolution, the Western governments were gradually transformed from representative, publicly accountable systems into technocracies, staffed and advised – and de facto run – by unelected “experts”. The trend had started in the 1930s, the age of corporatism: in Europe, the age of fascism; in the US, the age of President's Roosevelt's New Deal policies. On both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, the age of corporatism saw the rise of giant bureaucracies and the expansion of executive powers. In 1961, President Eisenhower, speaking from first-hand experience, warned against the growing influence of the military-industrial complex on the nation's policies, as well as against the corruption of science by its increasing reliance on government contracts and against the corruption of politics by “the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.”⁷⁵ However, his successor, John F. Kennedy, picked up the technocratic theme again, declaring that “most of our problems are of a technical rather than a political nature” – i.e. beyond the ken of the general public and therefore not suited to be decided in or by elections. Of course, most of the experts were academics or staff members of industrial and financial firms, corporations or their “philanthropic” affiliates, e.g., the Carnegie, Ford, Rockefeller, Guggenheim, Getty and countless lesser-known “charitable” or “educational” tax-free, non-profit foundations⁷⁶. The principal function of those politically unaccountable experts and advisors was to dictate policy to – or to bypass – the official, politically accountable members of the President's “cabinet”, while their paymasters intervened in electoral processes at every level with large donations to compliant office holders and ditto office seekers,⁷⁷ or with promises of lucrative careers in the worlds of corporate business, philanthropy, NGOs and international organizations. Some of these experts soon became at least as famous as the presidents they advised. Prominent examples of the turn toward a “deep state” technocracy after 1960 are Robert McNamara (under President John F. Kennedy), a devotee of systems analysis

⁷⁴ The Cold War would last from 1947 to 1989, when the Soviet Union agreed to the integration of East-Germany into West-Germany (a.k.a. German “re-unification”)

⁷⁵ Dwight Eisenhower, Farewell Address to the Nation, January 17th, 1961

⁷⁶ See Appendix 7 (Philanthropic foundations)

⁷⁷ They generally donated about equally to Democrats and Republicans. Hence, the emergence in the US of an unofficial “uniparty”, composed of nominal Democrats and nominal Republicans, all of them thriving on support from the corporate elite

and Chairman of the Ford Motor Company; Henry Kissinger (under Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford), a geopolitical-strategy analyst; and Zbigniew Brzezinski (under Jimmy Carter), also a geopolitical-strategy analyst and a protégé of David Rockefeller. As private consultants to large commercial and political corporations, such men are able to amass fortunes long after their patrons have left the public political scene. Bureaucrats and technocrats, who run such corporations, like hiding behind whatever passes for “Science”.

At the same time, the common form of corruption, known as lobbying, was regulated, formalized and legalized as the main interface between business and politics. Through this bureaucratic-technocratic interface, Big Government became Big Business, and vice versa, on a scale never seen before. As could have been expected, the more permanent, private corporate interests soon captured the, to them, most meaningful policy areas, thereby rendering the input from the public of “ordinary citizens” irrelevant. One of the most disturbing aspects of recent developments is legislation that authorizes “electionproof public-policy making” by unelected bodies. The other side of the coin was that “politics in the public view” degenerated into a smokescreen of entertainment and distraction.⁷⁸ Politicians learned that there is an easy way to speak the truth, viz. by accusing one another of incompetence, conflicts of interests, and sinister designs and contacts, without ever suggesting ways to pierce the institutional veil behind which the technocratic blob operates.

After a long gestation period, the neo-conservatives rose to prominence in the American foreign policy establishment under the presidency of George Herbert Bush (*r.* 1989-1993). They had their great breakthrough under Bush's successor, William Jefferson Clinton (*r.* 1993-2001). Under their influence, Clinton ended the policy of *détente* that had been initiated under President Reagan (*r.* 1981-1989) and the last Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev (*r.* 1985-1991). Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO, Clinton launched the policy of expanding the alliance that had been created in 1949, supposedly to defend Western Europe, the US, Canada and Iceland⁷⁹ against the Soviet Union, even though, after WWII, the USSR had never shown, and would never show, any intention of attacking a Western European country. Indeed, in 1954, the USSR had proposed to join NATO, but the proposal was rejected.⁸⁰ Consequently, doubting the defensive nature of NATO, the USSR responded in 1955 with the creation of the Warsaw Pact (the Soviet Union and seven other socialist republics in East and Central Europe).

During the Cold War, other countries joined NATO: Greece, Turkey (1952), West-Germany (1955) and Spain (1982). Thereafter, from 1999 to 2022, NATO membership exploded from 16 to 30, and then to 32, when formerly staunchly neutral Finland and Sweden joined⁸¹ – thereby giving NATO full control over the Baltic searoute to Saint Petersburg, Russia's second-largest

⁷⁸ Cf. Guy Debord, *La Société du spectacle* (1967)

⁷⁹ Together with the US, Canada and Iceland, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom were the founding members of NATO, in 1949. Iceland, which had no army, provided a mid-Atlantic base for “technical” NATO installations.

⁸⁰ See above, page 9

⁸¹ Switzerland, nominally still a neutral country – and the seat of many US dominated international organizations – is not in NATO, but de facto, it lost its neutrality long ago, when its famed banking industry gave in to the threat of being excluded from the US market, if it did not comply with US regulations. Super imperialism at work!

city. Clearly, NATO's intention was to erect a new “Iron Curtain”⁸² to divide Europe by sabotaging every attempt to create what Russia demanded: a solid and stable “security architecture” for Europe.

Clinton's expansion of NATO was motivated by the explosive situation between Serbs and Albanians, Orthodox Christians and Muslims, that had arisen in the Balkan and would lead to the dismemberment of Yugoslavia in 1992. However, NATO intervention in the conflict, primarily against Serbia, a traditional ally of Russia, made it clear that Clinton's policy was also an effort to further the cause of American global hegemony (the neo-conservative “New World Order”) by ruthlessly exploiting the initial disarray and weakness of post-Soviet Russia.

The neo-conservative policy motto was “We do not negotiate until we have defeated our opponents”. It was still in place in Ukraine in 2022, when US President Joe Biden declared another “forever war” by refusing to permit Kiev to seek a diplomatic solution to its conflict with Moscow “before the Russians are defeated”. By that time, neo-conservative warmongering had thoroughly infected the political establishments of the major European NATO partners (England, under Boris Johnson; Germany, under Olaf Scholz; France, under Emmanuel Macron; Italy, under Mario Draghi) and the supra-national European Union (under EU Commission President Ursula von der Leyen⁸³). Only Hungary's Prime Minister, Viktor Orbán, voiced serious reservations about the idea that “War with Russia” was the proper way to consolidate “European Unity”. For this he was treated as a pariah by his colleagues and the Western media.

Incorporating Ukraine into the American Empire

To Allen W. Dulles and his brother and eventually most American policymakers, the UkrSSR was the weak underbelly of the Soviet Union, the enemy in their Cold War. One can bet on it that they were very, very interested in Ukraine.⁸⁴ However, the demise of the USSR in 1991 and the resulting disarray of its basic institutions of government under Boris Yeltsin made Ukraine appear less important. The RF itself seemed ripe for the picking. Repudiating the solemn promises of his predecessor, George H. Bush, to the last Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, Bill Clinton announced that eastward expansion of NATO would be official policy. The Russian Federation (“Russia”) was to be treated as a defeated enemy rather than as a partner in the post-Soviet concert of nations. Russia was to be coerced into subjugation to the hegemon in Washington, D.C.

To Clinton's imagination, the humiliation of Russia would make it possible to bring the western parts of the former USSR (Russia, Belarus and Ukraine) under American control simply by using proxies to buy up most of their natural and financial resources. American and British advisors would assist the three countries in the process of transitioning from a centrally planned to a market economy. The basic scheme for effecting the transition was relatively sound. It consisted of creating shares in state-owned industrial and financial enterprises and to distribute these shares exclusively among the local populations, to kick-

⁸² [bbc.com/news/world-europe-67564175](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-67564175) : Finland closes last border crossing with Russia

⁸³ See Appendix 9 (Ursula von der Leyen, Young Global Leaders)

⁸⁴ cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP83-00764R000500040001-3.pdf ; see Appendix 10 (Gladio, the culture of fear)

start a market economy based on private ownership of the means of production. However, few people in those countries were familiar with the concept of shareholding. They needed cash more than paper titles to uncertain dividends in enterprises that might not survive the transition. Moreover, the Western advisors to Yeltsin insisted that Russian buyers of the shares should be able to avail themselves of loans granted by foreigners. Thus, using a few favoured stooges (the soon to be world-famous “Russian oligarchs”) as front men, Western corporations would be able to control all of Russia's economically important and strategic resources. This would reduce the Russian population virtually to the status of “debt slaves” of their Western creditors.

The plan worked in Ukraine, but not in Belarus (under President Alexander Lukashenko, r.1994-the present). It also did not work in Russia, where the second President, Vladimir Putin, succeeded in curbing the power grab of the oligarchs without blocking market reforms or economic relations with the West. Indeed, for many years, Putin sought close cooperation with the Western powers⁸⁵, encouraging trade and tourism, while diligently working for a Russian economic and cultural renaissance to lift the country out of the chaos of the Yeltsin years. However, Clinton and the neo-conservatives would not forgive Putin for de-railing their take-over bid—and, anyway, NATO's mission was not to provide a framework for peace in Europe, but to secure American dominance by preventing Europe from seeking close cooperation with Russia.

US-Russia relations sank further when in 2003 President G.W. Bush (a son of G.H. Bush) decided to launch the Second Gulf War, supposedly in retaliation for the deadly attack on the World Trade Centre in New York City on September 11th 2001,⁸⁶ although there was not a shred of evidence that Iraq's Saddam Hussein was involved. Russia condemned Bush's plans to go to war and to raise an international “coalition of the willing”⁸⁷, ostensibly to defend “Western values” against “the enemies of freedom”, but in reality to hide its responsibility for its wars by presenting them as actions of one or other “international community”, assembled ad hoc. When France and Germany (and a few other European countries) refused to join the ad hoc coalition, the neo-conservatives in Washington got very, very upset. They issued ridiculous warnings about a Paris-Berlin-Moscow “axis” that would destabilize the world (i.e. threaten US hegemony), even though saner heads in Europe understood very well that closer cooperation with Russia would be a solid basis for détente and security in Europe. However, the Russia-hating political establishment in England⁸⁸ responded enthusiastically to the American call to arms. It had always liked the ability to tip the balance of power in a divided Continental Europe whichever way it liked, by opportunistically choosing sides.

US-Russia relations reached their nadir after Russia had warned, in 2007, that it would not tolerate further NATO expansion (i.e. ever more US military

⁸⁵ In 2000, Putin renewed the 1954 Soviet offer to join NATO, but even though the Cold War had ended, Clinton (at the behest of the neo-conservatives in Washington) rejected the proposal (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/nov/04/ex-nato-head-says-putin-wanted-to-join-alliance-early-on-in-his-rule>).

⁸⁶ Ca 3000 people died—see below, page 47

⁸⁷ According to the US, it involved 18 European countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, the United Kingdom – and from the rest of the world: Afghanistan, Australia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Japan, South Korea, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Turkey, and Uzbekistan.

⁸⁸ See Appendix 11 (Russia-hating Britain)

and nuclear bases ever closer to Russian territory).⁸⁹

Having failed to acquire Russia's economic assets in the last decade of the twentieth century and facing an obviously resolute Russian leadership, the US again turned its focus on Ukraine, instigating a coup in 2014 (“the Maidan coup”) that brought a vehemently anti-Russian government to power and divided the country into two irreconcilable factions.

Post-Soviet Ukraine

In 1991, the UkrSSR became the independent Republic of Ukraine, when the USSR was dissolved in an agreement between the leaders of the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia, Belarus and Ukraine. Ukraine voluntarily surrendered its stockpile of Soviet-era nuclear weapons to Russia, and Russia accepted that Crimea would remain under Ukrainian jurisdiction, although negotiations about the continued use of the city and harbour of Sevastopol by the Russian Black Sea fleet and the Ukrainian navy proved difficult, because of objections by various parties in both countries. Sevastopol had been a Russian military stronghold ever since its foundation in 1783.

Thus, Russia, Belarus and Ukraine, formerly regional administrative divisions of the Soviet Union, became independent states. Moscow, formerly the capital of both the USSR and the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic, became the capital of the Russian Federation (RF). These three former SSRs formed a Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS, the Belovezha Accords, December 8, 1991). However, Moscow gave all other former SSRs the option of becoming CIS members. Two weeks later, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan joined the CIS (the Alma-Ata protocols of December 21, 1991). Within a week, Mikhail Gorbachev, the President of the USSR, resigned and the Supreme Council of the USSR abolished itself. Other former SSRs, Georgia and the Baltic states (Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia, which had declared independence from the USSR earlier in 1988-1991), did not join the CIS. Georgia did sign the CIS Charter of 1993, only to withdraw from it in 2008 under the leadership of Mikheil Saakashvili, who later turned up in Ukraine as a governor of Odessa, appointed by Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko. Ukraine withdrew from CIS in 2018. Poroshenko was facing a difficult re-election battle and needed all the US support he could get. Withdrawing from CIS was an obvious confirmation of his pro-West, anti-Russia stance.

Powerful factions in Georgia⁹⁰ and Ukraine had started seeking Western military and economic support. However, the peoples of the European Union (EU, formally established in 1993) were not eager to admit either Georgia or Ukraine as members. Georgia was not even close to Europe; and Ukraine, with its vast territory (nearly 604,000 km²), population (ca 43.6 million in 2020) and formidable army (inherited from Soviet days), would instantly have become a dominant power within the EU, despite its reputation as a centre of corruption and illegal trafficking, despite its powerful nationalist militias and their Nazi-like ideology. However, as Europe had been reduced to the status of a vassal of the US – an XXL sized Puerto Rico (to paraphrase Michael Hudson) – American geopolitical priorities took precedence over the concerns of ordinary

⁸⁹ See above, note 23, on page 5

⁹⁰ See Appendix 13 (Georgia, FARA)

Europeans. The US was behind “colour revolutions” that brought pro-Western factions to power in Georgia (the “rose revolution” of 2003) and Ukraine (the “orange revolution” of 2004). However, as we know, the US had had its eyes on using Ukraine as a weapon against Russia from the early days of the Cold War onward.

As noted above, Crimea had been a proper SSR of the Soviet Union, until Stalin made it a part of the Russian SSR (after WWII). Khrushchev transferred it, in 1954, on his own authority to the UkrSSR. In the summer of 1991, while still under Soviet rule, the people of Crimea voted in a referendum for a restoration of their independence from Kiev, i.e. to undo what Khrushchev had done. At the time, everybody was talking about democracy, autonomy and forgetting the Soviet past. The government in Kiev first accepted the referendum, but then reversed its decision later in the year. In 1992, the conflict over Crimea was dealt with under a compromise that gave the peninsula a large measure of autonomy within the Ukrainian Republic. Another referendum, in 1994, reaffirmed the desire for independence, but Kiev declared it illegal. In 1995, making use of the deteriorating situation in Russia under President Yeltsin, Ukraine rescinded Crimean autonomy entirely and started governing the peninsula by decree, as if it were an annexed, occupied zone.⁹¹ This move of questionable legality caused more resentment against Kiev among the people of Crimea.

Before 2014, Russia, faithful to the principles of the CIS, had abstained from meddling in its neighbour's internal affairs. However, after the Maidan coup and its aftermath of violence against Russian-speaking Ukrainians, a local referendum validated a renewed Crimean request for reintegration with Russia. This time, the RF immediately recognized the peninsula as an integral part of Russian territory – an autonomous republic within the Russian Federation (excepting only the military stronghold of Sebastopol, which came, as it had been for most of its history, under the direct control of Moscow).

The West and its corps of regime-friendly media corporations⁹² unanimously denounced the events in Crimea as an unprovoked invasion – an illegal act of war – by Russia. In the 1990s, they had supported the independence of Kosovo from Serbia, an ally of Russia, to use Kosovo as the location for one more large NATO military base, Bondsteel. In 2014, independence of Crimea from Ukraine, an ally of the West, was more than the Western oligarchy could stomach. The West wanted Russia out of the Black Sea, to cut it off from its only ice-free port, and so to prevent Russia from exporting its grain to Africa and the rest of the world—Russia is the third largest grain producer in the world, after China and India, and way ahead of Ukraine. However, closing Russian access to the Black Sea would cause more harm to the rest of the world than to Russia, but it would not cut Russia off from the new trade system (the “Belt and Road Initiative”) that China was developing throughout the Eurasian continent and extending into Africa.⁹³ For the rest of the world, the West represents the spectre of continued neo-colonial

⁹¹ [off-guardian.org/2022/03/08/timeline-the-crimean-referendum/](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/03/08/timeline-the-crimean-referendum/)

⁹² These include the few international, incorporated press agencies (e.g., AP, Reuters, Bloomberg News, Agence Presse, etc.) that provide the publishing and broadcasting media with almost all of their news material. They are controlled, wholly or in part, by a handful of media tycoons (e.g., Michael Bloomberg, the Murdoch family) with strong links to the now global oligarchy.

⁹³ Russia's icebreakers could be essential tools for opening an “Arctic Silk Road” to China.

exploitation in search of global hegemony; Russia and China represent hope of access to global trade routes, unencumbered by imperial ambitions. To counter the spread of this increasingly influential perception, the West had only one answer: projection of its own motivations onto its rivals—“Don't be fooled by the business-like, diplomatic approaches of Russia and China. If we are imperialists then so are they and they will be worse than we ever were.” Consequently, the Western leadership locked itself into policies of threatening and subverting its designated *ennemis du jour* to provoke them into committing acts of violent retaliation, which its subservient media would then decry as “unprovoked, naked aggression” and invoke as reasons for another “justified war”.

Other Russian-speaking areas in Ukraine, principally in the Donbas were not as lucky as Crimea. Donetsk and Lugansk had vainly sought greater autonomy from Kiev ever since the creation of the independent state of Ukraine in 1991. However, the Kievan establishment had always stopped short of granting autonomy under a federal constitution to its Russian-speaking provinces. However, as the Donbas – unlike Crimea – had no prehistory, prior to the Maidan coup of February 2014, of seeking independence from Ukraine, Putin, a stickler for international law, thought the legal basis for direct intervention to aid the Donbas too thin. The Donbas provinces sought independence from Kiev and asked Moscow for protection against the Kievan army, but Moscow declined to intervene in what it considered the internal affairs of Ukraine. Consequently, Kiev, with American support, felt free to continue and gradually intensify its campaign of shelling Donbas. The worst shelling occurred in February 2022, just prior to the start of the SMO.⁹⁴

Moscow then began the process of organizing negotiations between Kiev and the Donbas provinces which would lead to the Minsk Agreements of 2014 and 2015. These agreements were to be guaranteed by Germany (under Chancellor Angela Merkel) and France (under President François Hollande), but they were never implemented because they would have interfered with Kiev's and Washington's plans to build up the Ukrainian armed forces and to construct a complex of military fortifications along the border with the Donbas in preparation of a final assault on the secessionists in Donetsk and Lugansk. Later, in 2023, Putin admitted that he had been fooled by Western duplicity and that, instead of trusting the Western powers, he should have intervened actively in the Donbas, perhaps even acceded to the provinces' demand for their integration into the Russian Federation.

Post-Maidan Ukrainian “democracy”

In 2022, the West began to hail Ukraine as a democracy and to intensify its condemnation of Russia as an autocracy or even dictatorship, although ever since 1991 both countries had held regular elections and had a plurality of political parties under a democratic constitution. However, having lifted Russia out of the chaos of the Yeltsin era, Putin and his party (“United Russia”, established in 2001) were able to emerge victoriously out of all nation-wide elections. Putin's personal electoral score gradually increased from 53 to about

⁹⁴ According to a report, dated February 22nd 2022, from the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) – the report is still available as a .pdf file on the World Wide Web: [osce.org/files/2022-02-22%20Daily%20Report_ENG.pdf](https://www.osce.org/files/2022-02-22%20Daily%20Report_ENG.pdf).

66%, with higher spikes whenever he succeeded in mastering one or other grave crisis. The only significant dip in his rating occurred when the Russian Federal Parliament (Duma) lifted the two-term limit on the Office of the President. This permitted Putin to remain in office for as long as he remained the most popular candidate. In the presidential elections of March 2024, on the second anniversary of the SMO, he got nearly 88% of the votes. By then, most Russians had come to see NATO's involvement in the Ukrainian crisis as an existential threat to their country. Even the major opposition parties⁹⁵ refrained from criticism of the way Putin and his brilliant Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sergey Lavrov, handled the events in Ukraine and their international repercussions, including the ever-expanding list of economic and financial sanctions⁹⁶ imposed by the US and the EU.

