My 14 August 2018 article, “Climate Change Bites Big Business”, described the now evident large financial impacts on Big Business caused by climate change, for example:

* The bankrupting-level liabilities to one California electric utility company ("PG&E") for causing massive wildfires in 2017,

* The threat of similar future liabilities to the entire electric utility industry, especially in Western America,

* Huge losses to fire insurance companies in California during 2017-2018 (and similar possibilities wherever drought occurs in highly developed areas),

* Huge losses to flood, hurricane and tornado insurance companies, because of the more violent rain-and-wind storms of recent years (like Hurricane Sandy in 2012, and the hurricanes since),

* The possible throttling of future commercial and real estate investment if insurance rates and bank loan interest rates increase sharply because wildfire and weather-related destructive events are now permanently amplified by climate change.

In the article cited above, I concluded:

I think that the pretense of climate change denialism by the Big Money has crumbled, and we are now entering a period of overt climate change acknowledgment coupled with
fanatical efforts to gain public subsidies for private interests to both insure and indemnify them against climate change–related financial losses, and to also preserve the nature of their businesses even if they are major CO2 and organic vapor polluters, like the petrochemical and coal companies.

Confirmation of the above conclusion is provided by The Associated Press article of 22 August 2018, “Big oil asks government to protect its Texas facilities from climate change”, which describes:

An ambitious proposal to build a nearly sixty-mile “spine” of concrete seawalls, earthen barriers, floating gates and steel levees on the Texas Gulf Coast ... to shield some of the crown jewels of the petroleum industry, which is blamed for contributing to global warming and now wants the federal government to build safeguards against the consequences of it. The plan is focused on a stretch of coastline that runs from the Louisiana border to industrial enclaves south of Houston that are home to one of the world’s largest concentrations of petrochemical facilities, including most of Texas’ thirty refineries, which represent thirty percent of the nation’s refining capacity. Texas is seeking at least $12 billion for the full coastal spine, with nearly all of it coming from public funds. Last month, the government fast-tracked an initial $3.9 billion for three separate, smaller storm barrier projects that would specifically protect oil facilities.

Capitalism is a combustion engine that burns fossil fuels to churn out privatized financial wealth, government power (by fueling the military) and socialized waste heat and greenhouse gas pollution whose accumulation in Nature creates and accelerates global warming–induced climate change.

The bald fact of the oil industry seeking to have the public subsidize the protection of its facilities – and its profitability – from the natural climate–changing consequences of its own operations must rank as one the most colossal combinations of blind greed, chutzpah, cognitive dissonance, and inertia during this Oil Age.

But, this is where we are today in our collective response (if you can call it that) to the advancing threats posed by climate change to organized human life.

More polemics are pointless, and our existing politics is madness.

Note: The phrase “Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad” is spoken by Prometheus in Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's poem “The Masque of Pandora” (1875).

Electoral politics is not the solution to the Earth-threatening problems we face.

– Jeffrey St Clair, CounterPunch (August 10 2018)

There is now no non-violent way to reverse climate change. Even with morally unrestrained action, it is probable that there is now no physical possibility of reversing climate change. The time for action was 1973–1979, the time of the two oil embargoes (the post–Israeli War – against Egypt and Syria – Arab Oil Embargo of 1973; and the related–to–the–Iranian–Revolution vengeful price gouge oil embargo of 1979). This was the period of the Watergate–climax finale of the Nixon Administration, the Ford Administration, and the Carter “energy crisis” Administration. Politically, the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 killed the possibility of US climate change action.

From Reagan through Bush I, Clinton, Bush II and Obama to Trump, the mentioning of climate change – as one of government’s highest priorities, as one of corporate America’s foremost concerns (to be addressed, not suppressed), and as one of mainstream media’s primary and continuing focuses and leading stories – was minimized if not altogether absent. If anything, climate change denialism was heavily promoted by corporate and partisan (right wing) media, and by legions of corporate agents, flacks, and factotums masquerading as elected representatives in federal and state governments. That has now changed.

