

America's Militarized Economy

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, August 14, 2018

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Militarization and WMD](#)

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above

Donald Trump's biggest success, thus far into his Presidency, has been his sale of [\\$400 billion \(originally \\$350 billion\)](#) of U.S.-made weapons to the Saudi Arabian Government, which is owned by its royal family, after whom that nation is named. This sale alone is big enough to be called Trump's "jobs plan" for Americans. **It is also the biggest weapons-sale in all of history. It's 400 billion dollars, not 400 million dollars; it is gigantic, and, by far, unprecedented in world-history.**

The weapons that the Saudis and their friends, the 7 monarchies that constitute the United Arab Emirates, are using right now, in order to conquer and subdue Yemen, are almost entirely made in America. That's terrific business for America.

Not only are Americans employed, in strategically important congressional districts (that is, politically important congressional districts), to manufacture this equipment for mass-murdering in foreign lands that never threatened (much less invaded) America, but the countries that purchase this equipment are thereby made dependent upon the services of those American manufacturers, and of the taxpayer-funded U.S. 'Defense' Department and its private military contractors such as Lockheed Martin, to maintain this equipment, and to train the local military enforcers, on how to operate these weapons. Consequently, foreign customers of U.S. military firms are buying not only U.S. weapons, but the U.S. Government's protection — the protection by the U.S. military, of those monarchs.

They are buying the label of being an "American ally" so that the U.S. news media can say that this is in defense of American allies (regardless of whether it's even that).

American weapons are way overpriced for what they can do, but they are a bargain for what they can extract out of America's taxpayers, who fund the U.S. 'Defense' Department and thus fund the protection of those monarchs: these kings and other dictators get U.S. taxpayers to fund their protection. It's an international protection-racket funded by American taxpayers and those rulers, in order to protect those rulers; and the victims aren't only the people who get slaughtered in countries such as Afghanistan, and Iraq, and Libya, and Syria, and Yemen, and Palestine, but also (though only financially) are the American public, who get fleeced by it — the American public provide the bulk of the real funding for this operation to expand the lands where America's allies rule, and so to serve both America's aristocracy and the aristocracies that are America's allies.

This is how today's America enforces its 'democracy' around the world, so that America can spread this 'democracy', at gunpoint, and at bomb-point, like America's allies, those Kings and Emirs, and the apartheid regime in Israel, are doing, to the people whom they kill and conquer, with help from the taxpayer-funded American military — funded to protect those

aristocrats, against their respective publics, and to further enrich America's own aristocrats, at the expense of America's own public.

[The global 'aggressor' has been identified by America's previous President, Barack Obama, who won office like Trump did, by promising 'a reset' in relations with post-communist Russia, and by mocking Obama's opponent \(Mitt Romney\) for having called Russia "the number one geopolitical foe" — which America's aristocracy has historically considered Russia to be, ever since the aristocracy in Russia fled and were killed in 1917, which caused America's and other aristocracies to fear and hate Russia and Russians, for having ousted its aristocracy, this being an act that aristocrats everywhere \[are determined to avenge, regardless of 'ideology'\]\(#\). \(Similarly, America and its pro-aristocracy foreign allies, seek to avenge Iran's 1979 overthrow of the Shah.\) As Obama's own actions during his subsequent Presidency made clear, and as he already had started in 2011 \(if not from day one of his Presidency\) secretly to implement, he privately agreed with what Romney said on that occasion, but he was intelligent enough \(which his opponent obviously was not\) to recognize that the American public, at that time, did not agree with it but instead believed that Islamic terrorists and aristocrats such as the Saudis who finance them are that\); and Obama took full advantage of his opponent's blunder there, which helped Obama to win a second term in the White House \(after having skillfully hidden from the public during his first term, his intention to weaken Russia by eliminating leaders who were friends or even allies of Russia, such as in Syria, and Ukraine\).](#)

