

US Elections: Is Aggression Likely to Continue Regardless of Who Wins?

By **Bharat Dogra**

Global Research, October 04, 2024

Region: <u>USA</u> Theme: <u>Intelligence</u>

The biggest concern of the world regarding US elections is whether these can lead to the creation of a government with a significantly higher commitment to world peace. At the very least, what is hoped for is that even if the new President and the administration do not have any firm commitment to world peace, they have the sense of responsibility to keep miles away from any possibility of instigating or provoking the third world war which is likely to be a nuclear war and hence can threaten all life on earth. The present US President and his top security advisers have not shown such responsibility. Their policies are guided by the quest for dominance and always remaining at the top as the number one power, a quest which leads inevitably to aggression against rivals and potential rivals (as well as others) and therefore, with both sides armed very heavily with the most destructive weapons including nuclear weapons, there is the possibility of an existential threat for all life on earth.

Unfortunately, the overall indications are that this quest for dominance will continue regardless of US election results. In the case of Ukraine conflict there appears to be a greater chance, but certainly no guarantee, of early end of war if Trump wins. However regardless of election results there is not much of a chance of weapons supply to Israel being stopped. The wider reality is that overall the quest for dominance will continue regardless of who wins elections and with this the threat of a much bigger war involving the great powers, the third war or a nuclear war will continue.

This is a reflection of the wider fact that in the US democracy, at a practical level, the electoral contest is confined to just two political parties and to just two presidential candidates. Further, there is some kind of a deep state or deep establishment which ensures that only candidates who speak and work within a certain narrow framework are allowed to emerge as presidential candidates. Both the leading political parties are sometimes together referred to as the war party signifying their unwavering commitment to pursue the dominance of USA, regardless of how many more wars and regime changes and coups are needed for this. This is dressed up in patriotic and nationalist terms but deep interests of the military-industrial-politician complex and of other very big business interests lurk closely in the shadows.

The entire world is looking at the ongoing election campaign in the USA. However people at home and abroad also know better than to believe all that is said by politicians and candidates in the election debates, as they realize that the gulf between campaign statements and actual statements can be quite wide.

However for a moment let us try to imagine that the actual pursuit of foreign policy in recent

times, which is likely to broadly continue, is actually reflected in election campaign statements and commitments.

In such a situation a leading political party may release a statement saying, "We are committed to the pursuit of the USA's dominance of the world, so committed in fact that we'll continue to pursue dominance regardless of whether the entire world is threatened by weapons of mass destruction."

One or the other leading political parties may make things even clearer by stating, "We promise to the American people with the deepest sincerity that the USA will always continue to command the world, regardless of whether anyone is left to command."

To make the foreign policy aims of the USA more specific in terms of domestic implications, one of the leading politicians may say, "We promise that we will never falter in our commitments to supply weapons to our friends, proxies and clients, regardless of whether they use it for genocidal actions or to provoke bigger wars or even a world war, and we will not hesitate to divert for them resources needed for meeting the basic needs of all American people."

To be even more specific another election statement may say, "Having seen the success of our policy of inflicting some harm or the other on Russia without causing any harm to our soldiers, we assure the continuation of our policy of achieving this at the cost of the lives of the Ukrainians till as long as it takes."

Another variant of such a more specific commitment may be— "We will never falter in our support for Israel, and to ensure that this is done without troubling the conscience and hence the firmness of USA policy making establishment, we will issue orders that hereafter no data on information on the number of people killed, injured or displaced in Gaza or West Bank is to be mentioned or considered in our policy establishment."

Another or the same senior politician may also assert, "We once again re-affirm at least for the next four years our deepest commitment to the politician-military-industrial complex, even at the cost of denying billions of badly needed dollars for the homeless and other people most in need."

Of course such statements are never likely to be made actually and in reality such intentions are covered up to sound politically correct in many ways. We are mentioning such imaginary statements only to show the absurdity of what is happening when compared to the real needs of peace and real needs of people.

The existing situation with highly disastrous possibilities including WW3 will continue till a very large number of people do not come forward for a very big peace movement which works with continuity, guided by some of the world's best statesmen and scholars whose deep commitment to peace with justice is well-established. After all if millions of people can come forward to devote their time to election campaigns, why cannot they do so for the peace movement which has much higher chances of creating a better and safer world?

*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on <u>Instagram</u> and <u>Twitter</u> and subscribe to our <u>Telegram Channel</u>. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Birds Not Bombs: Let's Fight for a World of Peace, Not War

Bharat Dogra is Honorary Convener, Campaign to Save Earth Now. His recent books include Protecting Earth for Children, Planet in Peril, Earth without Borders and A Day in 2071. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is by Massoud Nayeri

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © Bharat Dogra, Global Research, 2024

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: **Bharat Dogra**

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