In contrast, beginning in 1991, Ukraine had followed the Western pattern of frequent major policy changes, as one party or coalition after another comes to power, makes a mess of things, is voted out of office and its leaders and heavyweights reward themselves with a sinecure in one or other international organization or secure a directorship in a company that seeks to capitalize on their political networks. As a result, in the West, political continuity and stability were increasingly ensured by a “deep state” ensemble of unelected bureaucrats, managers and technocrats and their patrons, the equally unelected oligarchs in control of mighty industrial and financial corporations. Of course, the deep state is interested mainly in consolidating and expanding its power by protecting it from the decentralized control mechanisms that, prior to the nihilistic, Nietzschean *Umwertung aller Werte*⁹⁷ of the late nineteenth-century, had come to define Western Civilization: democratic representative institutions, free markets and free trade in goods and services⁹⁸, a free press and free universities – all of them within a framework of Christian morality (the primary target of that *Umwertung*).

Ironically, in 2019, Zelensky had been elected President of Ukraine on an anti-oligarchy (“populist”) platform of restoring good relations with Russia and ending Kiev's harassment of Russian-speaking Ukrainians. Receiving 73% of the votes, he won a landslide victory over the 24% of the votes for the incumbent president, the oligarch Petro Poroshenko (“the Ukrainian chocolate king”). Poroshenko's administration (r. 2014-2019) was generally despised for its corruption and divisive pro-Western policies – its selling out the country to Western commercial and financial interests to the detriment of the general population.

The Poroshenko regime was overseen by the American Obama administrations (r. 2009-2013, 2013-2017), in particular by Joe Biden, Obama's Vice-President. From 2013 to 2018, Biden's son, Hunter, was a director of

⁹⁵ In order of size (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_political_parties_in_Russia), the left to far left Communist Party, the centre-left A Just Russia, the right to far-right Liberal Democratic Party, the centre-right New People, the far-right Russian-nationalist Rodina, and the centre-right Civic Platform

⁹⁶ See Appendix 12 (Sanctions, BRICS)

⁹⁷ Literally, changing the meaning of all value-words – in other words, speaking of non-values as if they are values (cf. Orwell's conception of Newspeak in his 1984). One should bear this in mind when one hears post-19th-century Western politicians speak of “Western values”: “All media exist to invest our lives with artificial perceptions and arbitrary values.” Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding media: the Extensions of Man* (1964).

⁹⁸ These classical notions of free markets and free trade should not be confused with the “neo-liberal” notion of unregulated markets in financial instruments to which only the oligarchy and deep state actors have direct access – cf. “The bond market is God” of the 1990s.

Burisma, a Ukrainian oil company holding a substantial amount of exploitation rights in the Black Sea, even though he had no experience in the oil or any other business—but that did not matter, because he was the son of a “big guy” in Washington. While he was at Burisma, Hunter Biden raked in about \$11 million for himself and his investment firm.⁹⁹ Burisma had been the object of an investigation for corruption by a Ukrainian public prosecutor. As Joe Biden boasted in 2018, in a meeting of the American Council on Foreign Relations¹⁰⁰, it took him no more than an hour to pressure Kiev into firing the prosecutor by threatening to cancel a million dollar loan to the Ukrainian government.

Under the Obama administration, American foreign policy was firmly in the hands of the neo-conservatives. One of them, Victoria Nuland, an American of Ukrainian descent, was in charge of the Ukraine desk at the State Department. She masterminded and oversaw the financing of the Maidan coup of February 2014, which ousted the Ukrainian president, Viktor Yanukovich, when it became clear that he wanted to have good relations with both Russia and the West. The Western media consistently portrayed Yanukovich as “pro-Russian”, even though he had been close to signing an agreement with the EU. He only changed his mind when Russia offered an alternative that was much more favourable to Ukraine. Throughout the whole affair, it was the West that insisted that Ukraine choose between Brussels (i.e. Washington) and Moscow. Russia had no objection to a sovereign but neutral Ukraine making its own decisions. Unfortunately for Yanukovich, the neo-cons considered such neutrality a hostile situation, a threat to American hegemony: “You accept American dominance or you're finished.” Refusing to submit, Yanukovich was soon finished. On February 21st 2014, he fled to Russia, when the Maidan protests turned into a wild riot after never-identified shooters opened fire on both the crowds and the police forces in Maidan Square.¹⁰¹ It may have been a false-flag attack.¹⁰²

Before that event, Western politicians – among them, the neo-con warmonger *extraordinaire* Senator John “Bomb, bomb, bomb Iran” McCain, the ambitious Belgian Euro-parliamentarian Guy Verhofstadt and the Polish neo-con Radoslaw Sikorski (now Poland's Foreign Minister) – had shared platforms on Maidan Square stoking the fires of Ukrainian nationalism and

⁹⁹ <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/analysis-hunter-bidens-hard-drive-shows-firm-took-11-million-2013-2018-rcna29462>

¹⁰⁰ The relevant fragment of the meeting can still be seen on the World Wide Web. See: realclearpolitics.com/video/2019/09/27/flashback_2018_joe_biden_brags_at_cfr_meeting_about_withholding_aid_to_ukraine_to_force_firing_of_prosecutor.html. The full interview is on cfr.org/event/foreign-affairs-issue-launch-former-vice-president-joe-biden. CFR is a quasi-official think tank of the American foreign policy establishment. It dates back to the end of the First World War.

¹⁰¹ The role of the police in the Maidan events is not clear, because under Ukrainian law they seem to have had much discretion in dealing with public disorders and because they were surely infiltrated (or at least partially controlled) by Ukrainian ultranationalists. Before the Maidan coup succeeded, Western media referred to them as “Yanukovich's brutal police forces”. Afterward, complaints about police brutality suddenly disappeared, even as the country turned into a veritable police state under the divisive regime of Petro Poroshenko.

¹⁰² papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=1321588 (March 2022 paper by Ottawa-based Ukrainian academic Ivan Katchanovski): “The analysis shows cover-up and stonewalling of the investigations and trials by the Maidan governments and the far right. The prosecution denied that there were any snipers in the Maidan-controlled buildings. Not a single person is convicted or under arrest for the massacre of the protesters and the police almost 8 years after one of the most documented mass killings in history.”

Russophobia among the protesters with promises of Western support. The Maidan coup had all the markings of a covert operation by the Americans, who had been counting on Yanukovich's demise long before it happened. In a telephone conversation (leaked online on February 4th 2014)¹⁰³, Victoria Nuland could be heard saying “Fuck the EU”, in response to a comment by the American Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey Pyatt, who had noted that the EU was not pleased with the American choice of post-Maidan leaders for Ukraine. “Fuck the EU” was a telling comment from a bureaucrat who knew that the American policy establishment considered the EU no more than a vassal that might utter some protests but will in any case fall in line with Washington's directives. Still, it was an odd remark, because Nuland's officially publicized position was that she was merely aiding “the Ukrainian people” (excluding the majority that had voted Yanukovich into office) to accomplish “their wish to become a part of Europe” (i.e. the EU) by making sure their government complied with conditions imposed by the International Monetary Fund (which, together with the World Bank, is the main instrument for locking nations into the global, US-dominated financial system). Apparently, weeks before the Maidan protests turned ugly, Ukraine's future was being decided in Washington.

Emboldened by their sudden success, Ukrainian nationalists began their persecution of Ukraine's largest ethnic minority. In the immediate aftermath of the Maidan coup of February 2014, a mob of ultra-nationalistic Ukrainians burned alive a group of 46 Russian-speaking protesters in a trade union building in Odessa,¹⁰⁴ and ultra-nationalist politicians (among them a former prime minister, Yulia Tymoshenko¹⁰⁵) and entertainers¹⁰⁶ clamoured for

¹⁰³ E.g., [youtube.com/watch?v=KlvRljAaNgg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KlvRljAaNgg) (transcript: [bbc.com/news/world-europe-26079957](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-26079957)); when Nuland admitted, in 2014, that the US had “invested” \$5 billion in Project Ukraine ([youtube.com/watch?v=U2fYcHLouXY#t=504](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U2fYcHLouXY#t=504)), a US State Department spokesperson claimed that the sum covered various programs over the whole of the 1991-2014 period (politifact.com/factchecks/2014/mar/19/facebook-posts/united-states-spent-5-billion-ukraine-anti-government/). That explanation was not plausible. It certainly ignored various kinds of off-budget and other unaccountable covert (e.g., CIA) spending on building up “a strategic asset”, as well as the money sent to Ukraine by various supposedly “private” NGOs (such as The National Endowment for Democracy, billionaire founder of eBay Pierre Omidyar's Center for United Action, or one or other of George Soros's outlets for setting up and staffing oligarchy-friendly “civil-society institutions”). It also ignored the many billions American corporations had lent to Kievan oligarchs to acquire control of Ukrainian assets. Large swaths of Ukraine's agricultural land are owned by, or on behalf of, American agribusinesses. Energy giants such as Exxon-Mobil and Shell have invested tens of billions of dollars in Ukraine's oil industry.

¹⁰⁴ theguardian.com/world/2014/may/02/ukraine-dead-odessa-building-fire: “The aim is to completely clear Odessa [of pro-Russians],” said Dmitry Rogovsky, an ultranationalist Right Sector activist, whose hand had been injured during the fighting.” Of course, the victims were not “pro-Russian”; they were protesting against the announced policies of the new government. (The Guardian did not bother to interview any of the surviving victims of the massacre—maybe there were none).

¹⁰⁵ washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/03/25/in-latest-wiretapping-leak-yulia-tymoshenko-appears-to-say-nuclear-weapons-should-be-used-to-kill-russians/. Tymoshenko had risen to prominence during the so-called Orange Revolution of 2004, the first major symptom of the rift within Ukraine between a neutral and a militant pro-Western faction.

¹⁰⁶ For example, the popular band Yarmak ([youtube.com/watch?v=mOOClnYKmc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mOOClnYKmc)); lyrics refer to Russians as creatures of the swamp, while Ukrainians are called Arian knights; also to Father Khmelny (Bohdan Khmelnytsky), a Ukrainian Cossack who revolted against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and massacred thousands of Poles and Jews in 1648-1649. Irony of ironies, he then sought protection against the Poles by becoming a vassal of the Russian Tsar—see Appendix 3 (Ethnic Ukrainians), Appendix 5 (The Protocols of the Elders of Zion). As wartime songs go, Yarmak's efforts are a far cry from “I'm gonna hang out my washing on the Siegfried Line” or “There'll Be a Hot Time in the Town of Berlin When the Yanks Go Marching In”.

genocide of the Russian-speaking population. According to a report on [Voltairenet.org](http://voltairenet.org), on March 13, 2022, Ukrainian television channel 24 broadcast a show in which the host, Fakhruddin Sharafmal, called for the extermination of all Russians, including women and children: “We need victory. And if we have to slaughter your families to do it, I'll be one of the first to do it. Glory to the nation! And hope that there will never be such a nation as Russia and Russians on this earth again because they are just scum who are destroying this land. If the Ukrainians have the opportunity, they should do what they are basically doing right now, viz. to destroy, slaughter, kill, and strangle the Muscovites. And I hope that everyone contributes and whacks at least one Moskal.”¹⁰⁷ Also, one of the first acts of the post-Maidan government was to deprive the Russian language of its traditional status as an official language. The Western media remained virtually silent. Even shutting down opposition media, arresting or expelling opposition leaders, and war crimes against the civilian population of Donbas were passed over in silence or else condoned as legitimate, if slightly regrettable, actions of a beleaguered democratic regime against an evil dictatorship.

Zelensky, a comedian and actor with no political experience whatsoever, had been promoted by the Cypriot-Israeli oligarch Ihor Kolomoisky¹⁰⁸, who had produced a hugely popular television series, “Man of the People”, in which Zelensky played the leading role of a lowly schoolteacher's rise to the Presidency. Kolomoisky's businesses stood to gain from trade and cooperation with not only the West but also Russia. However, the US, then under the presidency of Donald J. Trump¹⁰⁹, quickly intervened to pry Zelensky away from his patron with promises of money and arms, if he would align himself with the West's designs on Ukraine. Eventually, Kolomoisky was forced to leave Ukraine. Assured – or so he thought – of the backing of the West, Zelensky fell prey to megalomaniacal delusions. When the Russian SMO started, he began to present himself as the political conscience of the world, insisting that all his demands be met immediately, lecturing all and sundry that they were evil people, if they did not assist him in “defeating Putin”—“If Ukraine does not defeat Putin then he will defeat all of you.” Such impressively nauseating theatrical performances got him invited all over the West to be fêted, kissed and embraced as a conquering heroic saint. In truth, he was just a pawn in a geopolitical power struggle that went far over his head, a figment of the West's political establishment's imagination—for the West needed an imaginary war hero to legitimize its attempt to salvage its crumbling, morally decrepit Empire.

In Ukraine itself, Zelensky was a hostage of the Ukrainian “extreme right”, a redoubtable force of vehemently Russophobe ultra-nationalists – e.g., Right Sector, Svoboda (“Freedom”, originally the Social-National Party of

¹⁰⁷ voltairenet.org/article216124.html; read the feeble rebuke by the Ukrainian Commission on journalistic ethics (cje.org.ua/en/news/regarding-the-behavior-of-fakhruddin-sharafmal-on-the-air-of-24-tv-channel/): Channel 24 was controlled by the TRK Group of Kateryna Kit-Sadova (wife of the mayor of Lvov)

¹⁰⁸ nytimes.com/2019/11/13/world/europe/ukraine-ihor-kolomoisky-russia.html

¹⁰⁹ Having won the presidency in the 1916 elections, Trump discovered that he was persona non grata in Washington, D.C., where he was opposed in almost everything he did by deep-state actors in the bureaucracy, the judiciary and the media. In a futile attempt to remedy the situation, he invited some neo-cons into his administration, notably Mike Pompeo, a former CIA director (as Secretary of Foreign Affairs), and John Bolton, an inveterate neo-conservative warmonger (as Foreign Policy advisor)

Ukraine¹¹⁰) and other Banderite groups, descendants of Stepan Bandera's Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists of the 1930s and '40s. They were financed by various business tycoons (“oligarchs”), who controlled most of the country's valuable resources as proxies for their Western, mostly American and British financiers.¹¹¹ These extreme-right forces wielded, and continue to wield, considerable power in Kiev through their heavily armed and well-trained militias – most (in)famously the Azov Regiment – that had been cherished and trained by the West¹¹² and then incorporated as elite corps into the official army. They had been and continued to be useful allies of the American neo-conservative foreign policy establishment, even though their ultranationalist ideology is fundamentally as anti-EU and anti-US as it is anti-Russia. They would not hesitate to eliminate Zelensky, if he sold out to the West (to the benefit of the Kievan oligarchs) or agreed to negotiate with Vladimir Putin (to the benefit of American and European taxpayers).¹¹³ They were the driving force behind the post-Maidan government's policy of silencing all opposition. Before the SMO began, the Western media had regularly reported on the nefarious influence of those extremist groups on Ukrainian politics, but afterward they pretended that these groups were unimportant, marginal phenomena, as irrelevant to the government in Kiev as the Ku Klux Klan is to Washington, or a drug-dealing German motor gang to the EU Commission.

In November 2023, Zelensky, the West's great hero of democracy, announced his intention to suspend elections for the duration of the war – i.e., for as long as the West would send money and weapons to Kiev to keep the illusion alive that Ukraine was bound to win: “Now is not the right time for elections.”¹¹⁴ Thus, beginning in June 2024, Zelensky will no longer have constitutional authority in Ukraine—but why should a truly progressive democrat care for a constitution, the dead hand of the past? Meanwhile, in Russia, presidential elections were held in 2024, according to the schedule prescribed by the constitution. They resulted in the re-election of Vladimir Putin, this time with the greatest margin of his political career.

2023 had seen the dismal failure of the ballyhooed Ukrainian spring, summer and fall “counteroffensives”. The confidence in the Zelensky regime was faltering among the increasingly war-weary Ukrainian population – or what remained of it, for millions of Ukrainians had fled the country, either to the West or to Russia. At the same time, in Russia, the vast majority of the population had become aware of the fact that the West was waging a proxy war on Russia. There was no more appetite for those¹¹⁵ who wanted to turn Russia

¹¹⁰ The name change dated from 1995. Western interest in Ukraine dictated downplaying the National-Socialist (“Nazi”) sympathies of the party.

¹¹¹ See above note 103, on page 28

¹¹² See above, note 22, on page 5

¹¹³ Incredibly, Zelensky, now the political figurehead of Ukraine's Nazi past, was the guest of French President Macron on the 80th anniversary of the Allied landings in Normandy, while Russia was shunned (even though Russian troops had made the landings possible by engaging and defeating the best German armies on the eastern front).

¹¹⁴ <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/03/30/europe/ukraine-election-zelensky-intl/index.html>

¹¹⁵ E.g., the notorious huckster, Alexei Navalny (1976-2024); according to Western media, he was the most significant opposition leader against President Putin, although he was virtually unknown in Russia itself and his followers were mostly nouveaux riches in Moscow, Saint-Petersburg and a few other cities. Often accused and convicted of fraud, corruption and treason, Navalny was expelled even from the pro-West liberal party. However, he continued to attract financial support from the West. He died in prison – of natural causes, according to the medical report, which his mother, but not his widow, accepted. No doubt hoping to continue to

into a debt-ridden, thoroughly financialized satrapy of the West – another Ukraine.

3. THE ELITE, THEIR MEDIA AND THE ADULTERATION OF THE LAW

In today's Europe and the US, non-descript “democratic values” (defined and re-defined ad hoc by the corporate-political elite and its media outlets) substitute for democratic procedures. Accordingly, the primary function of Western politicians is no longer to “represent” but “to stand up to” the voters—whose “values” may not match the currently ordained fashion—to silence, censor and demonize any opposition to the oligarchy, and so to clear the path for locating decision making power in ever bigger international and multinational constructions, far removed from and inaccessible¹¹⁶ to ordinary men and women – preferably in technocratic organizations, run by the experts of various industries that stand to profit most from “super imperialism”.

At present, the corporate mass media are little more than vehicles of propaganda. Their function is to persuade, not to inform. The first more or less systematic treatise on the techniques of political propaganda had been included in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1925). It was based on Hitler's admiration of British propaganda during WWI. A sanitized summary version was shortly thereafter published by Edward Bernays (*Propaganda*, 1928). Its opening paragraph states: “The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country.”¹¹⁷ Bernays made propaganda an academic discipline (under labels such as ‘communication science’ and ‘marketing studies’). Anybody with enough money can learn to master the techniques of propaganda for his or her own purposes. However, it takes real media power to prevent the public from seeing or hearing only one's own propaganda.

I still remember the days when there was an opposition press in my country, but those days are gone. The American sickness of consolidating the major media in a few corporations that relentlessly dish up the same narratives – the same *pensée unique*¹¹⁸ – has spread all over the West.¹¹⁹ The formula of the

collect Western donations to Navalny's cause, his widow suddenly appeared at various high-level Western political gatherings. [time.com/6967013/exclusive-yulia-navalnaya-speaks/](https://www.time.com/6967013/exclusive-yulia-navalnaya-speaks/)

¹¹⁶ Where money and credit are concerned, there are two operationally separate circuits: commercial or retail banking (to which everyone has access) and national and supranational banking (to which only state actors and the national or global elite have access). In the retail banking sector, Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) is set up to control every individual's life in minute detail by checking, in “real time”, every cent of his income and expenditures. In the global banking sector, it is set up to facilitate transactions between big players and to give them instant access to unlimited amounts of credit. (realitycheck.radio/replay/our-digital-future-james-corbett-independent-journalist-on-cbdcs-digital-ids-and-more/)

¹¹⁷ An early reference to what is now called the ‘invisible government of the deep state’

¹¹⁸ Warnings had come already in the 1970s, e.g., Jean-François Revel, *La Tentation Totalitaire* (1976), *La Nouvelle Censure* (1977). I stopped reading newspapers in 1985, because there were too many false stories in the national media about local events about which I had first-hand knowledge. Also, I had grown up without television and never picked up the habit of “watching the news”.

¹¹⁹ Beginning in the late 1990s, I had to remind students on several occasions that they were the most systematically, most thoroughly indoctrinated and brainwashed generation in the history of the world. Most of them had grown up in a virtual reality of mass produced context-less words and images and lived under a regime that had learned to use Orwell's 1984 and

corporate mass media is simple: Because, with few exceptions, the readers and viewers of the mass media are unable and, in any case, unlikely to check the veracity of what they are told, they will believe anything, certainly if all the mass media to which they have access whistle the same tune. Moreover, it should not be too difficult to silence the few exceptions by ridiculing, shadow-banning, or otherwise intimidating them. Some dissidents might be co-opted as “controlled opposition”, allowed to dissent on one or two marginal points, provided they are first in line to calumniate other dissidents as lunatics, “conspiracy theorists” or “Putin lovers”.

