

The Obama Regime's Military Dogma Rejects Diplomatic Opportunities

By [Prof. James Petras](#)

Global Research, August 28, 2013

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Introduction

Political and economic changes in recent years have opened possibilities for the end of international and national conflicts. Regime changes, pragmatic leaders and the promise of serious negotiations in the Middle East, North Africa, Russia, Southwest Asia, China and elsewhere provided the Obama regime an opportunity to end long standing and costly wars, to access new markets and resources and to reduce domestic deficits and external trade imbalances.

At every opportunity, with precise consistency, the Obama regime rejected fresh overtures from adversaries, choosing instead to rely on a now discredited “double discourse”, of talking peace and engaging in war, of talking trade and increasing sanctions and of talking about ‘greater Asian engagement’ while fomenting economic pacts which exclude the second biggest economy in the world.

The Obama regime's incapacity to take advantage of the favorable political and diplomatic conjuncture can be attributed to several structural causes: (1) His embrace of a “military metaphysic” which identifies violence as the key to empire building, independently of the context, correlation of forces and possibilities of victory. (2) His overweening commitment and submission to Israeli-dictated Middle East policies transmitted and implemented by the domestic Zionist power configuration. (3) His overwhelming commitment to FIRE – capital (finance, insurance and real estate) over any long-term, large-scale commitment to rebuilding the US productive sector and the welfare state. (4) His commitment to short-term goals of “regime change” – destroying adversaries (and countries) – over and against pursuing long-term economic linkages and incremental concessions.

Regime Dogmatism and Rigidity

The Obama regime's conception of empire building and empire defense is inflexible in its reliance on strategic military intervention and abysmally ignorant of the short and long-term negative consequences. Imbued with self-deluding moralizing as a “rational” justification for crude militarism, the regime is deaf, dumb and blind to the diplomatic openings and opportunities offered by its adversaries. It proposes negotiations and promises “new beginnings” while, at the same time, announces plans to destabilize the same regime.

From the perspective of long term empire building and given the economic constraints of a stagnant economy, impending military defeats in Southwest Asia and the Middle East and the political debacles resulting from the global spy expose, the Obama

regime's current diplomatic failures can only lead to further economic decline, greater political isolation and more explosive military conflicts.

Militarism Trumps Diplomacy: The Case of Seven Lost Opportunities

Over the past year at least seven grand opportunities emerged, which offered the Obama regime a chance to crawl out from under long term costly wars and confrontations and to move ahead toward an era of relative economic expansion and peaceful coexistence.

The Case of Iran : Sacrificing the “Grand Bargain” to Serve the State of Israel

For over a decade the US has headed a United Nations Security Council coalition opposed, as it claims, to Iran developing nuclear weapons. Rejecting the evaluation of its own intelligence agencies, which clearly specify that Iran has not been engaged in producing highly-enriched uranium, the Obama regime and US Congress chose to accept Israeli lies and propaganda about an Iranian nuclear threat. Washington imposes harsh sanctions, threatens war and demands unilateral, unconditional surrender from the Iranians, citing the supposedly 'extremist' character of the Islamic regime. Washington has never engaged in any serious negotiations with Teheran. In mid-2013, Iran elected a new President (Rohani), who, by all accounts, is a pragmatic, conciliatory and flexible political leader eager to end the nuclear stalemate and provide guarantees in exchange for an end to economic sanctions and normalization of relations.

President Rohani proposed to negotiate with the Obama regime with an 'open agenda' without pre-conditions. Rohani has emphasized that his priority is domestic economic recovery and development over and above any present or future development of a national nuclear capacity or even uranium enrichment. He appointed a prominent Western-oriented Foreign Minister, Mohammed Jawad Zarif, who has a track record favorable to a “Grand Bargain” with the US Administration.

Instead of welcoming these major political and diplomatic breakthroughs, the Obama regime supported a Congressional resolution, drawn up and promoted by Zionist zealot David Cohen of Treasury and the Israel lobby (AIPAC), to tighten oil sanctions even further. In the face of the new Iranian President's friendly overtures, Obama and the Congress chose military confrontation, issuing threats and promoting regime change over and against the pursuit of a grand diplomatic opportunity which could include: (1) securing an intrusive monitoring of Iran's nuclear program; (2) an end to non-military enrichment of uranium; (3) Iranian co-operation in securing the peace in Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria; (4) and US business access to its multi-billion dollar petroleum market.

