

Whether to Go to War Against Russia Is Top Issue in U.S. Presidential Race

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, October 18, 2016

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 12 October
2016

Region: [Russia and FSU, USA](#)

Theme: [Military and WMD, US NATO](#)
[War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [Nuclear War, U.S.](#)
[Elections](#)

The United States government has already declared that in regards to what it [alleges to be a Russian cyberattack against the U.S. Democratic Party](#), the U.S. reserves [the right to go to war against Russia](#). NATO has accordingly [changed its policy](#) so as to assert that a cyberattack (in this case actually cyber-espionage, such as the U.S. government itself perpetrates against even its own allies [such as Angela Merkel by tapping her phone](#)) constitutes an act of war by the alleged cyberattacker, and so requires all NATO member nations to join any cyberattacked NATO nation in war against its alleged (cyber)attacker, if the cyberattacked member declares war against its alleged cyberattacker.

Excuses are being sought for a war against Russia; and expanding the definition of "invasion," to include mere espionage, is one such excuse. But it's not the only one that the Obama Administration has cooked up.

[U.S. Senator Mike Lee has asserted that President Barack Obama must obtain a declaration of war against Syria — which is allied with and defended by Russia — before invading Syria.](#) Syria has, for the past few years, already been invaded by tens of thousands of foreign jihadists (financed mainly by the royal Saudis and Qataris, and armed mainly with U.S. weaponry) who are trying to overthrow and replace the Syrian government [so that pipelines can be built through Syria into Europe](#) to transport Saudi oil and Qatari gas into the EU, the world's biggest energy-market, which now is dominated by Russia's oil and gas. Since Syria is already being defended by Russia (those royals' major competitor in the oil and gas markets), America's invasion of Syria would necessarily place U.S. and Russia into an air-war against each other ([for the benefit of those royal Arabs](#) — who [finance jihadist groups](#), as [even Hillary Clinton acknowledges](#)): Syria would thus become a battleground in a broader war against Russia.

So: declaring war against Syria would be a *second* excuse for World War III, and one which would especially serve the desires not only of U.S. 'defense' firms but of the U.S. aristocracy's royal Arabic allies, who buy much of those 'defense' firms' exports (weaponry), and also U.S. oilfield services firms such as pipelines by Halliburton. (It's good business for them, no one else. Taxpayers and war-victims pay, but those corporations — and royal families — would profit.)

The U.S. government also [declares that Russia 'conquered' Crimea in 2014 and that Russia must restore it to Ukraine](#). The U.S. government wants Ukraine to be accepted into NATO, so that all NATO nations will be at war against Russia if Russia doesn't return Crimea to

Ukraine, of which Crimea had only briefly (1954-2014) been a part, until Crimeans voted on 16 March 2014 to rejoin Russia. This Crimean issue is already the basis for America's economic sanctions against Russia, and thus Russia's continuing refusal to coerce Crimeans to accept again being part of Ukraine would be yet a *third* excuse for WW III.

The U.S. Presidential Contest

[Hillary Clinton says "As President, I will make it clear, that the United States will treat cyber attacks just like any other attack."](#) She alleges that when information was unauthorizedly made public from Democratic National Committee computers, the cyberattacker was [Russia](#). She can be counted as a strong proponent of that excuse for WW3. She's with Barack Obama and the other neocons on that.

She has furthermore said that the U.S. should shoot down any Russian and Syrian bombers in Syria — the phrase for that proposed U.S. policy is to "establish a no-fly zone" there. She makes clear: ["I am advocating the no-fly zone."](#) It would be war against not only Syria, but Russia. (After all: a no-fly zone in which the U.S. is shooting down the government's planes and Russia's planes, would be war by the U.S. against both Syria and Russia, but that's what she wants to do.) She can thus be counted as a strong proponent of those *two* excuses for WW3.

On the matter of Crimea, [she has said](#) that "Putin invaded and annexed Crimea," and "In the wake of Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea in early 2014, some have argued that NATO expansion either caused or exacerbated Russia's aggression. I disagree with that argument." She believes that the expansion of NATO right up to Russia's borders is good, not horrific and terrifying (as it *is* to Russians — just like USSR's conquering of Mexico would have *been* terrifying to Americans if USSR did that during the Cold War). Furthermore, because [Ukraine is the main transit-route for Russian gas-pipelines into Europe](#), the [coup](#) that in 2014 overthrew the neutralist democratically elected President of Ukraine and replaced him by leaders who seek NATO membership for Ukraine and who have the power to cut off those pipelines, was strongly supported by both Obama and Clinton. She can thus be counted as a strong proponent of *all three* excuses for WW3.