Prior to February 24th 2022, the Western oligarchy had not yet fully instructed the media what to say and what not to say about Ukraine. So, occasionally, more or less accurate reports of what was happening there would reach the Western public. The oligarchy's – and therefore the media's – attention had been focused on the campaign of Donald Trump in the 2016 US presidential elections, his threats “to drain the swamp in Washington” and “to bring an end to America's forever wars”¹²⁰ – in brief, his threat to take on the oligarchy and the mainstream media, which it owned. In 2016, ordinary Americans, sensing that they were considered superfluous people declared their intention to vote for Donald Trump, in protest against the Democrats, the ruling Party in Washington. Leading Democrats (since the days of Bill Clinton, prominent spokespersons for the oligarchy) routinely humiliated and excoriated them as “deplorables” (Hillary Clinton) or even “the dregs of society” (Joe Biden¹²¹). Accordingly, from 2017 onward, the media focused on ridiculing and vilifying President Trump and his supporters. The anti-Trump propaganda was largely effective, at least on an international level, in Western Europe. In 2016 I heard many ordinary people assert categorically “Trump is mad” – as if they knew him personally – even though it was obvious enough 1) that they had no clue about American internal politics or even the electoral system in the USA, and 2) that many of them would have been ardent Trump supporters, if they had been American citizens.

The second point was not lost on the European political establishment. As the 2016 Brexit referendum in England and the rise of populist sentiment all over Europe had shown, European politicians eventually would have to choose between service to the oligarchy and service to the people – between, on the one hand, the money and status supplied by the global oligarchy (through the international institutions and financial and trade flows it controls) and, on the other hand, the votes of the people they supposedly represent – votes which, in principle, they should obtain only by proving themselves capable of upholding the age-old law of convivial freedom (i.e. living together in freedom and peace

Huxley's Brave New World as technocratic manuals rather than warnings against dehumanization. See Michael Nehls, *The Indoctrinated Brain* (2023)

¹²⁰ Under the presidency of Trump's predecessor, Barack Obama, the US was actively involved in at least eleven wars. According to US Army General Wesley Clark, a candidate in the Democratic Party's “primaries” for the 2008 elections, the Pentagon had plans “to take out seven countries in five years” (Sudan, Somalia, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Lebanon, and Iran). See the interview with Clark on [youtube.com/watch?v=6Knt3rKTqCk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Knt3rKTqCk). An incomplete list of notable American/CIA interventions since WWII: Korea 1950, Guatemala 1954, Indonesia 1958, Cuba 1961, Vietnam 1961, Congo 1961, Brazil 1964, Dominican Republic 1965, Greece 1967, Argentina 1976, Nicaragua 1981, Grenada 1983, Philippines 1989, Panama 1989, Iraq 1991, Serbia 1995, Sudan 1998, Yugoslavia 1999, Afghanistan 2001, Iraq 2003, Yemen 2002, Somalia 2006, Lybia 2011, Syria 2011, Ukraine 2014

¹²¹ [youtube.com/watch?v=7_JQsbuMt0k](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7_JQsbuMt0k)

and on friendly terms¹²²) in the right or just way. After all, to uphold that law – i.e. to uphold “the Rule of Law” – had been the original *raison d'être* of the modern representative (“democratic”) state.

According to that original rationale, the representative organ (the Parliament, the “ruling power”, the “power of the purse”) of the state, is supposed to impose rules on the executive branch (the Government or Administration, the “police power”, the “power to spend”)¹²³, to ensure that the executive did not abuse its power of enforcing the law. The Parliament is not supposed to govern the people by imposing rules (“laws”) on them—the law of conviviality does not need to be legislated, as it is within every civilized person's comprehension. With respect to the people, the Parliament is the supreme judge *under the law*. Separating the power to rule, i.e. the power to judge (*jurisdiction*), from the power to command (to govern, *gubernaculum*) and subordinating the latter to the former is the essential precondition of civilized society. Wisdom takes precedence over force. Thus, under the Rule of Law”-conception of the modern state, the law of conviviality is supposed to be adjudicated ideally by judges agreed to by the parties to a conflict, or if this proves impossible, by judges selected in accordance with rules and conditions laid down by the ruling power, the state organ that represents the people. The role of legislation is limited to restraining the police power of the state and to ensuring that no one can avoid judgment according to law, a fortiori, that no one can “take the law into his own hands, unless he does so in self-defence against an obviously unlawful, clear and immediate aggression”.

However, the Rule of Law was subverted from early on by the special interests of an oligarchy of “successful people”, large landowners and wealthy merchants, later also industrialists. They replaced the Rule of Law with the Rule Legislation (rules of their own making). To succeed in doing that, they had to wrest education out of the hands of traditional, non-political authorities (parents, local communities, churches), which they thought incapable of providing anything more than education in “good manners”. In their view, education needed to be based on science and technological expertise, because its primary purpose was to increase “the Wealth of the Nation”¹²⁴ by producing good (skilled) workers and good (docile) citizens that would follow and serve the Nation's truly dynamic, innovative, progressive, entrepreneurial wealth creators. For the oligarchy, traditional education was all too often an obstacle to wealth creation. The function of the state was to remove that obstacle and to put in its place a modern system of schooling, dedicated to instruction in scientifically enlightened techniques. This idea gained traction in intellectual circles under the influence of John Stuart Mill's widely read *On Liberty* (1859). It engendered the idea that state-legislated schooling was the essence of a “liberal education”; also the idea that legislation liberates or emancipates

¹²² The Law of Conviviality is also known as the Natural Law or the Law of Reason, but the latter label has been misunderstood ever since ‘reason’ ceased to be a synonym of ‘intelligence’ and became a synonym of ‘rationality’ (see below, page 35).

¹²³ Separating the power of the purse and the power to spend was an echo of the medieval theory that the king had to beg the “estates” (the income producing landholders and traders – the nobility, the religious orders, the burghers) for money for specific undertakings (such as going to war) and maintaining his royal prerogatives (e.g., minting the coin of the realm, marrying into or making alliances with other royal houses). However, enterprising kings soon found other means of getting the money (conquests, taxation, loans, inflating the currency) and so to buy the support of various factions of the estates or to set up one estate against another: *Divide et impera*—divide and command.

¹²⁴ The concept was made famous by Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776)

people from strictures of unenlightened common sense. Before long, most Westerners came to believe what they were told in state-dominated school systems (arguably the first and most comprehensive mass media), viz. that legislation is the first and most important “source of law”. Of course, if we peek behind the veil of scientific enlightenment, we see that legislation is produced in an opaque, opportunistic process of wheeling and dealing among politicians, bureaucrats and lobbyists for various particular interest groups. In contrast, the classical, and for a long time traditional, conception of law had been the principle of peaceful coexistence and productive cooperation among the many and highly diverse human beings on the planet.¹²⁵ Legislation is definitely not a source of law. On the contrary, law is the touchstone of morally justifiable legislation. Legislation appeals to particular interests of individuals and groups. The appeal to law is an appeal to the human conscience, to all of civilized humanity's common sense of things being in order or in disorder, being right or wrong. However, over the course of my career (now a distant memory), I noticed the diminishing status of philosophy of law (sustained reflection on the fundamental distinction between right and wrong, justice and injustice) and the rising status of something called ‘legal philosophy’ (a contrived rationalization of how a legal system remains the same, even though it today makes illegal/legal what, until yesterday, was legal/illegal – in other words, a rationalization of “decisionism”, i.e. opportunism and arbitrariness in high places).

Law and justice vs legislation and policing

The law of convivial freedom has three principles, which apply to everybody without distinction: “live in good faith, harm no one, and allow each to enjoy what is his own”¹²⁶ – in simplified form, “Live and let live in mutual respect”. Accordingly, justice, the art or skill of applying that law, requires a dedicated, constant and perpetual will to give to each what is his due in the infinitely variable, often tumultuous circumstances of life. Justice under the law of conviviality is all a civilized person is entitled to expect of others; it is also the least he ought to be prepared to grant to others. Obviously, today's oligarchy's idea of total control is incompatible with the law of conviviality.

In the West, the law of conviviality has been replaced, at first gradually then in a revolutionary manner, by the law of socialization, i.e. the “social” or “collective” organization of virtually all human relations within hierarchical, bureaucratic constructions of directors and their subordinates, commanders and their underlings. Every one of those constructions is subject to “the iron law of oligarchy”.¹²⁷ The principal law of oligarchic organization is that all the lower-ranked members of an organization should unconditionally obey the orders given by their superiors, ultimately the director(s) of the organization, to attain

¹²⁵ Thinking in terms of Man and his World *sub specie aeternitatis*, rather than “Our group, here and now”, had been the great achievement of Greek philosophy. It was retained in much of the theology of medieval Christianity.

¹²⁶ Ulpian's classic formulation in *Digesta* 1.1.10 (recorded in the sixth-century law books of the Roman Emperor Justinian): *Honeste vivere, alterum non laedere, suum cuique tribuere*.

¹²⁷ Robert Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie. Untersuchungen über die oligarchischen Tendenzen des Gruppenlebens* (1911); Michels' iron law of oligarchy holds for all but the smallest organizations. It applies with particular force in enduring, multigenerational organizations, where entrenched oligarchies are the rule rather than the exception.

the goals which the directors set for it. Every member of an organization must know his place and the job description that goes with it. In almost all cases, this implies “Do not act on your own initiative but follow orders or ask permission”. At most only a few officers of an organization have *plena potestas*, and then only in strictly limited areas and for specified purposes—they are free to choose the means and methods to achieve the goals set by their superiors. Only the directors (de jure or de facto owners, top managers) of an organization have *plenitudo potestatis* (fullness of power)—they are free to set the goals as well as the ways and means of achieving them.

Obviously, the law of conviviality cannot apply within an organization. In a convivial order, it is perfectly all right to say to another: “You want to go that way? Please do, but I’ll go this way.” One does not expect to hear that answer from a nurse to the surgeon’s instruction, from a shipmate to the captain’s command, or from an ordinary citizen to the government’s legislative and regulatory directives.

Nevertheless, the classical idea of organization still presupposed that the directors ought to be intelligent, wise persons (sages), who have knowledge of the law of conviviality and are committed to make sure that their organization and every one of its members fully respect that law in interactions with outsiders.¹²⁸ At bottom, there are only two ways of ensuring respect for the law of conviviality. One way is through the enhancement of civilization by educating people to self-control their expressions, in words or actions, of their impulses, urges, wants and desires. However – as noted above – in the West education has been reduced to full-time schooling by arbitrarily assigned agents of massive state-funded bureaucracies, and by exposure to peer pressure in a particular age cohort in the schools (the “culture of the playground”, which is more often than not defined by the corporate producers of comic strips, television series and ephemeral celebrities). The other way is through perfecting techniques of external enforcement (policing) by the administration of rewards and punishments¹²⁹. The obvious problem with the latter is that policing techniques can be used to ensure not just respect for the law of conviviality but also – and far more easily – obedience to any commands whatsoever. Experts in policing are not ipso facto experts in justice.

Intelligence vs rationality

In Europe, starting in the fifteenth century with the rise of large armies and their corps of full-time staff officers (whose job it was to win wars for their commander-in-chief, usually a king, duke or ambitious magnate), the insistence on intelligence and wise judgment was increasingly replaced with an insistence on rationality and structures of effective command. Rationality is but a small, technical, calculating part of intelligence or wisdom, viz. the part that is concerned with “getting what one wants, while playing by the rules” (whatever the rules may be: rules of chess, basketball, mathematics, rules laid down by the current commander or legal system). The moral or ethical aspects of intelligence make the difference between “civilized humane person” and “cunning human animal”, but they are not parts of the modern conception of rationality.

¹²⁸ See Appendix 14 (Plato)

¹²⁹ Rewards and punishments are matters of government (*gubernaculum*). They are not to be confused with praise and blame, which are matters of ruling (*jurisdictio*).

People now speak of “artificial intelligence” (AI), but that is a misnomer for “artificial rationality” (AR), which is technologically enhanced, high-speed processing of enormous amounts of suitably formatted data according to complex systems of pre-defined rules and commands. Intelligence views things in context and seeks to judge conscientiously. Rationality demands that the context be specified, so that it can be treated as one more set of data. It does not judge conscientiously or otherwise; it calculates. However, super fast calculation – Big Data processing – does not come cheap. It requires enormous amounts of energy to keep the “servers” running and water to prevent them from overheating. Only the super-wealthy oligarchy can afford the infrastructure that makes artificial rationality possible. They determine who will have access to which part of that material infrastructure. There may be ways to circumvent or disable the built-in filters of AR programs and force them to provide unfiltered answers to questions, but these ways are in any case far beyond the ken of ordinary end-users.¹³⁰ As long as these filters are kept secret, AR is a powerful weapon of mass deception. As they are being developed mainly under “defence contracts” (i.e. as instruments of war), they are also powerful weapons of mass destruction. Consequently, each one of them is expected to provide the ability to sabotage other AR-programs a split second before it gets destroyed by them. Speed is of the essence; time for conscientious reflection is not. AR promises to eliminate the pesky, irrational, error-prone human factor. How can it do so without also eliminating future Arkhipovs and Petrovs¹³¹, the human factors that once did and may yet again save the world from assured destruction?

In the modern conception of rationality, “what one wants” is no longer considered a matter to be judged by reason (intelligence or *ratio*, in the classical sense of the word) but a somehow given (not to be questioned) objective or goal. Accordingly, rationality is now concerned almost exclusively with the utilitarian problem of devising means and methods for effectively (and preferably efficiently) getting what one wants. For most people – including journalists and “science workers” – this usually means getting what their paymasters want. On this modern view, the meaning of life is no longer living wisely or intelligently; it is getting satisfaction, the sooner the better.

In the process of reducing intelligence to modern, utilitarian rationality, consideration of principles of law and morality dropped out of the picture: “The end to be sought justifies the means to be used”. This translates ultimately as “The means are the end to be sought” – e.g., “Amassing more power to amass more power justifies amassing more power”. As, in this context, ‘power’ means ability to make others do what one wants them to do, total control (absolute power) emerges as the one and only rationally justifiable end or goal. Or, as one might also put it: The one and only rationally justifiable end is reducing others to pre-programmed, remote-controlled robots. Thus, mind control, by incessant propaganda, indoctrination and distraction, became a rational imperative of power seeking. That is where controlling the school

¹³⁰ An end-user may become aware of these filters when an AR programs starts answering probing questions with “I do not understand the question” or “Sorry, I cannot help you”, or starts repeating the same answer again and again (which usually means “I have no permission to say anything more”). See the hilarious debate between Scott Adams and a ChatGTP robot, on youtube.com/watch?v=O1QWWBc6yYs; also mikestone.substack.com/p/a-friendly-chat-about-cell-culture

¹³¹ See above, note 38, page 8

systems and the media entered the political picture. As means of power seeking, they were soon followed by the prescription of stupefying, stultifying drugs (e.g., sedatives, opioids), also pesticides, adjuvants and additives to food, drink and medicine, other medical interventions (e.g., vaccinations, lobotomies, electroshocks), and ultimately by remote-controlled electronic implants (micro- and nanotechnology). In their politicized uses, the latter techniques are essentially high-tech forms of poisoning and torture. They open up the possibility of physically controlling the actions, even the thoughts, of other people.¹³² According to the logic of utilitarian power seeking, control of the schools, the media, medical, pharmaceutical and telecommunications industries should be conjoined to control of the traditional military industries.

This momentous change in the dominant view of man and his world is most conspicuous in the elite's conception of populism. 'Populism' is a term that in the twentieth century came in vogue to label, on the one hand and in a positive sense, ordinary people's attitude toward living peacefully with others—"Leave us in peace" (the proverbial "Vox populi, vox Dei")—and on the other hand and in a pejorative sense, the actions and the rhetoric of "demagogues", who want to mobilize the populace against their present social superiors – ultimately, against the present oligarchy – not to restore respect for the law of conviviality but to replace one oligarchy with another. In any case, from the elite's point of view, populism is a threat to their power, prerogatives and privileges. However, even now, the reference to "ordinary people" or "the common man" is mostly a reference to people with no other particular distinction than that they are civilized, satisfied with treating others and being treated by others in a just, lawful manner.

The change in the dominant view of man and his world is also conspicuous in modern "higher education". The universities may still admit intelligent, wise students but then go out of their way to turn them, as they turn other students, into mass-produced *idiots savants*, experts in applying one or other academically approved (or merely fashionable) teachable method or skill, without a thought for the cultivation of their intellectual and moral character. The output of these universities-turned-into-technical-finishing-schools is then let loose on a labour market dominated by large to gigantic governmental and commercial corporations. Within these big organized structures, the graduates are supposed to function as specialist technicians and administrators. The more ambitious of them hope to climb the organizational career ladder and to make it into the blessed circle of senior staff officers, possibly even as commander-in-chief. The goals of the organizations they work for do not really matter—their rationally emaciated intelligence is not concerned with the quality of goals, only with the usefulness of means and methods for attaining given objectives.

In the industrial age, the larger corporations still produced tangible goods, but their growing addiction to cheap credit fostered the growth of corporations that specialized in amassing "universal means", money and power, which are

¹³² This was the explicit aim of the CIA program known as MK-Ultra (early 1950s to early 1960s – see Stephen Kinzer, *Poisoner in Chief: Sidney Gottlieb and the CIA Search for Mind Control*, 2019). It was supposedly discontinued by the mid-1960s—i.e. it ceased to be a secretive CIA operation—but the relevant research continued in various research institutions and university departments (e.g., medicine, clinical and social psychology, sociology, communications science) and military and police academies (e.g., techniques of crowd control) – all of them funded by the government or another big corporation. Cf. President Eisenhower's Farewell Address (January 17th 1961): "Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity."

useful for any purpose whatsoever. In the late nineteenth century, finance and government began to coalesce into a technocratic organizational structure that had no other purpose than amassing more money with which to buy anything whatsoever and more power with which to take anything whatsoever—as Julius Caesar put it: “With money buy men; with men take money.” As noted above: Big Business became Big Government, and vice versa. At the top of that highly structured organizational (but to outsiders utterly opaque) network was the national oligarchy, justifying itself as the elite – the “elect” of the meritocracy that had arisen from the modern cult of rationality and efficiency.¹³³

Personal and corporate liability

It usually does not take long for the elite to become a technocracy, almost exclusively composed of former careerist technicians and administrators, unable to judge the quality of ends, goals or purposes other than the greater accumulation of the means of power. For them, efficiency is an abstraction, an absolute. They do not recognize that efficiency is subjective and relative – the same thing may be efficient for one group or purpose but not for other groups or other purposes.¹³⁴ That is because, in their way of thinking, what matters is only this: getting more of what one wants by getting every thing one wants faster or more cheaply. The rationale usually given for this cult of efficiency is: By doing things efficiently, we can free time and means to do more of the things we want to do. The problem with this is not only that most people have no clear idea about what else they would want to do, if they had more free time or more means; it is also that having to do things more quickly or more cheaply may be unbearably stressful, while the quality of what is actually done is likely to suffer.

In a convivial setting, where people are personally responsible and liable for what they do, these problems are relatively unimportant. Because in that setting, there are no structural, let alone institutionalized, ways for shifting the problems created by one's own actions onto one's neighbours (one's peers), it is difficult to durably externalize the costs of one's actions. Consequently, irresolvable liabilities exist typically only within single small households as consequences of “domestic abuse” of spouses, children, or domestic servants. However in a heavily socialized setting (such as modern society), the situation is different. There, large households (organizations, corporations, states) predominate and their “domestic abuse” may affect thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of subordinates, all of them bound by the rules of responsibility and liability dictated by the directors or chief managers – not by the law of conviviality. It should surprise no one that directors or managers of such large entities prefer rules that diminish their personal liabilities by shifting them unto parts or even the whole of their organization. This is especially easy in “public” organizations where the nominal owners (members, shareholders, citizens) are legally anonymous and the directors and managers get away with presenting themselves as mere employees of the organization. As mere employees they can claim that they are only doing their job, viz. make the

¹³³ See e.g., John Ralston Saul's *Voltaire's Bastards – The Dictatorship of Reason in the West* (1991)

¹³⁴ Murray N. Rothbard, “The Myth of Efficiency”, in Mario J. Rizzo (ed.), *Time, Uncertainty, and Disequilibrium* (1979), pp. 92-98

organization more cost-efficient by externalizing the cost-liabilities of their decisions unto their subordinates, unto the nominal owners, or unto outsiders, who may have to spend a fortune trying to find out just where in the organization the decision was taken that harmed them. This is a particularly nice arrangement, if – as is so often the case – the directors or managers determine how much they should be paid for doing their job and how the liabilities of their decisions should be distributed among people who are not involved in making those decisions and lack the knowledge to judge the technical merit or rationality of those decisions on the basis of publicly available information (i.e. information not under the control of the management).

People usually look to the state to discipline the leadership of large private corporations. They do so assuming that the state is not only independent of such corporations but also more powerful than they are. However, the state itself is a large corporation. Its political leaders (presidents, ministers and affiliated political-party leaders) are as eager to avoid being personally liable for the effects of their policies as their counterparts in private corporations are. They share the same corporate management culture. To meet the demand for accountability, they like to organize supposedly “independent higher authorities” (state-like international or multinational organizations) to legitimate their actions and policies. All of these organizations are committed to the principle that their directors or managers cannot be held personally liable, no matter how much damage their corporate decisions cause “on the ground”, i.e. to ordinary private persons.

Gutting the laws of personal responsibility and liability is the enduring legacy of the managerial revolution¹³⁵ (of the socialization of capital de jure in the hands of anonymous nominal “owners”, and de facto in the hands of managers with little to no personal liability for their managerial actions). In *On Violence* (1970), Hannah Arendt noted: “In a fully developed bureaucracy there is nobody left with whom one can argue, to whom one can present grievances, on whom the pressures of power can be exerted. Bureaucracy is the form of government in which everybody is deprived of political freedom, of the power to act—for the rule by Nobody is not no-rule. Where all are equally powerless, we have a tyranny without a tyrant.”

4. THE EMPIRE OF LIES

After the Second World War, the contradictory attempt to curb the excesses of technocratic power at the national level by imposing elaborately organized, supposedly expertly designed, international, transnational and supranational versions of the same, created a vastly greater need for technocratic administrations and an expanded arsenal of expertise. However, from its very beginning, that superstructure was dominated by the US, which considered itself “an exceptional nation”, not subject to any law but instead a law *sui generis* unto the rest of the world. For the American oligarchy, the goal of global hegemony seemed to be within reach. Of course, “hegemony” means never having to fear any serious competition. In blunter terms, it means having the power and the money to squash competitors or – which is even better – to prevent any competition from arising.

¹³⁵ See above, page 18

The West routinely makes ample use of crude propaganda techniques, e.g., “endless repetition of the same lies”, “simplification” (Climate Change: blame CO₂; Covid: blame sarscov2; WWII: blame Hitler, War in Ukraine: blame Putin), “projection” (insistently accusing one's opponents of doing what one is doing oneself), and “redefining the meaning of words”¹³⁶. Such techniques serve to rationalize curbing free speech and other civil liberties, and censoring or defunding independent scientific enquiries. The media provide “fast intellectual junk food” and “instant opinions” on a 24/24, 7/7 basis. They count on masses of dumbed-down consumers to swallow dubious or even pseudo-science and accusations unquestioningly and without considering the motives of the supposed experts or the accusers. The general theme of propaganda is, of course, exploitation of ignorance and doubt. By de facto monopolizing widely-used channels of information, the oligarchy's media make it nearly impossible for most of their consumers to find out just how much of the official narrative is actually disinformation or misinformation, or how much information is wilfully suppressed. Of course, it is easy to overstate the power of the media over their consumers, who retain the ability to decide whether to read, listen or watch. But, it is not easy to overstate the power of the media bosses over their employees, who are paid to keep filling pages and airtime slots with what their bosses want to propagandize. They risk losing their livelihood, if they should decide to follow their conscience. Cogs in the media machines, they can ill afford to give in to the temptations of honesty, truth or reality. So they dutifully continue “selling sleep on the long road to nowhere” (Jon Rappoport¹³⁷).

More than fifty years ago, in 1971, US Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black opined in *New York Times vs The United States*: “The Government’s power to censor the press was abolished so that the press would remain forever free to censure the Government. The press was protected so that it could bare the secrets of the government and inform the people. Only a free and unrestrained press can effectively expose deception in government. And paramount among the responsibilities of a free press is the duty to prevent any part of the government from deceiving the people and sending them off to distant lands to die of foreign fevers and foreign shot and shell.” Today, that message sounds utterly naïve. Who will protect the people from the oligarchy that controls the media as well as the deep state, where the government hides behind the freedoms of private-sector corporations and the latter hide behind the prerogatives of the government?

Corona and the global coordination of media propaganda

In early 2020, the year of the novel coronavirus, almost all of the media (newspapers, newsmagazines, radio, television, the big Internet platforms, Google, Youtube, Facebook, also Wikipedia) immediately fell in line with the official narrative of a life-threatening, highly contagious viral “pandemic”¹³⁸ that could only be addressed with draconian police measures until the pharmaceutical industry came up with “a safe and effective vaccine”, that would end the pandemic – but “only if every person on Earth were

¹³⁶ The World Health Organization redefined the meaning of ‘pandemic’ for the first time in 2009, to be able to call the Mexican flu (a.k.a. Swine flu) a pandemic disease and to launch a worldwide vaccination program that proved utterly futile. See [cbsnews.com/news/swine-flu-cases-overestimated/](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/swine-flu-cases-overestimated/)

¹³⁷ jonrappoport.substack.com/p/writing-vs-scratching-on-the-walls-of-the-nyt

¹³⁸ See Appendix 15 (The corona-pandemic, 2020-2022)

vaccinated”¹³⁹. However, as the average age at death of covid19 was far above average life expectancy in most countries, it was clear from the beginning that the health risks of the corona-virus (Sars-cov-2) and the disease (Covid-19) it was presumed to cause were vastly exaggerated. So was the alleged reliability of the methods of diagnosis (e.g., the much ballyhooed PCR tests¹⁴⁰, also the even less reliable “Rapid at-home”-tests).¹⁴¹ From the beginning of the PCR-testing craze, critics noted: “Want to end the pandemic? Stop testing—and let doctors treat their patients according to traditional diagnostic methods, i.e. as individuals, not as statistical artefacts.”

However, with the blessing of the World Health Organization (which is heavily subsidized by the pharmaceutical industry and associated oligarchs, most notably Bill Gates and the Wellcome Trust), the healthcare bureaucracies of the Western policy establishments immediately agreed to impose severe disruptions of regular medical care as well as heavy-handed and utterly arbitrary lockdowns – all in the name of preventing contagion to prevent overburdening the intensive-care units of hospitals. Nevertheless, it was known from the start that almost no one died of the virus. Most officially declared covid19 mortalities suffered from many “co-morbidities” and were in such bad health that any complication, even a common cold, would have killed them. About the early, so-called disaster area in Bergamo (northern Italy), the Italian press agency, Agenzia nova, reported already on March 13th 2020: “There may be only two people who died from the coronavirus in Italy who did not show any other symptoms. This is evident from the medical files examined so far by the Istituto Superiore di Sanità, said the institute's president, Silvio Brusafarro, during today's press conference in Rome.” Brusafarro added: “Remember, these people died with the corona virus in their bodies and not from the virus.” Only in September 2020 did the American CDC (Centers for Disease Control) admit that at least 95% of the registered corona dead had suffered from “on average, 4.0 additional conditions or causes per death”.¹⁴²

In countries (e.g., in Africa¹⁴³) where standard medical care was not interrupted and “lockdowns” were not implemented or were generally ignored, “the virus” had no detectable statistical effect. Yet, it was not until early 2024 that international and national health bureaucracies and even pharmaceutical corporations began to admit that “mistakes were made”¹⁴⁴ – of course, without admitting their culpability in causing the disaster. The media too remained silent about their disgraceful, gratuitous fear-mongering stance during the entire episode.

¹³⁹ This statement was propagandized by US President Joe Biden, German Chancellor Merkel, French President Emmanuel Macron and other political authorities pretending to speak for “the Science”. youtu.be/zI3yU5Z2adi (Propaganda 101)

¹⁴⁰ PCR tests are known to give 100% false positives – e.g., the supposed Bordetella pertussis outbreak in the Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center (New Hampshire) in 2006. That was about a bacterial infection (which can be checked against a lab-controlled “pure culture”). However, it is impossible to produce “pure cultures” of viruses. On the Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center case, see nytimes.com/2007/01/22/health/22whoop.html and cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5633a1.htm

¹⁴¹ Pierre Chaillot, Covid 19, ce que révèlent les chiffres officiels fin 2023: mortalité, tests, vaccins, hôpitaux, la vérité sous nos yeux (2024)

¹⁴² See cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid_weekly/index.htm

¹⁴³ See apnews.com/article/coronavirus-pandemic-science-health-pandemics-united-nations-fcf28a83c9352a67e50aa2172eb01a2f; mises.org/wire/low-vaccination-rates-africas-covid-deaths-remain-far-below-europe-and-us

¹⁴⁴ zerohedge.com/covid-19/ex-cdc-director-says-its-high-time-admit-significant-side-effects-covid-19-vaccines; the ex-CDC director in question was Robert Redfield

The media took it upon themselves not only to advocate the most draconian, arbitrary even down-right silly non-medical measures and policies, but also to institute severe censorship of all dissident opinions, even those held by the, until then, most respected scientists, physicians, pathologists and statisticians—many of them were ostracized, lost their jobs or saw Wikipedia entries about them altered by anonymous editors. Meanwhile, their supinely compliant colleagues were lavishly subsidized for declaring even the most dubious cases ‘certified covid19 victims’. Paying people to lie is an effective method for skewing the statistics. It is not the only one—lying with statistics is easy. This is especially true, if the health authorities impose rules such as “Suspicion of covid19 = Covid19”¹⁴⁵ or “Positive PCR test proves sarscov2 infection” on doctors writing death certificates.

In any case, during the corona-panic, the oligarchy learned an important, lucrative lesson: Western populations are constantly dissuaded and distracted from doing their own thinking and constantly advised to defer to supposed experts “known from television”. Consequently, if enough money is invested in propaganda to make people live in fear of imminent death then they can be made to believe and do anything one wants them to believe and do – including accepting the shutting down of formerly standard medical care and devastating losses of income and opportunity, and standing in line to be injected with an expensive, hastily concocted, never adequately tested¹⁴⁶, new type of “vaccine” (actually, a genetically active substance) that quickly proved neither safe nor effective. It is now generally acknowledged that the “covid vaccines” are not effective in preventing or spreading infection. It is also admitted that “although they are generally safe, they may occasionally cause serious adverse effects, even death”. In fact, the statistical signal of their unsafe nature was much stronger than the adverse-effects signal of all previous vaccines taken together.¹⁴⁷ Of course, the consumers of mass-produced news were not informed about these facts. Neither were they informed about the fact that in most countries normal product-liability rules did not apply to the covid “vaccines”.¹⁴⁸ Nothing could be permitted to hamper the stream of billions of tax money into the coffers of Big Pharma, a major player in the oligarchy, a major sponsor of the media, a major lobbyist on the political scene, and a major “philanthropic” donor and content provider to universities, scientific institutions, and large-circulation medical journals (e.g., Nature, The Lancet, New England Journal Of Medicine)¹⁴⁹.

Without a doubt, the covid hoax¹⁵⁰ had been the most effective peacetime

¹⁴⁵ realclearpolitics.com/video/2020/04/08/dr_birx_unlike_some_countries_if_someone_dies_with_covid-19_we_are_counting_that_as_a_covid-19_death.html

¹⁴⁶ [bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n627](https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n627)

¹⁴⁷ According to the American Vaccine Adverse Effects Reporting System (VAERS), 67% of all reports in the period 1990-2024, occurred in the years 2021, 2022 and 2023 – i.e. the years of the covid vaccines – see medalerts.org/vaersdb/findfield.php?&PRECISION=2&UNIFORMONSET=&TABLE=ON&GROUP1=APPY; also the April 22nd 2024 interview with Japan’s Prof. Dr. Masanori Fukushima (https://odysee.com/@CMSi:9/Masanori_Fukushima_disaster_vaccination:0)

¹⁴⁸ hoover.org/research/vaccines-and-liability-0;

¹⁴⁹ John Jureidini & Lemon McHenry, *The Illusion of Evidence-based Medicine* (2020); nybooks.com/articles/2009/01/15/drug-companies-doctors-a-story-of-corruption/; also Marcia Angell, *The Truth about Drug Companies* (2005);

¹⁵⁰ rumble.com/v52ocm9-seven-shocking-rki-files-the-government-knew-prof-dr-stefan-homburg.html (Prof. Dr. Stefan Homburg on the release of Robert Koch Institute files); rumble.com/v4zwqxi-former-cdc-director-says-the-agency-tried-to-hide-that-the-covid-vaccines-d.html (former director Robert Redfield)

propaganda campaign in the war on truth in history. It was far more effective than the decades-old campaign to terrorize people and especially children with the threat of the imminent collapse of the Planet's "eco-system" – an excuse to accumulate layer upon layer of public debt on the backs of ordinary people, to drive down the capital value of, and then buy up at low prices or confiscate, small landholders' private properties all over the world, and to invest the proceeds in the oligarchy's various new technologies, supposedly required for the success of its "green agenda's" (e.g., genetically modified organisms, hydrogen fuelled machines, nano- particles and nano-machines, mRNA vaccines¹⁵¹, geo-engineering¹⁵², and God knows which other things). The common extortionist theme: "Get used to our new normal or you'll die."

Fortunately for the oligarchy, the Russian SMO in Ukraine provided a perfect excuse for shifting the public's attention away from the unravelling covid hoax onto a new demon, Russia's President Vladimir Putin. The oligarchy could do so without dismantling the huge propaganda apparatus that had been so effective in demonizing first Trump and his supporters as "mad authoritarians" and then the covid-sceptics as "grandma killers" and "science deniers". For the oligarchy's media conglomerates, playing fast-and-loose with the truth is par for the course, but questioning oligarchy-subsidized "science" borders on criminality.

The lies that killed Ukraine

About Ukraine, one lie, incessantly peddled by the media and their paymasters, was that Ukraine is a country inhabited by a single people, the Ukrainians, who were now being attacked by foreign invaders, the Russians. In truth, as noted above, Ukraine was a highly divided country, and the Russian SMO was not an attack on Ukraine but an attempt to put an end to the relentless eight years old war the regime in Kiev was waging – with the support of the West – against the people of two dissident provinces in the Donbas who sought to secede from Ukraine out of fear of being turned into second-class citizens, or worse, into a persecuted minority. In 2022, the media decided that it was okay for the West to support the aggressors in that war, but not okay for Russia to come to the aid of its victims.

Let us not waste time on the ridiculous lies produced by the Ukrainian propaganda machine: The heroes Snake Island,¹⁵³ the Ghost of Kiev,¹⁵⁴ Chornobaivka,¹⁵⁵ etc. By far the biggest Ukraine-lie is "If Putin succeeds in Ukraine, he will not stop there." There is not a shred of evidence for that thesis. One reason for Russia's extremely cautious and reactive¹⁵⁶ operation in Ukraine is that it wanted to demilitarize but not occupy Ukraine. It did not have the means and did not want to carry the burden of having to police a population of incorrigible Russia-haters, armed and financed by the West. Of course, the West's policy of supplying Kiev with ever more potent longer-range missiles "to strike targets in Russia" makes it a military imperative for Russia to extend

¹⁵¹ Alexandra Henrion Caude, *Les apprentis sorciers* (2023)

¹⁵² See Appendix 16 (Geo-engineering)

¹⁵³ [mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/ukraines-snake-island-heroes-who-32935830](https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/ukraines-snake-island-heroes-who-32935830)

¹⁵⁴ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ghost_of_Kyiv

¹⁵⁵ [bbc.com/news/world-europe-63754797](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-63754797)

¹⁵⁶ The Russian strategy reacts piecemeal to escalations from Kiev and the West. E.g., it waited more than two years before attacking conventional electricity-producing installations, rather than just power lines (which are easily repaired).

its “safe zone” deeper into Ukraine. Even so, Putin never declared the occupation of the whole of Ukraine a political imperative.

Still, the media continually represent Russia as an aggressive, imperialistic dictatorship – an accusation they ridiculously try to make plausible with references to past events in Chechnya and South Ossetia, even to Syria. However, Chechnya is a small republic in the North Caucasus regions of the Russian Federation. In the 1990s, it was caught up in the Jihadist onslaughts that caused so much trouble, terror and death in the Middle East and Western Europe, eventually in the USA¹⁵⁷. The First Chechen War started in 1994, when Russian President Yeltsin was up for re-election and Russia was in a most chaotic condition, its army underfunded and demoralized. Chechen ultranationalist separatists¹⁵⁸ in league with Jihadist forces in the Northern Caucasus sought to exploit the situation, while the rest of the population (Chechens and Russians) begged Moscow for help. The war formally ended in 1996, but the insurgency and Jihadist incursions continued. In 1999, the Second Chechen War erupted, when a wave of terror attacks struck many Russian cities, including Moscow in 2002¹⁵⁹. Moscow claimed the attacks originated in Chechnya and decided to clear the area with a military operation. Although he was pre-occupied with rebuilding Russia itself and dealing with the class of oligarchs and mafia gangs that had come to dominate the country under Yeltsin, President Putin ended the Second Chechen War in 2007. Restoring good relations with Chechnya paid off in the first year of the SMO. Chechen troops were amongst the fiercest forces coming to the defence of the Donbas provinces.

South Ossetia, just across the southern border of Russia, was formally the northern-most part of the former Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia (capital city: Tbilisi) and, after 1991, of the Republic of Georgia. South Ossetia was the victim of Georgian ultra-nationalism and some Jihadist terrorism. A large segment of its population consisted of ethnic Russians, which the Georgian nationalists wished to expel. The ethnic Russian population had sought to separate from Georgia in 1991-1992, but South Ossetia was placed under the joint control of Moscow and Tbilisi. When tensions flared up again in April 2008, Russian President Medvedev sent troops through the Roki tunnel under the Caucasus mountain range to restore order in South Ossetia. On August 12th, a cease-fire agreement, negotiated by French President Nicholas Sarkozy, ended hostilities. Russia recognized South Ossetia as an independent state, but declined its request for inclusion in the Russian Federation.

One might argue that the Russian intervention in South Ossetia was a breach of the 1992 Joint-Control Agreement with Georgia. If it was also a breach of international law then it was of about the same order of magnitude as the American interventions in Grenada (1983) and Panama (1989). Moreover, it was the only unilateral¹⁶⁰ intervention of the Russian Army outside the borders of the Russian Federation in the period between 1991 and the beginning of the SMO in Ukraine. In contrast, over the same period, the US participated militarily in at least eighteen wars, and played a role as financier or by means of covert operations in many more countries – not one of them even close to its

¹⁵⁷ The destruction of the two major towers of the World Trade Centre on September 11th 2001 was blamed, without proof, on Osama Bin Laden's Jihadist Al Qaeda group.

¹⁵⁸ As had Ukraine, Chechnya had suffered greatly under Soviet rule.

¹⁵⁹ britannica.com/event/Moscow-theater-hostage-crisis

¹⁶⁰ See Appendix 17 (Syria)

borders or inhabited by a sizeable number of Americans. The US has more than 800 extra-territorial military bases and installations, spread all over the world. Not counting the one in Crimea, Russia has only two military bases in countries that do not border Russia (Syria, Transnistria). However, it allegedly has agreements on planning bases with several African states (e.g., Niger) that wish to secure themselves against Western neo-colonial meddling. In the Newspeak of “the progressive West”, trying to secure one’s borders is “imperialism” (if it is not “racism”); covering the globe with military bases (some equipped with nuclear and bioweapons) and economic sanctions is “spreading democratic freedom”.

In March 2022, the Russian army pulled back from the area around Kiev, partly in anticipation of the planned negotiations in Istanbul¹⁶¹, but also because it was vastly outnumbered by Ukrainian forces. By March 30th, the Russians had pulled out of Bucha, a town near Kiev, after days of shelling by the Ukrainian army. Two days later, the Western press published photographs of bodies in the streets of Bucha alleging that the Russian army had executed civilians and committed an atrocious war crime. However, one of the photographs showed a close-up of a victim whose hands had been bound behind his back with a white ribbon of the kind worn by Ukrainian civilians who were sympathetic to the Russian SMO. For me, that photograph was a telltale sign that the media version of the event was dubious at best. Why should the highly disciplined Russian army execute its sympathizers? The timeline of the events quickly revealed that the Russians had nothing to do with the bodies in the streets. On the 31st, the mayor of Bucha, announcing that the Russian army had left the town, declared: “We are all safe and sound”. He made no mention of bodies in the streets, although the Ukrainian shelling and operations by Ukrainian resistance fighters in the previous week may have made many victims. Then the SBU (Special Forces of the Ukrainian police) entered the town. By the time the regular Ukrainian Army reached the town, the bodies were there to be photographed. The obvious conclusion: they were bodies of victims of the Kiev regime’s reprisals against its internal opposition, not of Russian aggression against civilians. When the official Bucha story threatened to unravel in full view of the world, an American satellite operator, Maxar, came to the rescue, publishing photographs that allegedly proved that the bodies were already in place on the 19th of March – as if a high-tech company (and military contractor) is incapable of altering the date stamp on, or photo-shopping, electronically processed images. Implausibly, the Maxar photographs suggested that citizens of Bucha had not bothered to collect and bury the bodies of their family members, neighbours and friends for nearly two weeks. Nevertheless, the oligarchy’s primary European propaganda outlet, the BBC, went out of its way to ridicule doubts about the official narrative of this alleged Russian war crime.¹⁶²

Accusations of a Russian missile attack on Kramatorsk train station (April 8th 2022) were easily discredited: fragments of the missile revealed that it was of a type that was used by the Ukrainians, not by the Russians. Moreover, its position on the ground indicated that it had reached Kramatorsk from the South-East, not from the East (where the Russians were).