Washington demands “negotiations” that essentially surrender Iran 's sovereignty. The Obama regime disdains a favorable diplomatic solution with the elected Rohani regime in favor of pleasuring the acolytes of the Netanyahu regime, by pursuing an impossible unattainable “regime change” via the economic strangulation of Teheran.

Palestine - Israel Peace Negotiations: Land Grabbing and Peace Negotiations

There is no political leadership more accommodating and financially dependent on US policymakers than the Mahmoud Abbas-led Palestinian Authority in occupied Palestine . Abba's police force works in tandem with the Israeli occupation army in repressing popular protests. He has arbitrarily retained dictatorial powers, repressing popular democratic

movements and denying Palestinian citizens legal electoral rights. He has refused to organize or condone mass protests against the ongoing Israeli land seizures.

In other words Abbas is the “perfect client” for Washington and the most pliant negotiator for the Israelis: one willing to accept an agreement with Israel, which (1) accepts 500,000 Jewish colonial settlers in the West Bank and East Jerusalem; (2) no ‘right of return’ for dispossessed Palestinian refugees; (3) the continued imprisonment of over 6,000 Palestinian political prisoners (4) and a perpetual Israeli military presence in Galilee. Abbas is willing to accept a “ Palestine ” composed of a series of non-contiguous territorial islands, surrounded by a ten meter walls and subject to colonial depredations and military intrusions. In entering negotiations, Abbas did not object, let alone reject, Secretary of State Kerry’s appointing Arch Zionist Martin Indyk as the US mediator, despite his notoriety in Washington as ‘Israel’s lawyer’ and a purveyor of confidential US government documents in the 1980’s.

The stage was set for a US “brokered” peace agreement – except that Israel announced a huge land grab: the massive expansion of 3000 new housing settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem . Secretary of State Kerry and President Obama has done nothing to restrain Israel ; on the contrary Kerry acknowledged that the Obama regime had foreknowledge of the latest Israeli land grab and clearly gave Netanyahu the green light. In effect, the proposed negotiations serve as an Israeli pretext to accelerate their planned annexation of the last 20% of what was “historic Palestine ”. As it stands, the Abbas regime has lost its last shred of legitimacy as it bows its head and enters negotiations over a pathetic, ever-shrinking remnant of Palestinian territory.

It is clear that the Abbas regime is “putting in time” to cover its four hundred million-dollar payoff from Washington and to buy personal safety and protection from their Israel colonial overseers. By accepting peace negotiations as a pretext for colonization, Obama gratifies his wealthy Zionist backers in the US while intensifying the anger and alienation of Palestinians and tens of millions of their Muslim supporters around the world. Kerry’s support for the Israeli land grab makes the perverse outcome a source for continued armed strife. Obama trashed a great “peace opportunity” by choosing Israeli annexation over a mini-state ruled by an iron fisted Palestinian stooge on the US payroll and willing to side with Washington in every Middle Eastern conflict.

US and Venezuela : Peaceful Co-Existence or Destabilization?

Since late 2001 and for the next twelve years, the US has engaged in a multifaceted destabilization campaign designed to overthrow the democratic-nationalist government of President Hugo Chavez. Threats, military coups, large scale funding of electoral opposition parties, violent street demonstrations and referendums have been part of the imperial repertory that has been tried and failed to stem the tide of Venezuela’s policy of expanding public ownership, social welfare and regional integration (via ALBA). With the death of Hugo Chavez and the election of President Vicente Maduro, Washington refused to accept the electoral outcome, which had been validated by international observers and governments the world over. Washington launched its defeated client candidate (Capriles) on a destabilization campaign first via violent street actions and sabotage and then in a regional crusade, all of which made no headway and only further isolated the US in Latin America .