This is American 'democracy', after all ([rule by deceit, lies](#)), and that's the reason why, when Russia, in 2014, responded to the U.S. coup in Ukraine (a coup under the cover of anti-corruption demonstrations) which coup was taking over this large country next-door to Russia and thus constituted a deadly threat to Russia's national security, [Obama declared Russia to be the world's top 'aggressor'](#). Obama overthrew Ukraine and then damned Russia's leader Putin for responding to Obama's aggressive threat against Russia from this coup in neighboring Ukraine. Russia was supposedly the 'aggressor' because it allowed the residents of Crimea — which had been part of Russia until the Soviet dictator in 1954 had arbitrarily handed Crimea to Ukraine — to become Russian citizens again, Russians like 90% of them felt they still were, despite Khrushchev's transfer of them to Ukraine in 1954. The vast majority of Crimeans felt themselves still to be Russians. But Obama and allies of the U.S. Government insisted that the newly installed Government of Ukraine must rule those people; those people must not be permitted to rule (or be ruled) by people they've participated in choosing.

[Ever since at least 2011, the U.S. Government was planning to overthrow Ukraine's democratically elected Government; and the plan started being put into action by no later than 1 March 2013 inside America's Ukrainian Embassy.](#) In preparation for this planned coup ("[the most blatant coup in history](#)"), a poll of Crimeans was funded by the International Republican Institute and USAID, in which Gallup scientifically sampled Crimeans during 16-30 May 2013, six months prior to [the forced rejection on 20 November 2013 of EU membership by Ukraine's democratically elected government](#) — that's six months prior to the Ukrainian Government's rejection that Obama's team were intending to use as being the pretext for the anti-Government demonstrations, which would start on Kiev's Maidan Square the day after this forced rejection, on November 21st. [The poll of Crimeans](#) (which was [made public on 7 October 2013](#)) found (here are highlights):

p.14:

"If Ukraine was able to enter only one international economic union, which entity should it be with?"

53% "Customs Union with Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan"

17% "The European Union"

p.15:

"How would you evaluate your attitude to the following entities?"

"Russia": 68% "Warm"; 5% "Cold"

"USA": 6% "Warm"; 24% "Cold"

p.17:

"In your opinion, what should the status of Crimea be?"

"Autonomy in Ukraine (as today [under [Crimea's 1992 Constitution](#) and [as subsequently celebrated by RFE/RL on 20 January 2011](#)])": 53%.

"Common oblast of Ukraine [ruled under Ukraine's 1991 Constitution]": 2%.

"Crimea should be separated and given to Russia": 23%.

In other words: prior to the U.S. State Department and CIA operation to steal Ukraine's government from Ukraine's citizens — including *especially* from the residents of the sole autonomously governed region in Ukraine, which was Crimea — 53% of Crimeans wanted continued autonomy, 23% wanted not only a total break away from the Ukrainian Government but their becoming again citizens of Russia, such as had existed until 1954; and only 2% wanted restoration of the situation in 1991 when Crimea was briefly a "common oblast" or regular region within Ukraine, a federal state within Ukraine just like all the other states within Ukraine were. And, obviously, after America's coup in Ukraine, the percentage who wanted a total break away from Ukraine rose even higher than it had been before.

Consequently, the U.S. demand that the newly imposed Ukrainian regime, which Obama's coup created, made upon Crimea subsequent to the coup, and which demand both Obama and his successor Trump insist must be imposed upon and obeyed by Crimeans if the anti-Russia sanctions are even possibly to end, is the demand that Crimeans, in that May 2013 poll, even prior to [the bloody Obama coup](#) and the takeover of Ukraine by [rabidly anti-Crimean Ukrainian nazis](#), **had supported by only 2%** (it was demanding reimposition of the brief 1991 Ukrainian relationship, which Crimeans had rejected in 1991), as compared to the 53% of Crimeans who favored continuation of Crimean "autonomy," and the 23% who favored becoming Russians again.

Furthermore, the May 2013 poll showed that only 17% of Crimeans favored becoming part of the EU, whereas 53% preferred to be part of the "Customs Union with Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan"; so, clearly, Crimeans, prior to the democratically elected Ukrainian Government's having declined the EU's offer, overwhelmingly wanted Ukraine's democratically elected Government to do precisely what it did — to turn down the EU's offer.