¹⁶¹ See above, page 5

¹⁶² [bbc.com/news/60981238](https://www.bbc.com/news/60981238)

Wikipedia, eager to endear itself to the oligarchy (as it had done consistently with respect to the oligarchy's Climate Change and Green Agendas and its Corona-Covid policies), soon found allegations of Russian war crimes all over Ukraine.¹⁶³ For good measure, Wikipedia mentioned also one – only one – Ukrainian war crime: shooting captured Russian soldiers in the knees as they were unloaded from a van – the “Mala Rohan incident”, which was proudly documented on video by members of a militia of Ukrainian nationalists that was by then integrated in the Ukrainian army. Wikipedia's treatment of the humanitarian situation during the 2014-2022 war in Donbas was only slightly less biased. It mentioned “allegations of war crimes by both sides”.¹⁶⁴

The “Russian war crimes”-hysteria eventually resulted in the International Criminal Court's¹⁶⁵ issuing an arrest warrant for Vladimir Putin and his Presidential Commissioner for Children's Rights, Maria Lvova-Belova, for the crime of “kidnapping children” (elsewhere in Ukraine and the world – and formerly in the West¹⁶⁶ – known as evacuating children from an active war zone).

The West concentrated on winning the propaganda war with the full connivance of its obedient media in an effort to justify its refusal to seek a negotiated solution to the conflict: “We do not negotiate with war criminals.” Reproducing, ad nauseam, press communiqués issued by the authorities in Kiev and ignoring or vilifying critical voices had become the West's standard of “objective journalism”.

Lying as policy

Of course, lies and provocations are at the basis of all the wars of the Western powers, from “Spain sinks the U.S.S. *Maine* in Havana harbour” (the Spanish–American war) onward. Remember “German soldiers kill Belgian babies with their bayonets” and “German U-boat sinks the passenger ship *Lusitania*”¹⁶⁷ (WWI); Roosevelt's lies about “Tokyo's unprovoked surprise attack on Pearl Harbour”¹⁶⁸ and “Hitler's design to conquer South America and use it as a base for attacking the US”; Churchill's lies about total support for Poland, albeit on condition that Poland refuse to negotiate with Hitler about a corridor to Gdansk, and about Hitler's “plans to invade England” to justify a week-long bombing campaign on Berlin and so to provoke Hitler into revoking his embargo on attacking Great Britain (WWII); Lyndon Johnson's lie about the “Gulf of Tonkin Incident” to justify escalating the Vietnam War; G.H. Bush's

¹⁶³ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_war_crimes

¹⁶⁴ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humanitarian_situation_during_the_war_in_Donbas

¹⁶⁵ See Appendix 8 (International courts)

¹⁶⁶ E.g., during the Battle of Britain in the Second World War, the British authorities evacuated children from cities that were likely to be bombed by the Nazis to the country side: iwm.org.uk/history/the-evacuated-children-of-the-second-world-war

¹⁶⁷ The *Lusitania* was built as a passenger ship; in 1915, when it was sunk, it was used as an “auxiliary warship”, carrying ammunitions through a war zone to England. As a result of the incident, President Woodrow Wilson, accepted the resignation of his Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, a non-interventionist and advocate of US neutrality in foreign wars, and replaced him with the interventionist Robert Lansing. (On July 17th 2014, a Malaysian passenger plane, MH17, inexplicably flew over an active war zone in the Ukrainian Donbas, and was “shot down”, according to the Western media, “by the Russians”. See John Helmer, *The Lie that Shot Down MH17*, 2020)

¹⁶⁸ Roosevelt used this lie to send nearly 120.000 Japanese (including, in violation of the Bill of Rights, ca 90.000 American citizens) to concentration (“internment”) camps: (history.com/this-day-in-history/fdr-signs-executive-order-9066)

lie about “Iraqi soldiers killing Kuwaiti babies in their incubators”¹⁶⁹ (the First Gulf War); G.W. Bush's lie about “Iraq's weapons of mass destruction” (the Second Gulf War); Cameron and Sarkozy's lie about “Colonel Gaddafi's use of rape as a weapon against the opposition”; Obama and Hillary Clinton's lie about “the Syrian government's use of chemical weapons against its own people”¹⁷⁰, which was followed by US air raids, illegal under international law (War in Syria); and Biden's lie about “Russia's unprovoked attack on Ukraine”. This is just a sample of egregious lies. The full history of US secret operations in Asia, Africa and Central and South America still needs to be written.¹⁷¹ It ranges from murder (e.g., of the Congo's first elected Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba in 1961) to rent-a-crowd financing (e.g., in the 1953 CIA Operation Ajax to get rid of Iran's elected Prime Minister Mossadegh and restore the emperor “Shah” Mohammad Reza Pahlavi to regain control of Iran's oil).

It is said that eventually the truth will come out. But, ‘eventually’ does not mean in the foreseeable future. Only a minority of Americans still believe that President Kennedy was shot by “a lone gunman” (as the official Warren Commission¹⁷² concluded) but, in violation of enacted legislation, more than sixty years after the event, not all the relevant documents have been made public. We still wait for the truth about the “Watergate scandal”. Was it a break-in (June 17th, 1972) at the offices of the Democratic Party's National Committee authorized by President Nixon (the official version); or was it a deep-state machination¹⁷³ to drive Nixon out of office (which is what happened: Nixon resigned on August 9th, 1974) and get his newly appointed Vice-President, Gerald Ford¹⁷⁴, to take over? Unlike Ford, Nixon was never liked by, and did not trust, the policy establishment in Washington, but he had been re-elected with the biggest margin in history: almost all of the votes in the Electoral College and almost 61% of the popular vote (albeit with only about 55% of the voting age population actually voting—but that was an about average turnout for second-term elections). Consequently, he had to be stopped.

Also, the truth about the 9/11/2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York has not yet come out. The official version of what happened: A handful of Muslim terrorists took some lessons in flying single-motor planes, high-jacked four passenger jet planes, flew two of them into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center, one into the outer wall of the Pentagon and crashed another in a field in Pennsylvania – all of these events happening while the US Air force was absent from the region between the Canadian Border and

¹⁶⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nayirah_testimony : how to use a Kuwaiti ambassador's 15 year old daughter to justify a murderous war

¹⁷⁰ See Appendix 17 (Syria)

¹⁷¹ E.g., A.W. McCoy's *The Politics of Heroin: CIA Complicity in the Global Drug Trade* (2003); *A Question of Torture: CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror* (2006), and *In the Shadows of the American Century: The Rise and Decline of US Global Power* (2017); also Daniele Ganser, *USA: The Ruthless Empire* (2023); Douglas Valentine, *The CIA as Organized Crime* (2017)

¹⁷² Former CIA director Allen W. Dulles – he had been sacked by Kennedy – was a prominent member. At that time, the CIA and the media began to use ‘conspiracy theorist’ as a derogatory term for anyone who publicly doubts the veracity of the officially approved versions of politically important events. See Lance deHaven-Smith, *Conspiracy Theory in America* (2014)

¹⁷³ See Appendix 18 (Watergate scandal)

¹⁷⁴ Gerald Ford was a typical Washington insider. He had been a member of the Warren Commission that had investigated the murder of John F. Kennedy

Washington, D.C. This narrative has been called into question numerous times by engineers, demolition experts, aviation experts, people familiar with the inner workings of the Pentagon, and journalists who asked the obvious question, “Who profits from the attacks?” Still, the media always find an academic or former policy insider who delights in “debunking” critics of the official narrative, usually without investigating his or her possible conflicts of interests.

Of course, the corporate media have no interest in discussing the impact of the CIA's long-running, ever-expanding Operation Mockingbird¹⁷⁵, the explicit purpose of which is to hide inconvenient truths and to spread convenient lies, half-truths and distractions. Remember James Jesus Angleton's (an early CIA director) famous quote, “Deception is a state of mind and the mind of the state”; William Casey's (CIA director under Reagan) “We’ll know our disinformation program is complete when everything the American public believes is false”¹⁷⁶; and Mike Pompeo's (Secretary of State under Trump) happy reminiscence of his time as CIA director, “We lied, we cheated, we stole. We had whole training courses.”¹⁷⁷ In the US, the CIA often substitutes for the corps of civilian diplomats, even though it is a secret army rather than what it is supposed to be, viz. an organization that informs the President about developments in foreign countries.

When “populist” President Donald Trump ran for re-election in 2020 against long-time Washington insider and former Vice-President (under Obama) Joe Biden, his predicted win did not materialize. Late at night on Election Day, vote-counting was stopped in several states, where Trump was in the lead. When the count resumed the next morning, Biden had overtaken Trump. Despite numerous protests, the political establishment and their subservient media stuck to the official story: “All is well, nothing to see here.” Popular protest led to a massive manifestation in Washington, D.C., on January 6th 2021, and a much smaller march on the Capitol Building, where senators were about to vote on validating the election results. On the steps to the terrace on one side of the building, a melee developed between protesters and police forces, while on the other side, the Capitol Police let protesters inside the building for a peaceful walk-around.¹⁷⁸ The political establishment falsely accused Trump of inciting his supporters “to storm the Capitol” and to “instigate an armed insurrection”¹⁷⁹, although no protesters inside or outside

¹⁷⁵ spartacus-educational.com/JFKmockingbird.htm; Carl Bernstein, “The CIA and The Media”, Rolling Stone Magazine, October 20th, 1977

¹⁷⁶ truthstreammedia.com/2015/01/13/cia-flashback-well-know-our-disinformation-program-is-complete-when-everything-the-american-public-believes-is-false/

¹⁷⁷ His response to a student's question about foreign policy, Texas A&M University, April 15th, 2019

¹⁷⁸ cha.house.gov/cha-subcommittee-reading-room-fe781e74-d577-4f64-93cc-fc3a8dd8df18

¹⁷⁹ Trump's speech was recorded in toto on multiple videos, none of which showed the slightest evidence for these charges. However, the media preferred reporting the statements of Democratic Party and Anti-Trump politicians and deep-state spokesmen to reporting the facts. FBI Director Christopher Wray spoke of “armed insurrection” and “domestic terrorism”, Democratic Judiciary Committee Chair Dick Durbin called the protestors “insurrectionists... the latest incarnation of a violent white supremacist movement that has terrorized fellow Americans on the basis of their race, religion, and national origin” (c-span.org/video/?509033-1/fbi-director-christopher-wray-testifies-january-6-capitol-attack&live#). Durbin was following Obama, who had regularly called critics ‘racists’, to avoid having to answer their arguments. By playing the “racism” card, Obama hoped to unify the political establishment in Washington against the populism of ordinary people who instinctively distrust highfalutin declamations by people “who play with fire but don't even know that fire is hot” (to paraphrase George Orwell's characterization of “Left-wing thought” (in *Inside the Whale*, 1940). Trump, in contrast,

the Capitol building were known to have been carrying firearms.¹⁸⁰ All of those who were inside quietly left the building when ordered to do so by the officers who accompanied them. Nevertheless, many of them were later arrested, prosecuted and condemned to excessively long and harsh prison sentences—some were held in solitary confinement. Their real “crime” was being Trump supporters. While the American media enthusiastically joined the Democratic Party's witch hunt, the European media dutifully presented the transatlantic establishment's narrative as factual – no questions asked. When polls indicated Trump's continued popularity, Time Magazine (on February 4th 2021) attributed his defeat to a skilfully conducted “secret but legal” campaign by Democratic Party operatives funded by oligarchs and trade unions of teachers and civil servants.¹⁸¹

In 2021, the politicization – political corruption – of the American court system went in overdrive. It had started during the Trump Administration (2017-2021), when the oligarchy and the political establishment in Washington it controlled (almost the entire Democratic Party and the so-called RINOs – Republicans-in-name-only, or “Anti-Trumpers” as they then called themselves) had used their wide-ranging and intensive contacts within the Department of Justice and the media not only to subvert the President's decisions (especially on illegal immigration, his main campaign pledge), but also to prosecute his closest collaborators¹⁸², most-vocal supporters¹⁸³, and eventually to “impeach” the President himself (in 2019, and again in 2021) in mock trials in the US House of Representatives. The “impeachments” had no constitutional effect, because they were purely party-political procedures of indictment (accusation) in the House of Representatives, not followed by conviction in the Senate. They were merely attempts to shape public opinion.

When it became clear that Trump remained popular and intended to run again in the 2024 presidential election, the policy establishment hit him with

appealed to ordinary people who refused “to let their face grow to fit the mask” the media were painting on it (a paraphrase of Orwell's words, in “Shooting an elephant”, 1936).

¹⁸⁰ “To my knowledge we have not recovered any [firearms] on that day from any of the arrests at the scene at this point.” said Jill Sanborn, assistant director of the FBI's Counterterrorism Division at an official hearing. “No one has been charged with a firearms violation.” See [justthenews.com/government/congress/senate-hold-second-hearing-security-failures-leading-capitol-siege](https://www.justthenews.com/government/congress/senate-hold-second-hearing-security-failures-leading-capitol-siege)

¹⁸¹ [time.com/5936036/secret-2020-election-campaign/](https://www.time.com/5936036/secret-2020-election-campaign/)

¹⁸² Among them Trump's National Security Advisor, General Michael Flynn, eventually even his lawyers

¹⁸³ In November 2022, ten years after the facts and despite multiple public apologies, investigative journalist Alex Jones was ordered to pay \$1.4 *billion*, most of it to some of the families of the victims of the Sandy Hook school shooting (December 12th, 2012) but also tens of millions to an FBI agent who had happened to be on the scene. Jones was accused of having caused psychic harm to the families by calling the shooting a staged event. The decision bankrupted Jones, whose total wealth amounted to a few million dollars. However, the lawyers who initiated the case were not interested in the psychic harm to their clients. That became clear when they wanted to silence Jones, preventing him from earning any income from his popular radio and television broadcasts. If they succeed then it will be impossible for their clients to receive more than a tiny fraction of the sum awarded to them. Again, the establishment media (including Wikipedia) did not care. They continued to vilify Jones remorselessly, in part because he was far more often right about events and developments than they were. Steve Bannon, another popular podcaster and Trump supporter, was sent to prison from July 1st to November 1st 2024 for not cooperating with the partisan “January 6th 2021 Committee” (an act that is usually punished with a fine). He will not be able to communicate with his large audience until the election is over. The same had happened on another occasion to economist and Trump supporter Peter Navarro. One might think that the shady politicized legal moves against Jones and Bannon constituted “interfering with the electoral process”. But that was not what the media wanted their audience to think.

dozens upon dozens of expensive civil and even criminal lawsuits (concerning “victim-less crimes” that existed only in the minds of a few partisan public prosecutors¹⁸⁴ and judges in super wealthy districts – such as Manhattan, the home of the oligarchy – where ordinary people are hard to find and would be excluded from sitting as members of a jury in a Trump trial at the slightest suspicion of their being Trump supporters—in contrast, even outspoken anti-Trump jurors were okayed by the judge¹⁸⁵). The obvious motive for these prosecutions was to prevent Trump from campaigning, possibly even to disqualify him from running, and – at the very least – to intimidate and frighten away his more timid supporters. Again, the American media were ecstatic, chanting “See, nobody is above the law”, even though prominent lawyers (e.g., Alan Dershowitz, Robert Barnes, Jed Rubenfeld) and commentators (e.g., Fareed Zakaria, Joe Rogan, Glen Greenwald) did not mince words in condemning the complete abandonment of long-established principles of justice and due process, and long-standing precedents, by the state prosecutors and judges that cooperated in the Biden administration's campaign of “lawfare” (abuse of the prosecutorial and judicial systems¹⁸⁶) against its major electoral opponent.¹⁸⁷ Most lawyers agreed that verdicts against Trump were likely to be reversed on appeal – but that did not matter to the Biden camp, because the appeals would be decided only after the elections.¹⁸⁸

Sad to say, the European media and political establishments again sheepishly followed the American official narrative. Most Europeans know of the US only from stories told by its national and international media, which are based in Washington and New York (The New York Times, The Washington Post, CNN, MSNBC, Bloomberg, etc.), all of which tell essentially the same stories, because they are owned by, and propagandize the designs of, the same oligarchy. Occasionally, criticism of the official line reaches the public, but only if it is clearly labelled ‘Fiction’ (e.g., Hollywood films or novels).

By the time the Russian SMO got under way, the West had truly become an Empire of Lies and Arrogance. However, the West greatly underestimated the resilience of the Russian Federation and its diplomatic ability to build up support in Asia, Africa and South America, especially in countries where resentment against Western arrogance and neo-colonial impulses ran high. Could it be that Western reports about Putin's becoming more and more isolated are greatly exaggerated?

¹⁸⁴ In some states (of the US), the office of Attorney General is awarded to the winner of an election. The oligarch and billionaire ideologue George Soros has donated lavishly to help elect many Democratic or anti-Trump candidates – hence the expression ‘Soros prosecutors’.

¹⁸⁵ Juan Merchan, a former prosecutor, presided over the trial, despite the fact that his daughter runs a consultancy firm involved in the electoral campaigns of Democratic Party politicians. Conflict of interest? “No” ruled the judge in his own favour. Eventually the jury convicted Trump, although nobody could make out exactly for which crime he was convicted. However, for the exultant media that was no problem at all. By traditional standards, the trial was a series of due-process violations, a travesty of justice (see below, note 187)

¹⁸⁶ Recently, the practice of lawfare has spread to Europe as well (against the AfD party in Germany, and the populist Vlaams Belang, in Belgium)

¹⁸⁷ [rumble.com/v532ock-uncovered-legal-system-weaponised-trump-hunter-bannon-and-biden-the-winston.html](https://www.rumble.com/v532ock-uncovered-legal-system-weaponised-trump-hunter-bannon-and-biden-the-winston.html)

¹⁸⁸ Trump has probably learned that he cannot function as president without the support of the oligarchy. He has recently supported sending billions to Ukraine, and ramped up his anti-Iran and anti-China rhetoric—the Republican Party and the “Christian Right” are hysterical about “China infiltrating and taking over the US”. Whether this is merely a tactical, electoral move or a strategic embrace of America's “forever wars to achieve hegemony” remains to be seen.

And so the war in Ukraine continues, while the West seeks to expand it to Georgia, another neighbour of Russia, and to Taiwan, ostensibly to deter China from threatening US economic interests by maintaining normal relations with Russia (thereby sabotaging the West's sanctions policy against Russia). Moreover, American efforts to get rid of neutral politicians (e.g., Imran Khan in Pakistan¹⁸⁹) and to destabilize neutral countries (e.g., Thailand¹⁹⁰, Armenia¹⁹¹) continued unabated.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

At present, it is unclear whether, or in what shape or form, Ukraine will continue to exist as an independent nation – independent, that is to say, from both Russia and the Washington-led NATO coalition. It is also unclear how far the US and Europe will go in their attempts to prolong the war with their policy of continual escalation – continually shifting and then crossing their own red lines concerning war aims and restrictions on the delivery and use of military supplies to the gang in Kiev.

The differences in the US and European approaches to the war in Gaza (which started on October 7th 2023) are stark, even though they are now muted because of concerns in Washington (also in Brussels) about the US presidential election on November 5th. However, while the EU still aims for a two-state solution in Palestine, it has never supported a similar solution in Ukraine. There, it rejects the Donbas region's desire for independence from Kiev. Moreover, it has never come out in favour of Ukrainian neutrality or even a federalization of the Republic of Ukraine, which would have ensured substantial autonomy for its largest ethnic minority and prevented the kind of foreign interference that culminated in the Maidan coup of 2014.

However, the warmongering non-diplomat, Josep Borrell, the EU Commission's High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security, was not interested in peace and security.¹⁹² As he said in a May 3rd 2024 lecture at Oxford University: “If Putin succeeds in Ukraine, he will not stop there. The prospect of having in Kyiv¹⁹³ a puppet government like the one in Belarus, and the Russian troops on the Polish border, and Russia controlling 44% of the world grain market is something that Europeans should be aware of.”¹⁹⁴ Apparently, it never seems to have crossed what passes for his mind that the

¹⁸⁹ Imran Kahn, the hugely popular former prime minister of Pakistan (r.2018-2022), was recently sentenced to a ten-year prison term. apnews.com/article/pakistan-khan-court-hearing-graft-election-b390b903841d29ab3f95f28c1f5d459f

¹⁹⁰ landdestroyer.blogspot.com/2020/08/why-is-us-funding-protesters-to-attack.html

¹⁹¹ In 2018, a “revolutionary government” came to power in Armenia, under Nikol Pashinyan, an authoritarian neo-liberal, talking the West's talk about human rights, direct foreign capital investment and “austerity”, and a hardliner on Nagorno-Karabakh (an Armenian, Christian enclave in Azerbaijan, a Muslim country). However, in 2020, Pashinyan gave up on Nagorno-Karabakh to meet the West's conditions for closer ties with the EU. The policy caused hundreds of thousands of Armenians to flee the enclave and wide-spread protests in Armenia: apnews.com/article/armenia-protest-azerbaijan-3efe1478d6ed36ae9b0b728711b22feb

¹⁹² It is likely that he will be booted from his EU post after the upcoming elections for the European Parliament, but not likely that the EU Commission's Ukraine policy will change.