The Obama-Kerry regime, having failed to destabilize the Maduro regime, ‘apparently’ decided to try diplomacy, following the common sense precept; “if you can’t defeat them by

force entice them with peace". At a regional conference in Guatemala, Secretary of State Kerry approached the Venezuelan Foreign Minister Elias Jaua calling for "a new relation, the re-opening of Ambassadorial ties and diplomatic negotiations" ... Venezuela's President Maduro responded favorably, eager to lessen tensions and reach a peaceful accommodation with Washington. Almost immediately this overture was sabotaged: Samantha Powers, Obama's nominee to be the US Ambassador to the UN, testified before the US Congress, declaring that she would lead "the fight against state repression in Venezuela ", in other words, she would use her position in the UN to promote intervention in Venezuela on behalf of the defeated opposition.

And her boss, Secretary of State Kerry endorsed her position, highlighting Washington 's unrelenting hostility to the elected Maduro government. Kerry's brief overture was thus exposed as an empty ploy of no consequence. Peaceful reconciliation went out the window. No negotiations took place. In order to retain ties with its client opposition, Washington turned its back on diplomatic measures to end its isolation in Latin America and eliminated prospects for any economic openings which would have benefited US business interests.

US and Russia : Obama's Snowden Caper Revives the Cold War

At the beginning of his second term, President Obama announced that he would seek to improve relations with Russia . President Putin responded favorably. The Russian president allowed (1) the US-NATO assault ("no fly zone") on Libya; (2) US-designed economic sanctions against Iran; (3) allowed the US to ship arms and military personnel through Russia to bolster the occupation of Afghanistan; (4) and convinced President Assad of Syria to participate in negotiations in Geneva with the Islamist terrorist-led opposition backed by Saudi-Turkey-NATO. Putin went along with US policy on Israel-Palestine. Clearly Washington got most of all it wanted from Putin via this diplomatic relationship. Ongoing peaceful cooperation was clearly working in Obama's favor. In exchange, Obama offered to attend an OECD meeting in Russia and have a side meeting with Putin. In the run-up to the meeting, Russia granted asylum to the US whistle-blower, Edward Snowden, seeking refuge from political persecution in the US for his exposures of illegal spying. Obama sharply denounced Putin. Washington ignored its ignominious record of giving refuge to and refusing extradition requests for Chechen terrorists, Russian oligarchical swindlers, as well as the infamous Cuban airline bomber and terrorist, Posada Carriles and Bolivian President Sanchez de Losada - accused of murdering dozens of protestors. The White House responded by cancelling Obama's meeting with Putin and threatening further reprisals and "dire consequences".

In other words Obama put into questions a favorable asymmetrical diplomatic relation, and resorted to Cold War rhetoric and threats. The Russians responded by affirming their right to grant asylum to political refugees and pointed to the onerous restrictions they had imposed on Snowden, which effectively curtailed any further revelations from the whistle-blower. Putin censored Snowden from discussing the illegal US spy operations while he remained in Russia . In a word, instead of deepening a favorable diplomatic policy, Obama put it into the deep freeze, ensuring the loss of an important ally in the US ' ongoing wars and conflicts.

The Syrian Triangle: Secular Collaborator, Al Qaeda Terrorists and Obama's Double Discourse

For years Syrian President Bashar Assad worked closed with the US in (1) curbing Al Qaeda

terrorists; (2) preventing cross border attacks against Israel ; (3) denying sanctuary for Iraqi insurgents fighting against the US occupation of Baghdad ; and(4) complying with US policy by withdrawing Syrian troops from Lebanon .

Syria was a “co-operative adversary”, maintaining regional stability, and a tolerant multi-ethno-religious state in a region ripped apart by Islamist and Jewish sectarian violence. But Washington , under Obama, magnified their differences and prioritized the policy of establishing a totally submissive client-state. Instead of continuing a policy of diplomatic pressure and tactical collaboration, Obama joined with an unholy alliance of Gulf State Islamic autocracies (especially Saudi Arabia), ex-colonial European powers (especially France and England) ,Israel’s secret services (Mossad) and Turkey Islamist President Erdogan in arming, financing, training and providing sanctuary to armed Islamist mercenaries led by Al Qaeda terrorists. Syria was drowned in bloody conflict, the economy was destroyed, security was non-existent and millions of refugees fled to Iraq , Jordan , and Turkey and beyond.

Thousands of Jihadists from afar journeyed to the neighboring countries and received arms, paychecks and terrorist training in order to establish an ethnically-cleansed ‘Taliban style’ regime in Syria as a springboard to destabilize pro-US client states in the region. Turkey ’s and Egypt ’s (under Morsi) intervention, on behalf of the Islamist uprising provoked internal mass popular protests weakening the US collaborator regimes. Obama’s “all or nothing” approach to establishing a client regime in Syria via terror and civil war has produced a “no win” situation: either Assad retains power as a less co-operative adversary or the Islamist mercenaries establish a regime that serves as a springboard for one, two, and many caliphates. In the midst of this negative scenario, through Russian mediation, Bashar Assad agreed to pursue negotiations with the opposition in Geneva . The Obama regime seized diplomatic failure from the mouth of a face-saving peaceful resolution: it failed to convince the terrorists and rejected any diplomatic option.

The war continues and refugees destabilize neighboring clients and Obama’s incapacity to recognize failures and seek diplomatic ‘half way solutions’ erodes imperial pretensions.

US-Afghanistan: Prolonging the Longest War and Sacrificing a Diplomatic Retreat

The US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 was the prelude to (1) the longest war in US history; (2) a war costing hundreds of billions of dollars and tens of thousands of dead and wounded soldiers; and (3) the incitement of major insurgencies in Pakistan and elsewhere. In the face of substantial US majorities calling for the end of US military adventures abroad and in the face of rising fiscal deficits, the Obama regime promised to withdraw most US combat troops by the end of 2014... provided the “security situation allows” the US departure. ‘Favorable security’ in Afghanistan is a very dubious pre-condition for a face-saving withdrawal. The 300,000-strong Afghan army is divided by nationalists, Islamists and other opponents of the grotesquely corrupt Hamid Karzai puppet regime. US war atrocities, including drone attacks, are unlikely to win much cooperation from the Afghans.

The Afghan Army will likely overthrow the pro-US regime the first chance it gets. In the face of a military-retreat and with improbable collaborators in Kabul , who have their baggage packed and tickets in hand, the Obama regime seemingly had no viable option but to cut its losses and open negotiations with the Taliban. The opportunity for negotiations existed: the Taliban had set-up an office in Qatar (December 2011) and Washington seemed to be agreeable to talks ...but then Washington chose to accommodate its corrupt puppet Karzai

and insist on his presence in the process. Obviously, participation from the client regime in Kabul would exclude any meaningful recognition of the Taliban's minimum demand for regime change. To further undermine any settlement, Obama rejected the Taliban's strategic demand of total US military withdrawal. Given the futility of dealing with Washington under its current president, the Taliban closed their Qatar office in July 2013. In other words the Obama regime sacrificed the possibility of a peaceful, face-saving settlement which would moderate Taliban foreign and domestic policies in order to prop up a corrupt puppet regime, lacking any popular support, based on mercenaries and armed forces of dubious loyalty and dependent on a continued US presence. Instead of accepting retreat, cutting losses and pursuing accommodation, Obama maximizes the US losses and ensures that the inevitable military withdrawal will prejudice relations for many decades ahead.

US-China Containment in the Face of Impotence is a 'No-Brainer'

China has the second largest economy in the world and a growth rate three to four times that of the United States . China has become one of the most important investment sites for the top US multi-national corporations and potentially a major source of investment capital for re-invigorating the US economy. Given China 's growing demands for advanced technology, financial and IT services, agricultural, energy and other commodities and the US demand for manufactured goods, there is a high degree of economic "complementarity". US-China cooperation offers opportunities for greater integration and joint ventures, which can exploit market opportunities.

Faced with the historic opportunity to forge an economic partnership with an emerging global power, Obama has decided to isolate China by (1) actively promoting regional trade agreements (the Transpacific Partnership) which pointedly exclude China , (2) intervening and fomenting territorial and maritime disputes between China and its neighbors and (3) supporting separatist ethno-religious groups within China .

The Obama regime raised hopes that he would turn from the US ' losing and costly Middle Eastern military adventures toward the more lucrative and profitable Asian markets, when he announced his "pivot to Asia ". Instead of a reasoned and balanced shift toward (1) expanding US economic bridgeheads in China ; (2) and seeking to deepen financial penetration and technological links, Obama simply transferred his failed militarist ideologically-driven policies onto Asia . He sided with Japan in a South China Sea dispute. He is inciting the Philippines and Vietnam to contest China 's maritime claims. He is securing new military base agreements with Canberra and Manila . Obama has (1) fortified its forward bases aimed at China ; (2) encouraged and supported separatist Tibetans; (3) and promoted the armed Uigar terrorists.

The Obama regime has attempted to undermine China 's economic linkages in Asia without providing any comparable alternative. The end result is that China still remains the pre-eminent trading partner for most of the members of what Obama conceived of as a "US centered" Pan-Pacific trade alliance. Furthermore, by bluster and provocative military maneuvers, Obama has pushed China into a closer and deeper strategic economic and political alliance with Russia . Obama's "isolationist ploy" was dead in the water. Commodity exporters like Australia , Indonesia , Peru , Chile and Colombia , can ill afford to shun China , for the simple fact that the US offers no alternative market! Nor can Taiwan , South Korea and Japan find an alternative market for their high tech exports. The US cannot compete with the massive infrastructure investments that China has made in Burma ,

Cambodia , Laos and Pakistan .

Obama's policy of mindless military posturing, accompanied by vacuous ideological sniping, has lessened US economic opportunities, and heightened military tensions. Obama's belligerent policy toward Beijing in pursuit of a US-centered and hegemonized Asia lacks economic substance and client states willing to sacrifice their own economic gain for the dubious "honor" of housing US military bases pointed at threatening their principal economic partner.

The grand, historic opportunity of a declining empire coming to peaceful and profitable terms with a rising global economic power has been missed.

Conclusion

The Obama regime has systematically rejected opportunities to resolve conflicts and move on to a more moderate and balanced foreign policy, one more in accord with the real capacity of the US economy and state. Current and recent foreign policy discussions and decision makers have been blinded by a 'military metaphysic' whose only 'calculus' is based on the capacity to project military power independently of the real consequences. Obama's diplomatic initiatives lack substance and most often are neutralized by parallel military moves and aggressive interventions. Even within the constraints of obsessive empire building, a dysfunctional legislature and incompetent presidential advisers, recent political changes, including the ascendancy of pragmatic adversaries, provided the Obama regime with real options that would have opened the door to political compromises and strategic gains.

Obama's failure to pursue diplomatic solutions can be attributed to the structural links between the Presidency and the military-police state apparatus. The latter has gained a high degree of autonomy from the productive economy, as evidenced everywhere, from Obama's China-containment policy to the economic losses resulting from sanctions on Iran , Syria and (previously) Libya .

Obama's deep, long-standing and pervasive links to the 1% of Americans affiliated with notorious Israeli ideologues and his pandering to their lobbies and wealthy fund raisers has led to a rigid adherence to colonial-military policies that eschew any diplomatic compromises which might restrain the megalomaniacal vision of "Greater Israel". Obama's myopia is 'structural'. He follows the dictates of prestigious Ivy League advisers whose judgment is forever defined by "what's good for Israel" and whose academic expertise is clouded by pea-brained assessments of what 'others' want and how they will react to perpetual belligerency.

The world view of the Obama regime is one of mirror gazing in an echo chamber: it cannot visualize and accommodate the interests of its rivals, competitors or adversaries, no matter how absolutely central they are to any meaningful compromise. The give and take of real world politics is totally foreign to the world's Chosen People. They only know how to "seize power" and create military facts, even as they then spend a dozen years and trillions of dollars and millions of lives in endless wars, bemoaning lost markets amidst serial diplomatic failures. The epitaph for the Obama regime will read:

They fought the Wars

They lost.

They turned friends

into enemies.

Who became

friends of our enemies.

They stood alone, in splendid isolation,

And said it was their only choice.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof. James Petras](#), Global Research, 2013

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof. James
Petras](#)

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