Climate change is now all over the front pages of the newspapers and is the headline story of the mainstream mass media, primarily because of the massive fires in California whose smoke has even reached New York City. Why this new overt and blaring mainstream news attention to climate change, a subject that was officially hush–hush, trivial, and fake news so recently in the past? Obviously, because climate change has begun costing big money to major sectors of American capitalism.
In the case of the 2017~2018 California wildfires, one of the costs to capitalism is the financial threat of bankruptcy via liability suits against Northern California’s regulated monopoly utility company, Pacific Gas & Electric ("PG&E"), which is being held responsible for causing the Sonoma and Napa Counties fires of 2017, because electric power lines swung into too-near tree branches during high winds setting off sparks that ignited fires that raced across the dry countryside, incinerating many communities and much industrial infrastructure (for example, for telephone, internet, and TV distribution, and also numerous small business facilities, croplands, and vineyards).

A second set of costs to capitalism from California’s vast wildfires of 2017~2018 are the high losses to fire insurance companies, prompting their threats to leave the California insurance market, which in essence would mean a very sharp increase of fire insurance rates for California residents, homeowners, and businesses. It seems unlikely to everybody that multi-countywide wildfires like those of 2017 and 2018 are a fluke unlikely to reoccur next year and thereafter.

Companies offering flood, tornado, and hurricane insurance along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts of the United States, and in Puerto Rico, may now also be smarting from the increased damage caused by more frequent and more powerful hurricanes, and the drenching and flooding rainstorms of the last few years. As with the vaster wildfires and longer wildfire season in the West, the more frequent and extensive flood and tornado disasters in the Great Plains and Gulf and Atlantic coasts have likely seeded thoughts of insurance flight and massive rate increases, and loan rate increases, in the minds of the moguls of the liability underwriting industry and the investment banking industry.

Higher insurance and loan costs hamper any business operation and dampen real estate construction and sales activity, as well as adding usually unproductive costs to the living expenses of homeowners and renters seeking to buy a little security against unanticipated personal catastrophes.

It is good to remember that the reason the nuclear power industry (for electric generation) is dead is because the insurance industry worldwide rates nuclear power as an infinite liability and thus an uninsurable risk. **Nuclear power can only exist where government assumes 100% of the liability in perpetuity.** Insurance companies are starting to get the queasy feeling that perhaps wildfires in California (and probably the Great American Desert west of the Mississippi), as well as hurricanes along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts of the United States, are growing into potentially bankrupting infinite liability insurance risks.

A true and honest free market zealot would say:

---

**So what, if companies like PG&E are at fault for wildfire apocalypses then let them get sued into bankruptcy. Another set of entrepreneurs will take their place as providers of electricity and natural gas for consumers, and profit as they deserve for providing safe and reliable service. Also, if some insurance companies are too scared to underwrite the risks of wildfires, hurricanes, tornadoes and floods, then let them run away or price themselves out of the market, because newer entrepreneurs will become new insurance providers who will take advantage of capturing an underserved market by offering affordable insurance, and thus profit by gaining a large customer base that would then dilute their aggregate risk.**
Yes, zealot, but “true and honest” does not usually pair with “profit” when we are dealing with Big Money operators. So, what is more likely to happen?

In the official postmortem of the 2017 Northern California wildfires, PG&E was pointed to as the primary (essentially only) culprit because of the arcing contact between live electric cables and dry tree limbs during the high winds preceding the fires. PG&E is required by regulations to maintain a set clearance between its power cables and all trees near them. That clearance was obviously insufficient, either because of an inadequacy of the state regulations, or an insufficiency of tree trimming maintenance by PG&E’s tree trimming contractors, or both. Fingers will point, courts will be busy.

However, the idea of thousands of burned-out wildfire victims suing PG&E into bankruptcy will not happen because the state of California would then have the colossal headache of finding a new enormous and technically competent business entity to seamlessly take over the operations of producing and distributing electric power and natural gas to many millions of Californians populating a large and geographically diverse terrain. So, California state government will revise old laws or craft new ones to provide too-important-to-fail utilities like PG&E (and Edison International and San Diego Gas & Electric) with some legal protection from the financial threat of bankruptcy over the liability of causing wildfires. (See the citation at the end for the legalistic details.)

The FIRE combine (Finance, Insurance and Real Estate; and their meshing as Wall Street speculation), along with the War Industries Complex, has a stranglehold on today’s US Government. Recall that FIRE owned the political career of Barack Obama, who dutifully protected them from justifiable prosecution and punishment for the greatest robbery of all time, in 2008; and that military-related expenses and subsidies consume over seventy percent of the federal budget (our taxes). While American Big Business includes many other rich and politically powerful sectors, like Big Pharma, I think that FIRE and the War Industries Complex are the largest forces in American capitalism today.