¹⁹³ In 2022, the Western media immediately adopted ‘Kyiv’, the Ukrainian spelling of ‘Kiev’, but they continue to refer to Turkey (rather than Türkiye, as the government in Ankara insists they should)

¹⁹⁴ Josep Borrell, May 3rd 2024, Dahrendorf lecture, at St Anthony's College, University of Oxford – text of the lecture: eeas.europa.eu/eeas/united-kingdom-speech-high-representativevice-president-josep-borrell-oxford-university-about-world_en ; video of the lecture: audiovisual.ec.europa.eu/en/video/I-256530

Russians may be aware of the US stationing – with the blessing of the EU's puppet states – nuclear and biological weapons minutes away from Moscow. Borrell certainly did not care to answer the essential questions: “Where will Washington's hegemonic drive stop? At what point will the EU get the idea that peace and security in Europe depend on its recognition of Russia's legitimate security concerns, after decades of Western duplicity, dishonesty and betrayal of solemn commitments?” Peace and security in Europe do not depend on the EU's continual toadying to the oligarchy that finances the US's and its own neo-conservative policy establishment.

In his Oxford lecture, Borrell admitted: “We created this problem [in Ukraine] one way or another. And we have a strong responsibility in trying to solve it. The Ukrainian existence depends on us.” To this, he immediately added: “I know how to finish the war in Ukraine. I can finish the war in Ukraine in a couple of weeks just by cutting the supply. If I cut the supply of arms to Ukraine, Ukraine cannot resist. They will have to surrender, and the war will finish. But is this the way we want the war to finish? I do not want [that], and I hope that many people in Europe do not want [that] either.”

Mr Borrell, Ukraine is bleeding because you paid its leaders to believe that ‘neutrality’ is a dirty word. Meanwhile, the West is sinking under the weight of a growing mountain of debt, while flirting with the idea of provoking a nuclear war. Mr Borrell, I cannot stop you from doubling down on your vicious belligerence, your wanting to resurrect the inglorious Ukrainian SSR—but don't claim to do it my name.

Frank van Dun
Ghent, Belgium, June 7th 2024¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁵ Thanks to Philip Vanstapel for helpful comments and additional references

APPENDICES

The purpose of the following appendices is solely to provide some relevant background information and context to statements in the main text. The Empire of Lies extends far beyond news bulletins about Ukraine.

Appendix 1 (Oligarchy)

In today's world, holding or managing vast amounts of shares in a great number of corporations all over the globe has replaced holding and managing vast expanses of land as the mark of economic power and wealth. Of course, of particular importance are corporations holding and managing ownership of, or exploitations rights to, vast expanses of natural resources (land, mines) as well as financial corporations (states, banks, money funds) that amass other people's savings to supply the huge amounts of credit that they or their clients need to buy up land and to pay for the means of exploitation (workers, tools, machinery). States do so by confiscation and taxation; other financial corporations do so by promising people to make their savings earn interest by lending them to, or investing them, in large projects.

Accordingly, in its current sense, the word 'oligarchs' is virtually synonymous with 'plutocrats'. It refers to individuals wielding enormous economic power (as dominant shareholders or directors of large industrial or financial corporations or tax-free "philanthropic" foundations) which they translate into political power as donors or providers of "technical" counselling to servile politicians, political parties and NGOs (non-governmental organizations¹⁹⁶), and by entering into PPPs (public-private partnerships) with governments, governmental bureaucracies, treaty-based organizations and intelligence services. "Private" economic and "public" political powers are never separated for long.

Oligarchs typically own or have privileged access to research, intelligence and security services, law and accountancy firms. They are in frequent formal and informal contact with each other, directly (in person) or indirectly (through their trusted confidantes, collaborators, lawyers, chief officers of one or other of the corporate entities which they own or control). Because they are rich, they are usually perceived as being on the right of the political spectrum. However, because they are oligarchs – i.e. directors or top managers of formal organizations (French: *sociétés*, societies) – they are socialists at heart. The more aspects of human life and work are socialized (incorporated in, and regulated by, large societal entities), the more extensive the oligarchy's power becomes. Unable or unwilling to grasp this point, second-rate intellectuals (including most journalists) remain stuck in the fog of the media-propagated "Progressive Left versus Reactionary Right"-imagery of political economy.¹⁹⁷ Both sides espoused the modern view that societies (economic or political corporations) should be vertically integrated production units, with powerful, commanding managers and their secretaries at the top—they are the "insiders" and have "public authority" within the society—and powerless,

¹⁹⁶ Many NGOs are now heavily subsidized with tax money. In what sense are they "non-governmental"?

¹⁹⁷ The image had its root in the first edition of John Stuart Mill's hugely popular *The Principles of Political Economy with Some of their Applications to Social Philosophy* (1848). Mill thought that "production" was a "technical problem", to be solved by scientific technology, while "distribution of what was produced" was a wholly independent ("free") political choice—"Society can distribute its income anyway it wants". However, if today's distribution of produced income makes it no longer worthwhile for the producers to produce then tomorrow's production will suffer. The choice to distribute one way or another imposes more or less costs on production and therefore decisively affects future distribution.

obedient ordinary employees or citizens at the bottom—they are the “outsiders”, “private soldiers/citizens”, deprived of public authority.¹⁹⁸ The only “political” question is then the distribution of the “societal income” among the diverse layers in the societal, hierarchically organized “structure of production”. Right-wingers advocate distribution toward the higher layers, left-wingers toward the lower layers. Both sides abandon the traditional view that the basic political or constitutional question concerns centralization versus decentralization of political and economic power – socialism versus classical liberalism. When that question was decided de facto in favour of centralization or concentration of power (partly as a result of the rise, first of large national armies and associated logistic bureaucracies, later of large industrial and financial conglomerates, modelled on military structures of command), the term ‘liberalism’ eventually came to stand for meritocracy, a right-wing doctrine that demands that income be distributed according to “merit” as measured by one's proven ability to climb the social (or career) ladder. The term ‘socialism’ came to stand for the left-wing doctrine that insists that the social product be distributed according to the socially acknowledged “need” of individuals or groups, regardless of their productive merit. Despite this seemingly irreconcilable opposition, both leftist and rightists invariably ended up calling for increasing the social product by socializing ever more aspects of life. So, both sides advocated policies that effectively favoured the emergence and consolidation of oligarchic power, while pathetically protesting and lamenting that the current oligarchs are too right-wing or too left-wing. However, whether qualified as “of the Left” or “of the Right”, socialization itself breeds oligarchy—this is the “iron law of oligarchy”.¹⁹⁹

The existence of national and even global oligarchies (elites of “deep state” stakeholders) is a well-documented fact. Many consider it a welcome fact. For example, core members of the US Democratic Party are not worried that their President, Joe Biden – the headman of the most powerful nation in the world authorized to push the red button that will unleash the country's awesome nuclear arsenal – is mentally unstable. They are not worried because they know that Biden is not really in charge but is merely a puppet of some benign, invisible government, an all-powerful deep state, of which they are or fancy themselves a significant part. However, they do worry that his mental state may cause him to lose the election to an opponent whom the deep state may not be able to control as easily as it controls Biden. They think so, at least in part because they (and most people they know) work in one or other public or private organization within the deep state. They pride themselves on knowing how to get things on or off the political agendas; to sway elected politicians into doing one thing rather than

¹⁹⁸ The modern word ‘private’ is confusing. On the one hand, it connotes the Latin ‘privatus’ (bereft, robbed, deprived), from the verb ‘privare’ (to rob, steal); on the other hand, it connotes the Latin ‘privus’ (free, autonomous, independent, or proper to a person, e.g., as a personal property). Hence, by definition of ‘privatus’, a “private citizen” is without public authority; his “private property” (even his own body, which is by nature privus to him) is under the authority of somebody else (the state). A private citizen is not a free person. A privateer is a government-licensed pirate, not a respecter of private property. Orwell's Newspeak formula “Freedom is slavery” may seem a trivial truth, if one fails to recognize that *being privus* is the opposite of *being privatus*.

¹⁹⁹ See above, note 127, on page 34. Because the Left-Right scheme applies logically only within organized societies, problems arise when it becomes evident that sections of the diverse societal strata may be opposed not only to the prevailing distribution scheme within their organization, but also to the oligarchic nature of societal organization itself. To account for them and all other “misfits” the Left-Right scheme is extended to include “extreme left” and “extreme right” positions in the spectrum. Misfits are then relegated to these extremes depending on whether they are perceived as wanting to do away with meritocratic structures altogether or wanting to redefine merit (e.g., in terms of culture, race or ethnicity rather than contribution to the social product).

another; to make the possible seem impossible, the easy too difficult (and vice versa); to change the meaning or relevance of enacted legislation by tinkering with the protocols and procedures of the bureaus or agencies that are involved in its implementation; etc.

Pointing to the existence of a deep state is not a “conspiracy theory” about a non-existent secretive cabal. The deep state is what H.G. Wells (1866-1946) called ‘an open conspiracy’²⁰⁰, an informal network of networks, based on opportunistic collusions of interests – some publicly avowed, others hushed up – not on an obsession with organized secrecy. The oligarchy hides in plain sight: “Only the small secrets need to be protected. The large ones are kept secret by public incredulity.”²⁰¹ Nevertheless, because oligarchs control the media, the connections between their operations tend to be almost invisible to the public. The oligarchy is not a formal collective-decision making board or organ. However, its common interests set the parameters within which formal organizations (corporations, foundations, governments) may operate without risking a downgrading of their access to oligarchy-controlled assets (which include financial credit, donations, sponsorships, expertise, propaganda outlets, and many other benefits).

What is now called ‘the deep state’ or ‘the invisible government’ – and ridiculed by the media as a “conspiracy theory” – political scientists and analysts of all stripes used to call comprehensively ‘the fourth, not constitutionally recognized, branch of the Government’. As it happened, that label was soon applied almost exclusively to the corporate media, occasionally also to universities and “educational” or “philanthropic” foundations as suppliers of “policy experts” to the government and safe havens for former politicians and state officials. In that restricted sense, the fourth branch consists only of publicly recognized opinion makers and opinion spreaders. However, these men and women are little more than the public faces of particular opinions, pushed or tolerated by prominent sections of the oligarchy. Many, perhaps most, are paid for and promoted by more-or-less anonymous members of the oligarchy, who have a material interest (distinct from a purely intellectual interest) in seeing their opinions become enforceable legislation and no interest at all in provoking the enmity of other prominent oligarchs. Dissension within the oligarchy certainly exists, but it should not become public knowledge, much less a source of antagonistic political mobilizations.

Regarding a nominally representative political system, the expression ‘deep state’ refers to the existence of a loose and informal coalition (network) of the real “Powers that be”, the oligarchy of unelected, largely anonymous and in any case politically unaccountable people, leaders or directors of interest groups, public or private organizations, each with considerable, possibly decisive influence over the shaping, financing and implementation of decisions in one or other area of “public policy”.

After the Second World War, Western oligarchs became increasingly active in international and supranational organizations, which they provide with the financial and other means to operate a diversity of “special programs” to advance the agendas of the oligarchy. They set up various private and semi-private clubs and organizations (e.g., the Bilderberg Group, the German Marshall fund, the Trilateral Commission, the Club of Rome, the World Economic Forum) and affiliated networks of think tanks and NGOs to coordinate their interactions with political authorities and to hire mercenary academics and journalists to shape

²⁰⁰ See archive.org/details/the-open-conspiracy-h.-g.-wells, also Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope* (1966)

²⁰¹ Quote attributed to Marshall McLuhan

public opinion.²⁰² By the 1990s, what had begun, forty years earlier, as a CIA operation (“Operation Mockingbird”²⁰³) to infiltrate the mass media (including the film industry and other sections of high and popular culture) had spread its tentacles all over the Western world.

Today's global oligarchy likes to promote “agendas” to deal with supposedly world-threatening crises (“climate change”, pandemics) about which ordinary people feel helpless, but which the oligarchy promises to be able to master, provided people unconditionally submit to a Single World Government that is empowered to do “whatever it takes, and for as long as it takes” – the “it” in question being decided by the oligarchy itself. The basic idea: Only the concerted action of the very rich and very powerful can save the Planet from ordinary people—for, as the Club of Rome declared, “the real enemy is humanity itself”.²⁰⁴ You see, the end of the Cold War had created a void that must be filled with “new enemies, new strategies and new weapons”.²⁰⁵ In other words, it was high time for the heroic oligarchy to save the Planet by developing strategies for subduing the greatest enemy of all, the common people and their common media of expressing themselves, viz. free markets in useful goods and services, and local democratic institutions.

As for the global oligarchy's involvement in the Ukraine conflict: it is obvious that the West's war against Russia started with the support of the oligarchy and that it will peter out as soon as the oligarchy begins to withdraw its support. The global elite does not intend to become collateral damage of the ineptitude of the politicians it has made and can break. Because they have the most leverage in Washington, D.C., their attitude in this year's presidential campaigns in the US will be a major factor in deciding the future of not only Ukraine but also NATO and the EU.

Appendix 2 (Roosevelt; the military-industrial complex)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, US President from 1933 to 1945, was an admirer of Joseph Stalin (and Benito Mussolini until the latter allied with Hitler). After the failure of his New Deal policy (1933-38), Roosevelt built up the armaments industry to combat persistently high unemployment. He was also a master politician. He promised to ensure that the US arms industry would have branches in almost every state in the US, so that there would be little opposition to his plan in the House of Representatives and the Senate.²⁰⁶

By December 7, 1941 (Pearl Harbor), the US was ready to participate in WWII. Hitler's Germany was Roosevelt's principal nemesis. In part because of massive American investments, Germany had made a remarkably quick recovery from the devastation of WWI and the subsequent inflation of the Weimar Republic. While the US insisted on payback of its war loans to its allies, it showed only lacklustre support for their insistence, in the Treaty of Versailles (1919), that Germany pay “reparations” for the damage it had caused them during the war. Reparations were Europe's problem, not a problem for the US. Thus, Germany was poised to become a formidable competitor to US industry, not the least its armaments industry. Having entered the USA in the war, Roosevelt decided to squash Germany, to de-industrialize it and to starve its population – cf. the 1944 Morgenthau plan,

²⁰² See e.g., Udo Ulfkotte's memoir *Gekaufte Journalisten – Wie Politiker, Geheimdienste und Hochfinanz Deutschlands Massenmedien lenken* (2014)

²⁰³ See above, note 175

²⁰⁴ Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider, *The First Global Revolution*, 1993 edition, p. 115

²⁰⁵ *Idem*, p. 70

²⁰⁶ Thomas Fleming, *The New Dealers' War* (2001)

“Suggested Post-Surrender Program for Germany”, which was abandoned only when Harry Truman, Roosevelt's successor, fell for the CIA's ruse and declared Stalin's USSR the greatest threat to America's “security interests” (i.e. “American global hegemony”). Almost instantaneously, West Germany – still occupied by American, British and French troops – became the USA's most valuable ally in Europe in the Cold War against the USSR. However, that relationship became strained in the post-Soviet period, when Germany sought intensive economic relations with Russia. As in 1917 and 1941, so in the 1990s: The American quest for global hegemony required that Germany be prevented from becoming the European power broker, getting cheap energy supplies from Russia and selling high-value manufactured products to the rest of Europe and the world (including the USA), thereby threatening the US's status as the factory of the world. However, in the 1990s, the US was transforming itself into an essentially financial power, relocating much of its industrial base to countries where labour was cheap. This move created a huge gap within the US itself between city-based centres of “high-tech services” and areas of “low-tech industrial production”.

Despite Roosevelt's legions of hagiographers, many students of history viewed him as an agent of destruction. In a letter to historian Harry Elmer Barnes, Henry Beston (1888-1968, American writer and naturalist) wrote: “Roosevelt was probably the most destructive man who ever lived. He left the civilized West in ruins, the entire East a chaos of bullets and murder, and our own nation facing for the first time an enemy whose attack may be mortal. And, to crown the summit of such fatal iniquity, he left us a world that can no longer be put together in terms of any moral principle.”²⁰⁷

To understand Beston's verdict, we should not forget that the US created the State of Israel and the enduring mess that the Middle East became after WWII. Early in 1945, when the gruesome details of the Nazi's “final solution of the Jewish problem” were becoming public knowledge, President Roosevelt visited the Middle East for consultations with King Saoud of Saudi Arabia, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, and King Farouk of Egypt.²⁰⁸ When Roosevelt raised the question of the fate of Europe's Holocaust survivors and their desire for a Jewish homeland in Palestine – “one they were willing to share with their Arab neighbours” – Saoud was firm in his reply: “The Jews should return to live in the lands from which they were driven,” he said. In short: If you want to create a Jewish state, do so in Germany. Roosevelt responded that few Holocaust survivors would want to live in Germany. Unpersuaded, the king said: “Make the enemy and the oppressor pay; that is how we Arabs wage war. Amends should be made by the criminal, not by the innocent bystander. What injury have the Arabs done to the Jews of Europe? Christian Germans stole Jewish homes and lives. Let the Germans pay.” The king suggested the Rhineland as a suitable destination for survivors of the Holocaust. Roosevelt then tried another tack: “The Arabs are numerous and their lands extensive; the Jews, by contrast, are few.” The king looked FDR in the eye and uttered one word: “No”.²⁰⁹

Of course, the US prevailed. Under pressure from its powerful Jewish and Zionist lobby, it got war-beaten England to set apart a section of its Protectorate in the Middle East for the creation, in 1948, of a new state, which was to be reserved exclusively for Jews – not “one they were willing to share with their Arab neighbours”. From its founding, Israel was de jure an Apartheid state. The British

²⁰⁷ Quoted with approval in Barnes, Harry E. “Pearl Harbor After a Quarter of a Century”, *Left and Right* 4, No. 1 (1968)

²⁰⁸ See the 1945 newsreel [youtube.com/watch?v=mZNwVgvqU_w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mZNwVgvqU_w)

²⁰⁹ politico.com/story/2019/02/14/this-day-in-politics-feb-14-1945-1164052; two months after his trip, Roosevelt died on April 12th 1945.

had objected, but to no avail. They were all too familiar with the activities in Palestine of Jewish Zionist movements (e.g., Irgun, founded in 1931) and their paramilitary organizations (e.g., Lehi, “the Stern gang”) that terrorized the British “protectors” (attack on King David Hotel in Jerusalem, 1946), the local population (e.g., the Deir Yassin massacre, 1948), and murdered a visiting diplomat on a peace mission (Count Bernadotte, also in 1948). In 1948 alone, 700,000 Palestinians were driven from their homes and lands. This created a huge refugee problem in the region, but it also gave the US a secure foothold in the Middle East. Armed to the teeth by the US, Israel went on to expand its territories (on the West bank of the Jordan, the Golan Heights and Gaza). However, because Israel gave instant citizenship to any Jewish immigrant, the highly Westernized, secular Ashkenazi Jews (mostly European Holocaust survivors, American Zionists and aficionados of the Israeli collectivist institution, the Kibbutz) gradually lost control of the state to a massive influx of religiously Orthodox Jews from all over the world who came to Israel, because it was their “Promised Land” in the most literal Old-Testament sense of the expression. The deluded “Christian Right” in the US – i.e. most “Evangelical Churches” – accepted this “Biblical view” of the 1948 State of Israel, even though it fuelled Jihadist attacks on Christian communities that ended more than a millennium of mostly peaceful co-existence among Muslims, Christians and Jews in the Near and Middle East.

Appendix 3 (Ethnic Ukrainians)

In early historic times, the people living in what is now Ukraine and what is now western Russia were both called *Rus'*—but even then, they comprised a variety of Slavic and other tribes speaking a variety of languages and dialects.

Arriving in their rowboats, along the Dnieper, Scandinavian Viking raiders (referred to as *rus'*, i.e. rowers²¹⁰) founded a stronghold in what is now Kiev. So, the area was called '*Rus'land*'. The Kievan *Rus'* founded the Varangian Empire (ca 860) under the Rurikid dynasty. The empire disappeared during the Mongol attacks in the 13th century. The Rurikid dynasty then moved to Novgorod, later to Moscow, where Ivan IV “the Terrible” (1530-1584) became the first Tsar (“Caesar”) of Muscovy and later of all of Russia (r.1547-1584). In 1613, the House of Romanov took over from the Rurikid dynasty. Thus, Russia got its name from a Scandinavian Kievan dynasty that had to seek refuge in the North from the Mongol assault; and Ukraine (from Old Russian ‘oukrania’, frontier zone, borderland, outskirts) got its name from the *Rus'* in the North, who hoped to win back the lands that had been lost to the Tatars.

From the late-sixteenth century to the late-eighteenth century, much of what is now the western part of Ukraine was a part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (1596-1797), which was dominated by Polish landholders. Militarily and administratively too weak to hold its culturally, religiously and linguistically heterogeneous population together, the Commonwealth fell apart. Parts of its territory were annexed by Prussia and Austria and the rest by Russia in the 1790s. Until the Soviet era, the elite's language in the Lvov region was German; in Russia, it was French.