During [the U.S. coup](#), and immediately after it, until the 16 March 2014 Crimean referendum on what to do about it, Crimeans saw and heard on television and via the other Ukrainian media, [reports](#) that could only have terrified them about the new Government's intentions. Clearly the U.S. regime had no objection to placing [nazis](#) in charge, and Crimeans are intensely anti-nazi — not only anti-Nazi during Hitler's time, but against nazism, *the racist-fascist ideology, itself, regardless of which group it's targeting; but, in their case, it targets Crimeans, and, more broadly, Russians.*

A January 2015 poll of Crimeans was financed by rabidly anti-Russian Ukrainians in Canada

and released in early February, and it [found](#) (probably to their enormous disappointment) that 93% of respondents did “endorse Russia’s annexation of Crimea” and 4% did not. On 16 March 2015, the U.S. State Department issued a [statement](#): “On this one year anniversary of the sham ‘referendum’ in Crimea, held in clear violation of Ukrainian law and the Ukrainian constitution, the United States reiterates its condemnation of a vote that was not voluntary, transparent, or democratic.” No evidence was provided for any of that assertion, simply the allegation. Four days later, the far more honest Kenneth Rapoza at *Forbes* headlined [“One Year After Russia Annexed Crimea.”](#) and he opened:

The U.S and European Union may want to save Crimeans from themselves. But the Crimeans are happy right where they are. One year after the annexation of the Ukrainian peninsula in the Black Sea, poll after poll shows that the locals there — be they Ukrainians, ethnic Russians or Tatars are mostly all in agreement: life with Russia is better than life with Ukraine. Little has changed over the last 12 months. Despite huge efforts on the part of Kiev, Brussels, Washington and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the bulk of humanity living on the Black Sea peninsula believe the referendum to secede from Ukraine was legit. At some point, the West will have to recognize Crimea’s right to self rule.

The U.S. and its allies have a different idea than that. They reject Rapoza’s view.

The United States claims to support ‘democracy’. But it demands imposition upon Crimeans of [a rabidly anti-Crimean Government](#). What kind of ‘democracy’ does the United States actually support? Has the U.S. Government answered that question in Crimea — and, in Ukraine — by its *actions* there? Obama supported [this kind](#) of ‘democracy’, and [this kind](#). He wanted [this kind](#) of treatment of Crimeans. Trump hasn’t yet made clear whether he does, too; but his official representatives have made clear that they do.

America has a [militarized economy](#). It also [currently has the very highest percentage of its people in prison out of all of the world’s 222 countries](#) and so certainly qualifies as a police state (which Americans who are lucky enough to be not amongst the lower socio-economic classes might find to be a shocking thing to assert). On top of that, everyone knows that America’s military spending is by far the highest in the world, but many don’t know that it’s the most corrupt and so the U.S. [actually spends around half of the entire world’s military budget and that the U.S. ‘Defense’ Department is even so corrupt that it has been unauditible and thus unaudited for decades, and that many U.S. military programs are counted in other federal departments in order to hide from the public how much](#) is actually being spent each year on the military, which is well over a trillion dollars annually, probably more than half of all federal discretionary (which excludes interest on the debt, some of which pays for prior wars) spending. So, it’s a very militarized economy, *indeed*.

This is today’s American [‘democracy’](#). Is it also ‘democracy’ in America’s allied countries? (Obviously, they are more democratic than America regarding just the incarceration-rate; but what about generally?) Almost all of those countries continue to say that America is a democracy (despite the [proof](#) that it is not), and that they are likewise. Are they correct in both? Are they allied with a ‘democracy’ against democracy? Or, are they, in fact, phonies as democracies? These are serious questions, and bumper-sticker answers to them won’t suffice anymore — not after invading Iraq in 2003, and Libya in 2011, and Syria right afterward, and Ukraine in 2014, and Yemen today, etc.

Please send this article along to friends, and ask for their thoughts about this. Because, in any actual democracy, everyone should be discussing these issues, under the prevailing circumstances. Taxpayer-funded mass-slaughter is now routine and goes on year after year. After a few decades of this, shouldn't people start discussing the matter? Why haven't they been? Isn't this the time to start? Or is America so much of a dictatorship that it simply won't happen? We'll see.

*

This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).

*Investigative historian **Eric Zuesse** is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#). He is a frequent contributor to *Global Research*.*

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2018

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

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

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca