

How the Deep State ‘Justifies’ Itself in America

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, November 07, 2019

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 6 November
2019

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

*On October 30th, there was a panel discussion [broadcast live on C-Span](#) from the National Press Club and the Michael V. Hayden Center. The discussants were **John Brennan**, **Michael McCabe**, **John McLaughlin**, and **Michael Morrell**. They all agreed with the statement by McLaughlin (former Deputy CIA Director) [“Thank God for the ‘Deep State’”, and the large audience there also applauded it — nobody booed it](#). John Brennan amplified upon the thought, and there was yet more applause. However, that thought hadn’t been invented by McLaughlin; it instead had evolved recently in the pages of the New York Times. Perhaps the discussants had read it there. Instead of America’s ‘news’-media uncritically trumpeting what government officials assert to be facts (as they traditionally do), we now have former spooks uncritically trumpeting what a mainstream ‘news’-medium has recently concocted to be the case — about themselves. They’ve come out of the closet, about being the Deep State. However, even in that, they are lying, because they aren’t it; they are only agents for it.*

In America, the Deep State ‘justifies’ itself in the ‘news’-media that it owns, and does so by falsely ‘defining’ **what** the “Deep State” **is** (which is actually the nation’s 607 billionaires, whose hired agents number in the millions). They **mis-**‘define’ it, as being, **instead**, the taxpayer-salaried career *Government* employees, known professionally as “the Civil Service.” (Although some Civil Servants — especially at the upper levels — *are* agents for America’s billionaires and retire to cushy board seats, most of them actually are not and do not. And the “revolving door” between “the public sector” and “the private sector” is where the Deep State operations become concentrated. That’s the core of the networking, by which the billionaires get served. And, of course, those former spooks at the National Press Club said nothing about it. Are they authentically so stupid that they don’t know about it, or is that just pretense from them?)

How the Deep State’s operatives perpetrate this deception about the meaning of “Deep State” was well exemplified in the nine links that were supplied on October 28th by the extraordinarily honest anonymous German intelligence analyst who blogs as “Moon of Alabama” and who condemned there (and linked to) 9 recent articles in the *New York Times*, as posing a threat against democracy in America. As I intend to argue here, the 9 articles are, indeed, aimed at deceiving the American public, about what the true meaning of the phrase “the Deep State” is. He headlined [“Endorsing The Deep State Endangers Democracy”](#). (And that’s what the October 30th panel discussion was actually doing — endorsing the Deep State.) However, he didn’t explain the tactic the *NYT*’s editors (and those former spooks) use to deceive the public about the Deep State, and this is what I aim to do here, by showing the transformation, over time, in the way that that propaganda-organization, the New York Times, has been employing the phrase “Deep State” — a

remarkable transformation, which started, on 16 February 2017, by the newspaper's *denying* that any Deep State exists in America but that it exists only in corrupt nations; and which gradually transitioned into an upside-down, by asserting that a Deep State *does* exist in the United States, and that it fights *against* corruption in *this* country. As always, only fools (such as that applauding audience on October 30th) would believe it, but propagandists depend upon fools and cannot thrive without them. In this case, the *Times*, in those 9 articles, was evolving quickly from a blanket denial, to an American-exceptionalist proud affirmation, that a Deep State rules this country and *ought* to rule it. I agree with the statement that [“Endorsing The Deep State Endangers Democracy”](#), but I am more concerned here to explain how that endorsement — that deceit — is being done.

The first of these NYT articles was published on [16 February 2017](#), and it denied that the US has any “Deep State” whatsoever.

The second, published on [6 March 2017](#), blamed President Trump (since the NYT represents mainly *Democratic Party* billionaires) for mainstreaming the phrase “the Deep State” into American political discourse, and it alleged that that phrase actually refers *only* to “countries like Egypt, Turkey and Pakistan, where authoritarian elements band together to undercut democratically elected leaders.”

The third, published on [10 March 2017](#), repeated this allegation, that this phrase applies only to “the powerful deep states of countries like Egypt or Pakistan, experts say.”

The fourth, published on [5 September 2018](#), was an anonymous op-ed from a Government employee who condemned Trump and “vowed to thwart parts of his agenda and his worst inclinations.” “This isn’t the work of the so-called deep state. It’s the work of the steady state.” So: *still* the NYT’s editors were hewing to their propaganda-line, that no “Deep State” exists in America — there are just whistleblowers, *here*.

The fifth, on [18 December 2018](#), said, for example, that “Adam Lovinger, a Pentagon analyst, was one of the first to wrap himself in the deep state defense” — namely, that they consist of “people who have been targeted for political reasons.” So, the NYT’s editors were now reinforcing their new false ‘definition’ of “Deep State,” as consisting just of Government whistleblowers.

The sixth, on [6 October 2019](#), said, “President Trump and some of his allies have asserted without evidence that a cabal of American officials — the so-called deep state — embarked on a broad operation to thwart Mr. Trump’s campaign. The conspiracy theory remains unsubstantiated.” So: the NYT’s editors were back, again, to *denying* that there is *any* “Deep State” in America. This was a signal, from them, that they were starting to recognize that they’d need to jiggle their ‘definition’ of “Deep State,” at least a bit.

The seventh, on [20 October 2019](#), was by a member of the Editorial Board, and it boldly proclaimed, about “the deep state,” “Let us now praise these not-silent heroes.” The propagandists now had settled firmly upon their new (and previously merely exploratory) ‘definition’ of “Deep State,” as consisting of whistleblowers in the US Government’s Civil Services, “individuals willing to step up and protest the administration’s war on science, expertise and facts.”

The eighth, on [23 October 2019](#), equated “the deep state” even more boldly with the impeachment of President Trump: “Over the last three weeks, the deep state has emerged

from the shadows in the form of real live government officials, past and present, who have defied a White House attempt to block cooperation with House impeachment investigators and provided evidence that largely backs up the still-anonymous whistle-blower.”

The ninth, on [26 October 2019](#), which came from “a contributing opinion writer and professor of history,” alleged that the *origins* of “the deep state” are to be found with Teddy Roosevelt in the 1880s, when “A healthy dose of elitism drove Roosevelt’s crusade, as the spoils system had been the path to power for immigrant-driven political machines in big cities like New York. Yet the Civil Service laws he and others created marked the beginning of a shift toward a fairer, less corrupt public realm.”

In other words: the Deep State, in America, are not *perpetrators* of corrupt government (such as in “countries like Egypt, Turkey and Pakistan, where authoritarian elements band together to undercut democratically elected leaders”), but are instead courageous *enemies* of corrupt government; and they are instituted by the aristocracy here (today’s American billionaires), in order to reduce, if not eliminate, corruption in government (which, the *Times* now alleges, *originates* amongst, or serves, the lower classes).

The lessons about Big Brother, which were taught by George Orwell in his merely metaphorical masterpiece *1984*, were apparently never learned, because even now — as his “Newspeak” is being further refined so that black is white, and good is bad, and truth is falsehood — there still are people who *subscribe to the propagandists* and cannot get enough of their ridiculous con-games. Though in some poor countries, a corrupt Deep State rules; a Deep State rules in America so as to *reduce if not prevent* corruption, the *New York Times* now concludes.

You can see how it’s done, in those nine *NYT* articles. Isn’t it simply amazing there?!

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

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](#).

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2019

[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