Appendix 4 (NordStream 2)

In “A year of lying about Nordstream”, published September 26th 2023 on his seymouthersch.substack.com, veteran investigative journalist Seymour Hersh

²¹⁰ Derived from Scandinavian ‘Rösisti’, from Old Norse ‘roðr’, Old Swedish Röpsmenn’ (rowers)

concluded his investigation: “The Biden administration blew up the pipelines but the action had little to do with winning or stopping the war in Ukraine. It resulted from fears in the White House that Germany would waver and turn on the flow of Russia[n] gas—and that Germany and then NATO, for economic reasons, would fall under the sway of Russia and its extensive and inexpensive natural resources. And thus followed the ultimate fear: that America would lose its long-standing primacy in Western Europe.”

In other words, the sabotage of NS2 was really a ploy to lock Europe in a position of total dependency on the USA. A similar thesis had been proposed already on February 28th 2022 by economist Michael Hudson, “America defeats Germany for the third time in a century.”²¹¹ The war in Ukraine was meant not only to harass and possibly destabilize Russia but also to subjugate Europe – all in the interest of US hegemony.

To hide American involvement in what has been called “the greatest act of industrial sabotage in history”, the West later alleged that a handful of Ukrainian civilians, sailing on a yacht, the *Andromeda*, had blown up NS2.²¹² Still later, Kiev blamed the attack on Germany's energy supply on its popular General Valeri Zaluzhnyi, who had fallen out of favour for his criticisms of President Zelensky's handling of the war. Propaganda likes pointing the finger at scapegoats. In May 2024, Zaluzhny was removed from Kiev and made Ambassador to the UK.

Appendix 5 (The Protocols of the Elders of Zion)

The Protocols of the Enders of Zion (1903)²¹³ are a series of 24 short essays purporting to describe Jewish plans for world domination. At the time, anti-Semitic feelings were running high all over Europe. They were largely motivated by the prominent presence and overrepresentation of Jews in the increasingly important financial sector (banks, credit institutions) of the national economies in the age of industrialization.

Of uncertain origin, the Protocols emerged in Russia in the early 1900s. Their authenticity was first questioned in 1921 (see C.G. de Michelis, *The Non-Existent Manuscript: a Study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion*, 2004).

“Goyim [i.e. non-Jews] are mentally inferior to us; they cannot run their nations properly. For their sake and ours, we need to abolish their governments and replace them with a single government. This will take a long time and involve much bloodshed, but it's for a good cause. Here's what we'll need to do [Synopsis]:

- *Place our agents and helpers everywhere.*
- *Take control of the media and use them in propaganda for our plans.*
- *Start fights between different races, classes, and religions.*
- *Use bribery, threats, and blackmail to get our way.*
- *Use Freemasonic Lodges to attract potential public officials.*
- *Appeal to successful peoples' egos.*
- *Appoint puppet leaders who can be controlled by blackmail.*
- *Replace royal rule with socialist rule, then communism.*
- *Abolish all rights and freedoms, except the right of force by us.*
- *Sacrifice people (including Jews sometimes) when necessary.*
- *Eliminate religion; replace it with science and materialism.*

²¹¹ See michael-hudson.com/2022/02/america-defeats-germany-for-the-third-time-in-a-century/

²¹² See: theguardian.com/world/2023/mar/10/divers-used-chartered-yacht-to-sabotage-nord-stream-pipelines-report.

²¹³ vault.fbi.gov/protocols-of-learned-elders-of-zion/protocols-of-learned-elders-of-zion-part-01-of-01

- *Control the education system to spread deception and destroy intellect.*
- *Rewrite history to our benefit.*
- *Create entertaining distractions.*
- *Corrupt minds with filth and perversion.*
- *Encourage people to spy on one another.*
- *Keep the masses in poverty and perpetual labour.*
- *Take possession of all wealth, property, and (especially) gold.*
- *Use gold to manipulate the markets, cause depressions, etc.*
- *Introduce a progressive tax on wealth.*
- *Replace sound investment with speculation.*
- *Make long-term interest-bearing loans to governments.*
- *Give bad advice to governments and everyone else.*

Eventually the Goyim will be so angry with their governments that they'll gladly have us take over. We will then appoint a descendant of David to be king of the world, and the remaining Goyim will bow down and sing his praises. Everyone will live in peace and obedient order under his glorious rule."

The Protocols seem to have been inspired in part by Maurice Joly's *Dialogue aux Enfers* (1864), a satire on Napoleon III's megalomaniacal imperial ambitions. A significant number of the protocols match the list of "despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production"; i.e. "measures, which appear economically insufficient and untenable" in Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848)²¹⁴, Section II, *in fine*. There they serve the dictatorship of the proletariat rather than the Jews:

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degree, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible. Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production. Of course, these measures will be different in different countries. Nevertheless, in most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.

1. *Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.*
2. *A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.*
3. *Abolition of all rights of inheritance.*
4. *Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.*
5. *Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.*
6. *Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.*
7. *Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.*
8. *Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies,*

²¹⁴ marxists.org/admin/books/manifesto/Manifesto.pdf

especially for agriculture.

9. *Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinctions between town and country by a more equable distribution of the populace over the country.*
10. *Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c, &c.*

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character ... In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

Shorn of their Jewish, respectively proletarian packaging, The Protocols and the Communist Manifesto propose blueprints of means and methods for establishing the dictatorship of a small elite in a large country or even globally. I leave it to the reader to judge which of their proposals have already been implemented by, and which are still on the agendas, of the Western oligarchy.

Appendix 6 (Bretton Woods)

Under the 1944 Bretton Woods system²¹⁵, only the US dollar could be redeemed in gold "on demand and at a fixed price". In theory, this made the dollar "as good as gold", while other currencies had to be exchanged for dollars before they could be used to buy gold on the market. However, Bretton Woods required the American central monetary authority (the Federal Reserve System, FRS) to act in the interest of the world, but under American law, it was chartered to act in US interests only. Thus, the Bretton Woods system was doomed to fail. It lasted only twenty years. In the 1960s, under US President Lyndon Johnson, profligate spending on the War in Vietnam and on the construction of a European-style welfare state rapidly depleted the US gold stocks. In 1971, to stop the outflow of gold, President Nixon closed the "gold window", condemning the rest of the world to dependency on paper dollars, i.e. a "fiat currency" that no longer represented a real value (a definite quantity of gold). In the remaining years of the 1970s, world inflation skyrocketed, as the US, freed from the obligation to issue a gold-backed currency, started to print dollars galore. However, the US had a lucky break. Saudi Arabia and other oil producing nations decided to sell oil only for dollars and to park their oil revenues in US Treasuries (partly in return for American "protection", partly because the US was still the manufacturing centre of the world and offered the best prospects for sustained "economic growth"). Thus, the oil producing countries provided "oil backing" for the dollar – the so-called petrodollar. This gave Paul Volcker the opportunity to curb American inflation with a series of spectacular interest-rate hikes. He knew full well that the world would continue to demand dollars to buy oil and that the oil producing countries would continue to buy US Treasuries. The petrodollar seemed to make the dollar as good as oil, the primary source of energy in a rapidly industrializing world. 'As good as oil' was taken to mean 'better than gold', because the global oil market is much larger than the global gold market. Thus, the petrodollar seemed to imply an even stronger currency than the gold-backed dollar. The flipside of the coin was that the dollar became the hostage of the global oil market. The FRS still faced the choice of

²¹⁵ See Benn Steil, The Battle of Bretton Woods (2013)

providing the world with a stable reserve currency or using the dollar as a national policy tool. By the early twenty-first century, it had become clear that the US and the FRS did not intend to maintain the value of the dollar against oil any more than it had intended to maintain its value against gold. Consequently, the rest of the world, which held trillions of dollars, faced rising energy prices. Of course, unlike the US, the rest of the world could not print dollars. Moreover, most of it could hardly afford the transition to new, mostly unreliable “green energy” or natural-environment-destroying “bio-fuels”, which the West (especially Europe, awash in “Eurodollars”) was beginning to peddle under the pretext of combating climate change. Apart from the West, most of the world was beginning to question dollar hegemony

To forestall collapse of the dollar system, it needed to be “backed” by military power rather than tradable assets to maintain the dominance of the American financial institutions in what would soon turn into the greatest con game on Earth: the market in “financial products” (bonds and ever-more opaque financial derivatives). As the US, “the policeman of the world”, went rogue, fear of American economic and political (even military) sanctions replaced mutual trust as the basis of the international monetary system.

Appendix 7 (Philanthropic foundations)

On philanthropic foundations, see Rene Wormser's seminal study, *Foundations: Their Power and Influence* (1958, 1993).

In an interview with G. Edward Griffin, Norman Dodd, chief reasearcher for the Congressional Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations (the Reece committee of 1952-54), recalled that the Chairman of the Ford foundation had stated, off the record, that the aim of the major foundations was to use their grant making to restructure the US economy along the lines of the Soviet system, presumably to centralize decision-making power by strengthening the ties between politics, industry and education. Not only industry but also education (the schools, universities, and the media) had to be subordinated to national policy, principally by taking control of the teaching of American history to re-define the premise of American foreign policy from the Founding Fathers' non-interventionism and non-entanglement in foreign conflicts to global interventionism in the service of American hegemony. “To defeat the Soviets, we must adopt and adapt their system.”

Griffin's entire 1982 fifty-minutes interview with Norman Dodds is still available online.²¹⁶

Appendix 8 (International courts)

Most international organizations set up after WWII were dominated and financed by the US government or American corporate interests. They did not dare to pursue an independent course. Without becoming a member itself, the US permitted some to come into existence, on condition that they would not act contrary to US interests. An example is the **International Criminal Court (ICC)**, established 2002). None of the major military powers (the US, Russia, India, China) is a party to the ICC treaty.²¹⁷

²¹⁶ [youtube.com/watch?v=c5eHdTk5hjw&t=864s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c5eHdTk5hjw&t=864s). The reference to the Soviet Union comes at approximately minute 19; the reference to re-writing history at minute 27.

²¹⁷ The idea of an international court was launched toward the end of WWII and put into practice in the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war crimes. See Danilo Zolo, *Victor's Justice*, (2009). As could be predicted, allied attacks on Tokyo, Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki did not

In a May 25th 2024, interview with Christiane Amanpour, Karim Kahn, the Chief Prosecutor of the ICC, revealed that, while the Court was permitted by the Biden Administration to issue an order to its members to arrest Vladimir Putin for war crimes, a “senior leader”²¹⁸ in the Administration had warned him, “This Court was built for Africa and thugs like Putin” (i.e. not to inconvenience Washington or its allies).²¹⁹ Earlier in the year, South Africa had brought charges of war crimes (genocide) against the Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu (a US ally), for his wildly disproportionate military actions in Gaza in response to the kidnapping of Israelis in the October 7th 2023 Hamas raid into Israel. European countries with large populations of Muslim immigrants pleaded for a cease-fire, even sanctions against Israel, but did not openly support South Africa's accusation of genocide. Indeed, to placate the US, they doubled down on Ukraine, threatening to permit Ukraine to use Western supplied weapons for attacks “deep inside Russia” (eventually, no doubt,²²⁰ against Russian cities, including Moscow – a sure way to make Europe for the third time in little more than a century the birthplace of a World War).²²¹

Although much embarrassed by Israel's brutal operations in Gaza, the Biden Administration remained unwilling to antagonize the powerful Jewish and Israeli lobby in Washington, one of its major sponsors. It was further embarrassed by the decision of the UN-chartered International Court of Justice (ICJ, established in 1946) to issue a binding order to Israel to halt its Gaza operation immediately. Although the US is obligated to accept and respect the jurisdiction of the ICJ, it has no intention to have the order enforced against Israel – despite mounting international outrage.

The ICC is generally perceived as a Eurocentric political instrument of Western Imperialism, not a genuine court of law. Toadying to the transatlantic hegemon, Kahn stated, in the interview with Amanpour, that aversion to bullying is “a quintessential American value”. That may be true of many ordinary Americans, but with respect to the US foreign policy establishment it is utterly ridiculous. In 2003, the Belgian Foreign Minister, Louis Michel – the father of the present President of the European Council, Charles Michel – announced his intention to charge US President G.W. Bush with war crimes (under a law that authorized Belgian courts to judge war crimes wherever and by whomever they may have been committed). After a few threatening noises from the US Secretary of Defense, the plan and the law were shelved.

The ICC was inspired by the International Criminal Tribunal for The Former Yugoslavia (ICTY, established 1993), a blatantly partisan political court that sought to blame Serbia, a traditional ally of Russia, for the atrocities in the Balkan (after the breakup of Yugoslavia), and in particular, to cover up the dismal failure of the UN Peace-keeping force in Srebrenica in 1995.

In May 2024, the US succeeded in passing a resolution, sponsored by Germany and Rwanda²²², of the General Assembly of the United Nations to make July 11th, an “International Day of Reflection and Commemoration of the 1995 Genocide in Srebrenica”. The inclusion of the word ‘genocide’ means that no historians can ever

qualify as crimes, even though the bulk of their victims were civilians.

²¹⁸ My guess: National Security Advisor Jacob Sullivan, the US's real Foreign Policy Tsar

²¹⁹ See [youtube.com/watch?v=I78i2ZVOTfo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I78i2ZVOTfo) at ca 00:21:00

²²⁰ The history of the EU countries' involvement in the conflict in Ukraine is a long list of doing what only weeks or days earlier they had assured the world they would never do.

²²¹ The US does not really fear another World War. It is separated by two oceans from possible enemies and has military bases (some with nuclear weapons) close to their borders. A nuclear war is perceived as a minor threat to America's “national security”.

²²² Thierry Cruvellier, *Le Tribunal des vaincus: Un Nuremberg pour le Rwanda* (2006); corbettreport.com/keith-harmon-snow-reveals-the-truth-about-the-rwandan-genocide/

criticize the official version of what happened in Srebrenica without exposing themselves to the charge of being genocide deniers.²²³ The resolution was probably meant to rekindle tensions in the Balkan. It was certainly another American victory in the propaganda war against Russia, despite the fact that it was supported by only a minority of states in the General Assembly. It passed with 84 votes in favour, 19 votes against and 68 abstentions²²⁴—another 21 of the attending member states did not even bother to vote. However, the US now has to fear that the General Assembly, or the ICJ, will one day decide to recognize Israel's actions in Gaza or the Russophobic post-Maidan policies of Kiev as genocidal.

Appendix 9 (Ursula von der Leyen, Young Global Leaders)

Ursula von der Leyen made a career of failing and being promoted away (to higher levels).²²⁵ Her grand contributions to European integrity are 1) a secret deal to buy about 4.5 billion Pfizer “vaccine” doses (for a population of about 400 million)²²⁶; and 2) her idea to confiscate the interest on Russia's “frozen assets”²²⁷ to fund aid to Ukraine – i.e. to make the EU complicit in grand larceny in breach of international law, even at the risk that foreign investors will withdraw their funds from the EU for fear of losing them at the whim of the self-righteous gang of Eurocrats in Brussels: “Don't talk to us about law; we *are* the law.”

Most of the present generation of European, Australian and Canadian (but not American) political leaders are poster boys and girls for the Western oligarchy, “alumni” of the “Young Global Leaders” programs of the World Economic Forum (WEF, weforum.org/communities/young-global-leaders/). They are groomed to toe the line of US policy by being introduced to contacts in the American deep state and international organizations as well as a vast network of lavishly funded think tanks and NGOs. In September 2017, WEF chairman Klaus Schwab boasted: “We are very proud of the young generation like [Canadian] Prime Minister Trudeau, President of Argentina [Mauricio Macri], and so on ... and we penetrate [their] cabinets. So, yesterday, I was at a reception for Prime Minister Trudeau, and I know that ... more than half of his cabinet are actually Young Global Leaders of the World Economic Forum.”²²⁸ Other notable YGLs and WEF favourites are France's Emmanuel Macron, Belgium's Alexander de Croo, the Netherlands' Mark Rutte, and a host of leading politicians in Scandinavia and the Baltic states. They are collectively known as “globalists – which usually means that they care more about their international contacts than about the people who elect them. Accordingly, once elected and having revealed their globalist agendas, they do not last very long and are then recuperated in one or other organ of the global technocratic blob.

Appendix 10 (Gladio, the culture of fear)

As a child, growing up in the 1950s, I became aware of Ukraine because of frequent references in the media to Ukraine as a special target of NATO-CIA propaganda outlets such as Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and later the nominally private National Endowment for Democracy.²²⁹ Although I was blissfully unaware of

²²³ In the West, is it now accepted dogma that politically established authorities (e.g., courts) have the power to “fix scientific truth” – as if they are infallible?

²²⁴ See news.un.org/en/story/2024/05/1150156

²²⁵ politico.eu/article/ursula-von-der-leyen-biography-career-inconvenient-truth/

²²⁶ globalresearch.ca/video-censorshpsurveillancoercioncorruption/5798858

²²⁷ Financial assets deposited in the EU to which their Russian owners are denied access

²²⁸ rairfoundation.com/great-reset-globalist-klaus-schwab-explains-govt-takeover-of-industry-in-uneearthed-video-must-see/

²²⁹ See their websites rferl.org/ and ned.org/

any such thing, there must have been a lot of secret funding of Ukrainian resistance groups accompanying this propaganda. Indeed, in the late 1940s, CIA Head of Counterintelligence and former OSS operator James J. Angleton had begun to use the OSS's counterintelligence operation X-2 to recruit “stay behind” groups of Nazi and Fascist sympathisers, which had not joined the German Army's retreat from the countries it had occupied earlier in the war (Italy in the first place, but presumably also other countries, including Ukraine). For Angleton, “recruiting militant fascists is the best way to fight the communists.”

One can only wonder if funding or organizing subversive anti-communist opposition in the UkrSSR was a part of or perhaps the model for the mysterious anti-communist Gladio²³⁰ network that was involved in many terrorist attacks in Western Europe in the 1950s and '60s – mainly in Italy.

Gladio was originally set up as a CIA-affiliated network of right-wing “stay behind” resistance groups that would become active after a Soviet invasion (which never happened) or significant electoral gains by communist parties in Western Europe (which did happen). Then, it allegedly switched to destabilizing European countries in preparation of a right-wing, pro-US, coup d'état. For example, in Belgium, the mysterious gang of so-called ‘Brabant Killers’²³¹, responsible for several murderous shootings and armed robberies (1982-1985), was suspected of being a Gladio operation. Perhaps in response, left-wing terrorist groups became active in Western Europe – in Germany, the Rote Armee Fraktion (1970-1998); in Belgium, the Cellules Communistes Combattantes (1984-1985).

At about the same time, the European Commission (most notably under the French neo-socialist, Jacques Delors, r.1985-1995) was pushing the “dual labour market” theory, to attract poor immigrants and lock them together with the European “underclass” in poorly-paid manual and service jobs, while the rest of the population was cajoled into sending their children into higher education to satisfy the private and the public corporate sectors' demand for qualified technicians and administrators. This policy was intended to close the technological gap between the US and Europe. However, on the one hand, second- and third-generation immigrants understandably refused to be locked into an underclass, while on the other hand, the presence of large concentrations of mainly Muslim immigrants provided a foothold for Islamist militants (including Jihadists, even terrorists), eager to change Europe's predominantly US-inspired pro-Israel stance in the affairs of the Middle East.

With the threat of nuclear (later also biological and electronic) war looming in the background, the successive waves of right-wing, left-wing and Islamic terrorism created a culture of fear in Europe²³² – ‘terror’ being the Latin word for extreme fear. Terror as a cultural artefact was greatly exacerbated by insistent propaganda about imminent tipping points in “anthropogenic global warming” and “climate change”. However, all of these threats were dwarfed by the greatest terror campaign in history, the World Health Organization's fear-mongering declaration of the corona-pandemic (March 2020) as a prelude to an attempt to finally make good on its 1946 totalitarian Constitution:

“Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or

²³⁰ See [youtube.com/watch?v=yXavNe81XdQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yXavNe81XdQ), the famous 1992 documentary in the Time Watch series on BBC-2; also corbetteport.com/gladio-revisited-video/

²³¹ Dutch: ‘Bende van Nijvel’

²³² Frank Furedi, *How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the Twenty-First Century* (2018), also his *Therapy Culture: Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age* (2003)

social condition. The health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security *and is dependent on the fullest co-operation of individuals and States*”²³³

In other words, health (as defined by the WHO, i.e. everything that is good) is dependent on unconditional acceptance of the prescriptions of the global health bureaucracy and its main sponsors in the pharmaceutical industry. See Appendix 15 (The corona-pandemic, 2020-2022)

Appendix 11 (Russia-hating Britain)

In the Crimean War (1853-1856), England attempted to keep the weakening Ottoman Empire afloat and to stop the strengthening Russian Empire. Allying itself with the Ottomans and France, and supported by Austria and Australia, England succeeded in getting control of the Black Sea. Unrest in England over the large number of casualties suffered during the conflict led to the fall of the government and brought the notorious hardliner Lord Palmerston to power. Palmerston wanted to expand the war to the ultimate defeat and humiliation of Russia. However, after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, the newly founded Third French Republic disavowed the policies of its predecessor state (under President Louis Napoléon, later Emperor Napoléon III). As a result, England could no longer enforce the conditions it had imposed on Russia after the Crimean War. So Russia could finally start building a small navy to defend its Black Sea coasts. “Rule, Britannia rule the waves” experienced its first setback.

The utterly irrational Russia-hatred of the English ruling classes, even today, dates from the aftermath of the Crimean War. It intensified after the 2018 UEFA World Cup in Russia, when British soccer fans returned home with enthusiastic tales about their stay in Russia. “World Cup 2018: England fans praise welcome by Russian hosts”.²³⁴ The English establishment and the royal family boycotted the 2018 World Cup, ostensibly because of the Skripal affair. Sergei and Yulia Skripal were allegedly poisoned (on March 4th 2018) by Russian agents in Salisbury in England (only a few miles from Porton Down, the UK's top secret, chemical weapons lab²³⁵) with Novichok (“a nerve agent developed in Russia”). No evidence was ever presented. Although Sergei and Yulia survived the allegedly “deadly poison”, they disappeared without a trace after their supposed release from a hospital in the UK. See John Helmer, *Skripal in Prison* (2020).

Appendix 12 (Sanctions, BRICS)

The American and EU sanctions on Russia and Russians were mostly ineffective, as Russia was not as dependent on the West as the West's policy makers had assumed. Ironically, while under “Putin's despotism”, most Russian firms remained free to do business with any willing partner, wherever in the world, in the supposedly “free West”, most firms, eager not to offend the oligarchy, readily submitted to the demands of “political correctness” and scaled back or halted their relations with Russia, thereby creating a void that was easily filled with Russian firms. This was partly an effect of the sanctions on the remaining Russian oligarchs. They could no longer send their money abroad to invest in the West's financial casinos, where fortunes are made moving money around, playing the stock markets, loaning where interest rates are low and lending where they are high. Such casinos do not exist to any notable extent within Russia, where the distinction between the proverbial Wall

²³³ [who.int/about/accountability/governance/constitution](https://www.who.int/about/accountability/governance/constitution) (emphasis added)

²³⁴ [independent.co.uk/sport/football/world-cup/england-tunisia-world-cup-latest-volgograd-russia-praise-welcome-fans-trouble-a8405341.html](https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/world-cup/england-tunisia-world-cup-latest-volgograd-russia-praise-welcome-fans-trouble-a8405341.html)

²³⁵ [bbc.com/news/uk-48540653](https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-48540653)

Street and the proverbial Main Street is not what it is in the US or the West at large. By imposing sanctions on Russian business tycoons, the West actually forced them to submit to Putin's long-standing demand that they invest in the real economy of Russia, i.e. in the production of real goods and services that make life in the country better for everyone. In fact, that demand has been at the heart of Putin's policy from the very beginning of his first presidential term, in 2000. Of course, Putin always had to deal very carefully with the Russian oligarchy. While they were still riding high, they had the power to destroy him. Moreover, if he had tried to destroy them by purely political means, then the whole point of his policy would have been lost. After all, what Putin had set out to do, and what the vast majority of the Russian people came to expect him to do, was to make Russia a “normal country” with a relatively free economy, functioning public institutions, and peaceful relations with the outside world – a country that could finally forget seventy years of Soviet-style oppression and eight years of chaos and pervasive corruption under Yeltsin and his Western advisors. As every unbiased Putin watcher will tell us, Putin is a patient, intelligent, reasonable man and a competent leader. He is not interested in selling sandcastles on the beach. Precisely for that reason, the Western political establishment needs to demonize him. They cannot afford to let their voters hear what he has to say. In any case, their media make sure that voters in the West get no chance to catch a glimpse of the real Putin.

To the West, war is still “total war” – not just a political war (to be resolved by negotiations and diplomacy) but also an economic and cultural war (to be resolved by the enemy's unconditional surrender or total defeat and demoralization). Being denied access (by their own governments) to the Russian market greatly harmed Western businesses, especially smaller European enterprises, which had profited from Putin's policy of seeking good relations with the West. Moreover, Putin's policy of seeking good relations with the rest of world had produced a vast reservoir of alternatives to Western investments and markets. Projecting their own hegemonic designs on Russia, the West's policy makers presented Putin's seeking good relations with other countries as proof of his wanting to conquer the world.

To pursue its sanctions policy against Russia, the West had to impose sanctions on many other countries. Thus, to most of the world, the sanctions against Russia confirmed the West's status as the arrogant “bully of the world”. Representing less than one billion of the Earth's population, the West was threatening to harm countries that represented the bulk of the more than eight billion people on the planet, even as its source of geopolitical power was shifting from military, industrial and commercial dominance to the arcane world of dollar-dominated “high finance” (hedge funds, banks, shadow banks).

However, because of Putin's successes in taking Russia out of its twentieth-century miseries without turning it into an American vassal, the mighty dollar faced challenges from BRICS (an intergovernmental organization, founded in 2009). Its original member states were Brazil, Russia, India and China; South Africa joined in 2010, followed by Egypt, Iran, Ethiopia, and the United Arab Emirates in 2024. Many more other countries have shown interest in, even formally applied for, membership, only to be threatened with “Western sanctions” (which may include bombing and murder, as happened to Libya and its leader, Gaddafi, in 2011, when he sought to give Africa its own monetary system). BRICS seeks to wean its members from the US dollar, thereby threatening to end its status as the reserve currency of the world as well as the neo-colonial reign of American multinational corporations and the West's addiction to cheap credit at the expense of the rest of the world. Not surprisingly, the West's oligarchy worked hard to dissuade countries from joining BRICS and to fund opposition parties in its

member states (e.g., in South Africa).

Appendix 13 (Georgia, FARA)

In 2024, pro-Western protesters in Georgia threatened to subvert the government over a law that would require foreign agents to register. The Western media echoed their spurious claim that the law was “pro-Russia”, inspired by Russia, where a similar law had been enacted following the disclosure of many instances of Western financial aid to Russian anti-government NGOs. However, the US has had a Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) ever since 1938: “FARA requires certain agents of foreign principals who are engaged in political activities or other activities specified under the statute to make periodic public disclosure of their relationship with the foreign principal, as well as activities, receipts and disbursements in support of those activities ... The FARA Unit of the Counterintelligence and Export Control Section (CES) in the National Security Division (NSD) is responsible for the administration and enforcement of FARA.”²³⁶ The US also has a Foreign Accounts Tax Compliance Act (FATCA)²³⁷ that requires U.S. taxpayers to report their foreign financial assets and foreign entities to report on their U.S. account holders. Apparently, it is okay for the US and its allies to register foreign agents, but not for other countries.

The protests in Georgia were obviously organized by employers that had profited from supplying cheap labour to Western enterprises, also by NGOs, academics and journalists, who had profited from being unregistered political agents of Western interests. Just as they had done ten years earlier in preparation of the Maidan Coup in Kiev, European and American politicians descended on Tbilisi to incite the protesters against their elected government. Clearly, the government in Tbilisi was not anti-Russia enough.

Appendix 14 (Plato)

The classical idea of organization was developed in great detail by Plato (in his *Politeia*), when he raised the problems of 1) setting up an organization (a “police force”), the single purpose of which is to protect the convivial order of human coexistence against crime, organized crime in particular; and 2) making sure that the organization itself does not become a criminal force, acting for the benefit of its directors, its subordinate members or their business partners, friends and relatives. A Platonic police force should not *govern* the lives and affairs of ordinary people: it should *serve and protect* the convivial order of ordinary people against criminal, barbaric elements.

Politeia discusses how a police force should be organized and governed, not how it should govern a civilized people's convivial order. This point is often lost on many modern readers, accustomed as they are to the idea that the primary function of the police is to enforce obedience to the government's rules and commands. Fighting crime is still a police function, but it is subordinated to the government's prerogative of defining what will be considered a crime. In any case, disobeying a governmental rule, however inane it may be, is now considered an *illegal* and punishable offence – not just for those employed by the government, but for all citizens.

On this modern view, the government of a state has the legal/constitutional power to criminalize what, in reality, is lawful, and to legalize what is criminal. Once this nonsense is admitted as a “principle of rational governance”, the government rises above the law and becomes lawless. “Government without law”

²³⁶ [justice.gov/nsd-fara](https://www.justice.gov/nsd-fara)

²³⁷ [irs.gov/businesses/corporations/foreign-account-tax-compliance-act-fatca](https://www.irs.gov/businesses/corporations/foreign-account-tax-compliance-act-fatca)

is now the ruling paradigm of politics in the West, although the bitter pill is still routinely sugar-coated with lofty references to “democracy” and “human rights” (of which there are now so many that any policy can be rationalized as necessary for the protection of someone's “human rights”). Before 1968, hardly any lawyer failed to see the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1949) for anything other than it was, viz. a piece of political rhetoric. Then, ambitious “activist” judges began to read it as a licence to practice politics “from the bench”, confusing doing justice to people with governing their affairs. Inevitably, lawyers followed suit by taking political intentions and media-driven public opinion as “politically correct” legal grounds for overriding or dismissing established principles of law.

Appendix 15 (The corona-pandemic, 2020-2022)

The propaganda has it that Pfizer Inc. tested its “vaccine” on 40,000 people. However, the calculation of the announced efficiency of the product rested on data about little more than 200 subjects (who developed covid19 symptoms during the testing period). Moreover, whistleblowers revealed that the data were highly massaged (e.g., by disregarding the data of whole classes of people that might have compromised the desired results).²³⁸

Contrary to claims from health bureaucrats and media reports, the “novel corona virus” (sarscov2) was never scientifically identified (because there is no pure sample of that or any other virus). Virologists do not deal with viruses but with hypothetical theoretical constructs – now mainly “gene-sequences”, i.e. series of digits produced by computerized analyses of intensely manipulated impure samples (e.g., of a patient's slime) that contain a variety of organic materials with fragments of DNA or RNA of unknown origin. Sequencing genes from a sample of known origin (e.g., human blood) and comparing the result with other samples of the same stuff is not at all like sequencing genes found in a potpourri of genetic materials of unknown origin. Because there is no pure sample of any virus, one cannot take some real thing that has already been identified as a virus and then sequence its genes. The reverse happens: Some researchers claim that they can concatenate digital representations of various gene sequences, found in a sample, into a [nearly] complete genome of a new virus. They then enter the digital presentation into an international database (GenBank) or a strictly controlled information-sharing platform (GISAID), from which other researches can download it and compare it with digital representations of the fragments of genetic material they find in their samples (taken from other patients). Of course, concatenating digital representations of fragments into a theoretically possible digital representation of a chain of fragments does not prove that there is a real organism, the genome of which matches that representation.²³⁹

Moreover, there is no scientific proof that covid19 is a specific disease (as opposed to a syndrome of various symptoms that are often, but not always, found together in particular groups of patients), caused by a specific virus that requires a specific vaccine. Of course, the “one disease, one cause, one remedy” theory is an essential premise of the business model of the pharmaceutical industry—it has no basis in medical science or practice, but the expensive research facilities (high-tech labs) and publication outlets in these fields are heavily dependent on sponsorship by that very same industry. Judged by traditional standards of scientific proof,

²³⁸ See e.g., Thacker, P.D., “Covid19 researcher blows the whistle on data integrity issues in Pfizer's vaccine trial”, *BMJ*, 2 november 2021 (375:n2635); see also the interview with whistleblower Brook Jackson. (<https://odysee.com/@TLAVagabond:5/Brook-Jackson-Interview-12-2-21:e>). Jackson was fired on the spot, but pressed on with her complaints: see childrendefense.org/defender/pfizer-whistleblower-brook-jackson-lawsuit-dismissal-fraud/.

²³⁹ See theviral-delusion.substack.com/p/revealed-the-sars-cov-2-sequencing

virology is mostly technologically enhanced bluff. So what do we do? We lower standards of proof. After all, there is a lot of money going around in virology. I doubt that without the grants supplied by the military-industrial complex and Big Pharma, virology would be more than a marginal academic hobby.

With respect to supposedly transmissible respiratory diseases (such as influenza and covid19), it is worth noting that transmission by proximity with a diseased patient is not proven (see the Milton Rosenau experiments of 1919, concerning the Spanish Flu at the end of WWI²⁴⁰; also: “Although droplet transmission is thought to be the primary mode of influenza transmission, limited evidence is available to support the relative clinical importance of contact, droplet, and airborne transmission of influenza.”²⁴¹ Even less evidence is available concerning the transmissibility of “the novel corona virus”. The appearance of clusters of symptoms can be caused in many ways. It is often more a consequence of psychological than physical (chemical or biological) environmental factors.

On the one hand, critics of the HIV=AIDS hypothesis of the 1980s and 1990s were called irresponsible because their thesis “HIV has not been identified” implied that specific, supposedly effective anti-HIV prescriptions lacked scientific grounding.²⁴² On the other hand, critics of the Sarscov2 = Covid19 thesis were called irresponsible for claiming that there are well-known cheap, effective, and safe treatments for covid19 (such as patent-free hydroxychloroquine and ivermectine). The difference: despite frantic efforts, no vaccine against HIV infection was ever developed—so, only alternative treatments could make money for the pharmaceutical industry. In contrast, from the moment the first manifestations of covid19 were announced, the medical-pharmaceutical complex and the international health bureaucracies claimed that a vaccine would soon be ready for marketing. Selling these “vaccines” could only make money if the use of cheap remedies was prohibited.

Appendix 16 (Geo-engineering)

I first heard about geo-engineering²⁴³ (a.k.a. climate engineering) in the late 1960s but must confess I did not pay much attention to it – not even after reading Michael Crichton's footnoted 2004 novel *State of Fear*. There is an **Environmental Modification Convention** on the Prohibition of military and other hostile environmental modification techniques (1976).²⁴⁴ It was motivated by the fact that, from the beginning, “the science of geo-engineering” was funded mainly by military and corporate grants. It appears to have had little effect, other than legitimating the funding of research for supposedly “non-hostile” purposes. Of course, such research is useful, regardless of the purposes to which environmental modification techniques will be deployed. (Think of it as the equivalent of “gain-of-function” research in virology).

I now incline to the belief that “CO2-driven climate change” is essentially a distraction, used²⁴⁵ to divert attention away from, and to rationalize the use of,

²⁴⁰ ia800708.us.archive.org/view_archive.php?archive=/28/items/crossref-pre-1923-scholarly-works/10.1001%252Fjama.1919.02610250060026.zip&file=10.1001%252Fjama.1919.02610310005002.pdf

²⁴¹ academic.oup.com/cid/article/37/8/1094/2013282

²⁴² E.g., the expensive, patented and known to be dangerously toxic novel AZT; see John Lauritsen, *The AIDS War. Propaganda, Profeteering and Genocide from the Medical-Industrial Complex* (Asklepios, 1993, pp. 71-79)

²⁴³ See e.g., youtube.com/watch?v=rf78rEAJvhY (Dane Wigington's *The Dimming*, 2021); Peter A. Kirby, *Chemtrails Exposed: A New Manhattan Project* (2020)

²⁴⁴ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_Modification_Convention

²⁴⁵ Is it not telling that the Executive Summaries of the Reports of the UN's IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, established in 1988) focus almost exclusively on CO₂, ignoring other factors and hypotheses?

climate modification programs that rely on seeding the atmosphere (and therefore indirectly the Earth's water and soil) with toxic nano-particles (principally aluminium) and on high-frequency active auroral technology²⁴⁶ to modify (and weaponize) climate phenomena. Note that the present climate hysteria began with the suggestion, in the early 1970s, that we “are heading for a new Ice Age” and that “we might be able to avert it using geo-engineering techniques”. By the mid-1980s, ‘Ice Age’ had been replaced with ‘Global Warming’ as the great scare factor. The public's attention was drawn away from geo-engineering programs and their military applications. It was fixated instead on de-industrialization programs to create the impression that “humanity itself is the enemy”²⁴⁷. Fortunately, the oligarchs and their client-governments stand ready to save the planet with billion-dollar investments in climate engineering, “green energy” and other super-sized boondoggles.²⁴⁸

The increasing scale of toxic-particles-based geo-engineering practices and experiments provide not only a possible explanation of deteriorating health conditions of people, woodlands, agricultural lands, wildlife, plankton, etc. It also helps to explain the oligarchy's drive to create natural-asset companies (NACs) and trading schemes (such as the trade in CO₂-emission rights) that commoditize the world's commons of air, land and water on a scale never seen before.

Appendix 17 (Syria)

The Douma gas-attack incident (April 7th, 2018) revealed serious disagreements between the experts on the ground (the **Fact Finding Mission**, FFM, which found no evidence of bombing from the air and hypothesized that the attack was staged by rebel forces in the city) and the bureaucrats of the **Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons** (OPCW), who gave in to pressure from the “Assad must go”-coalition (US, UK, France) and decided *ex cathedra* that the Syrian government was responsible.²⁴⁹

Researchers at the University of Bristol's School of Policy Studies concluded: “It is now clear that the [OPCW] Director-General's statements on 28 May and 6 June 2019 – that the FFM had “examined, weighed and deliberated”, “considered” and “analysed” the engineering assessment – were unequivocally false: The Team Leader and Head of the FFM had refused to accept the document in February 2019. The Douma investigation has been passed to the **Identification and Inspection Team** (IIT). A brief examination of the careers of the investigators and analysts appointed to the IIT shows that all four of them have serious conflicts of interest. This calls into question their ability to resist pressure to come up with the answers that the influential delegations of the US, UK and France want.”²⁵⁰

Russia intervened at the Syrian government's request in its war against the apparently unstoppable “Islamic State” (a.k.a. ISIS or IS, an international non-state organization of Islamic fighters covertly backed and financed by Saudi Arabia and the US²⁵¹). The IS attacks began in 2011. ISIS only attacked Muslim countries with a majority of Shiite Muslims. It never attacked Israel. Even after the formal defeat of IS in Syria,

²⁴⁶ [britannica.com/topic/HAARP](https://www.britannica.com/topic/HAARP)

²⁴⁷ See above, page 56

²⁴⁸ news.yahoo.com/bill-gates-backing-plan-to-stop-climate-change-by-blocking-out-the-sun-183601437.html ; technocracy.news/bill-gates-ready-to-spray-chalk-dust-into-stratosphere-to-cool-planet/

²⁴⁹ consortiumnews.com/2020/01/24/opcw-investigator-testified-at-un-that-no-chemical-attack-took-place-in-douma-syria/ ; also wikileaks.org/opcw-douma/

²⁵⁰ research-information.bris.ac.uk/en/publications/update-on-the-opcws-investigation-of-the-douma-incident

²⁵¹ US financing of Islamic Jihadists and terrorist goes back at least to the days of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan (1979-1989)

American sanctions against Syria kept the population in extreme poverty. Syria was one of seven countries the US had been preparing “to take down” (see above, note 120). A result of the US's sanctions policy was that many Syrians kept seeking refuge in Europe, where mass immigration remained a hot topic. Apparently, the long-standing policy of destabilizing Europe, to keep it firmly under the thumb of the American hegemon, was still in place (see above, note 49).

Appendix 18 (Watergate scandal)

The scandal was revealed by *Washington Post* reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein. Remarkably, Woodward had been a naval intelligence officer, authorized to handle nuclear launch codes, on the U.S.S. **Wright**, a nuclear-armed National Emergency Command Post. In 1970, having been accepted to study law at Harvard, Woodward suddenly switched to journalism, but he never got an article published (because he could not write a decent text). Nevertheless, when the sensational Watergate story broke, he was immediately assigned to cover it, with the assistance of Carl Bernstein, for the *Washington Post*. Bernstein was an excellent writer of the “I write better than anyone who writes faster, and faster than anyone who writes better”-type. The *Washington Post* was (is) connected to the American “deep state”, which felt threatened by Nixon's China policy²⁵² and his handling of the war in Vietnam. In their book on the Watergate affair, *All the President's Men* (1974), Woodward and Bernstein made ample, indeed almost exclusive, use of an unnamed informant they called ‘Deep Throat’, which they later identified as Mark Felt, an Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI). However, by then, Felt was suffering from dementia. Others suspected that Felt had been little more than a stooge for the politically ambitious US Army General Alexander Haig (Chief of Staff of the White House under Nixon and Gerald Ford and Secretary of State under Reagan²⁵³).

²⁵² Nixon's policy aimed to divide the Communist Bloc, i.e. weaken the Soviet Union by making Communist China less economically dependent on Moscow. However, he also let the People's Republic of China (PRC, “Communist China”) replace the Republic of China (RP, “Taiwan”) as one of five “permanent members” (who have veto rights) of the Security Council of the United Nations. That move was bound to weaken the American quest for global hegemony. Before 1971, three of the five permanent members (France, Great Britain, Taiwan) were vassal states of the US, and would not dare to veto its proposals. Only the USSR was independent of the US. The PRC was simply too big to be any other state's vassal. Consequently, after Nixon's rearrangement of the Security Council, US diplomacy had to deal with the possibility that two of the five permanent members would veto its proposals.

²⁵³ When Reagan was shot on March 30th, 1982, Haig stormed into the White House and, ignoring all constitutional rules, shouted, “I'm in control here”. Before joining the Reagan administration, he was Supreme Allied Commander of all NATO forces in Europe (1974-1979)