U.S. President Obama has [made unequivocally clear that he regards Russia as being by far the world's most "aggressive" nation](#); and Clinton, too, commonly uses the term "aggression" as describing Russia (such as she did by her denial that "NATO expansion either caused or exacerbated Russia's aggression"). To her, Russia's opposing real aggression *by the U.S.* (in this case, America's [2014 coup that overthrew the democratically elected Ukrainian President](#) for whom [75% of Crimeans had voted](#)), *constitutes* 'Russia's aggression', somehow. Furthermore, as regards whether Crimea's rejoining Russia was 'illegal' as she says: does she also deny the right of self-determination of peoples regarding the residents of Catalonia though the Spanish government accepts it there, and also by the residents of Scotland though the British government accepts it there? Or is she simply determined to have as many excuses to invade Russia as she can have? She has never condemned the independence movements in Scotland or Catalonia.

The United States is clearly on a path toward war with Russia. Donald Trump [opposes all aspects of that policy](#).

That's the main difference between the two U.S. Presidential candidates. Trump

makes ridiculous statements about the 'need' to increase 'defense' spending during this period of soaring federal debt, but he has consistently condemned the moves toward war against Russia and said that America's *real* enemy is jihadists, and that Russia is *on our side* in this war — the *real* war — not an enemy of America such as Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama claim. Both candidates (Trump and Clinton) are war-hawks, but Hillary wants to go to war against both jihadists and Russia, whereas Trump wants to go to war *only* against jihadists. Trump's charge that Hillary would be a catastrophic President is borne out not only by [her past record in public office](#), but by her [present positions](#) on these issues.

America's Presidential campaign is dominated by Trump's crassly vulgar obsession with sex, and by debates about whether his hiding his tax-returns is worse than Hillary's hiding her paid speeches to corporate lobbyists, and her hiding her emails while she was Secretary of State. Regardless of whom America's next President will be (either Clinton or Trump), it's *not* going to be a good President, and anyone who thinks that these are the two best-qualified people to be contesting for the U.S. Presidency is either ignorant or else grossly misinformed — or else in sheer reality-denial. But all of those other issues are dwarfed by the top issue of this election: shall we have World War III? And that one issue is by far more important than all of the other 'issues' in this campaign, because it's nothing less than an *existential* issue, regarding all of the world, and all of the future, which threatens the entire world within just the next few years, or even months, or maybe just weeks.

Americans are being offered, [by this nation's aristocracy](#), a choice between a marginally competent and deeply evil psychopath Hillary Clinton, versus [an incompetent but far less evil psychopath Donald Trump](#), and the nation's press are reporting instead a choice between two candidates of whom one ([the actually evil Clinton](#)) is presented as being far preferable to the other ([the actually incompetent Trump](#)), and possibly as being someone who might improve this nation if not the world. Virtually none of America's Establishment is willing to report the truth: that the nation's rotting will get worse under either person as President, but that only under Trump might this nation (and the world) stand a reasonable likelihood of surviving at all (i.e., nuclear war with Russia being averted).

Things won't get better, but they definitely could get a hell of a lot worse — and *this* is the issue, the *real* one, in the present election: WW3, yes or no on that.

Hillary Clinton argues that she, with her neoconservative backing (consisting of the same people who cheer-led the invasion of Russia-friendly Iraq, and who shared her joy in doing the same to Russia-friendly Libya — "[We came, we saw, he died, ha ha!](#)"), is the better person to have her finger on the nuclear button with Russia. This U.S. Presidential election will be decided upon the WW3-issue, unless the American electorate are incredibly stupid (or else terribly deceived): Is she correct to allege that she and not Trump should have control over the nuclear button against Russia? She's even more of a neoconservative than Obama is, and this is why [she has the endorsement of neoconservatives in this election](#). And that is the issue.

The real question isn't whether America and the world will be improved by the next U.S. President; it's whether America and the world will be destroyed by the next U.S. President. All else is mere distraction, by comparison. And the U.S. public now are extremely distracted — unfortunately, even by the candidates themselves. The pathetic Presidential candidates that [the U.S. aristocracy](#) has provided to Americans, for the public's votes in the final round, don't focus on this reality.

Anyone who thinks that the majority of billionaires can't possibly believe in a 'winnable' nuclear war and can't possibly be wanting WW3 should read [this](#). That was published by the Council on Foreign Relations, Wall Street's international-affairs think tank. They mean business. And that's the source of neoconservatism — the top U.S.-based international corporations, mainly in 'defense' and oil and Wall Street. (Clinton's career is based upon precisely those three segments, whereas Trump's is based instead upon real estate and entertainment, neither of which segments is neoconservative.)

It doesn't come from nowhere; it comes from the people who buy and sell politicians.

*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](#), 2016

[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