It seems to me that now that climate change is biting Big Business in a big way, the mainstream media is excited to report all the lurid details of catastrophes spawned by climate change, because it is echoing the fears of their prime and patronizing audience: the loss of big money by Big Business, and its fear of the loss of future certainty of uninterrupted profitability. Big Capital is now openly scared about climate change, and that is what we are now seeing as headline news.

We will also be seeing urgent promotions – presented as mass media news and commentary – for varieties of government subsidized protection for those sectors of Big Business that feel most financially threatened by the biting furies of climate change. The little that California state government is now doing for moderating the potentially infinite liabilities of its wildfire-haunted electric utilities is only the beginning of what we can expect in the way of publicly subsidized climate change insurance for Big Business.

I think that the pretense of climate change denialism by the Big Money has crumbled, and we are now entering a period of overt climate change acknowledgment coupled
and we are now entering a period of overt climate change acknowledgment coupled with fanatical efforts to gain public subsidies for private interests to both insure and indemnify them against climate change-related financial losses, and to also preserve the nature of their businesses even if they are major CO2 and organic vapor polluters, like the petrochemical and coal companies.


https://www.counterpunch.org/2018/08/14/climate-change-bites-big-business/

Extreme Global Weather ...

... is “the face of climate change says leading scientist

Exclusive: Professor Michael Mann declares the impacts of global warming are now “playing out in real-time”

• Heatwave made more than twice as likely by climate change, scientists find

by Damian Carrington Environment editor

The Guardian (July 27 2018)

Emergency workers among damaged vehicles in an open parking area of northern Athens after a flash flood struck the Greek capital. Photograph: Angelos Tzortzinis/AFP/Getty Images

The extreme heatwaves and wildfires wreaking havoc around the globe are “the face of climate change”, one of the world’s leading climate scientists has declared, with the impacts of global warming now “playing out in real time”.

Climate change has long been predicted to increase extreme weather incidents, and scientists are now confident these predictions are coming true. Scientists say the global warming has contributed to the scorching temperatures that have baked the UK and northern Europe for weeks.
northern Europe for weeks.

The hot spell was made more than twice as likely by climate change, a new analysis found, demonstrating an “unambiguous” link.

Extreme weather has struck across Europe, from the Arctic Circle to Greece, and across the world, from North America to Japan. “This is the face of climate change”, said Professor Michael Mann, at Penn State University, and one the world’s most eminent climate scientists. “We literally would not have seen these extremes in the absence of climate change”.

“The impacts of climate change are no longer subtle”, he told The Guardian. “We are seeing them play out in real time and what is happening this summer is a perfect example of that”.

“We are seeing our predictions come true”, he said. “As a scientist that is reassuring, but as a citizen of planet Earth, it is very distressing to see that as it means we have not taken the necessary action”.

The rapid scientific assessment of the northern European heatwave was done by Geert Jan van Oldenborgh, at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute and also colleagues in the World Weather Attribution (“WWA”) consortium. “We can see the fingerprints of climate change on local extremes”, he said.

The current heatwave has been caused by an extraordinary stalling of the jet stream wind, which usually funnels cool Atlantic weather over the continent. This has left hot, dry air in place for two months – far longer than usual. The stalling of the northern hemisphere jet stream is being increasingly firmly linked to global warming, in particular to the rapid heating of the Arctic and resulting loss of sea ice.

Professor Mann said that asking if climate change “causes” specific events is the wrong question:

*The relevant question is: “Is climate change impacting these events and making them more extreme?”, and we can say with great confidence that it is.*

Mann points out that the link between smoking tobacco and lung cancer is a statistical one, which does not prove every cancer was caused by smoking, but epidemiologists know that smoking greatly increases the risk. “That is enough to say that, for all practical purposes, there is a causal connection between smoking cigarettes and lung cancer and it is the same with climate change”, Mann said.

Other senior scientists agree the link is clear. Serious climate change is “unfolding before our eyes”, said Professor Rowan Sutton, at the University of Reading. “No one should be in the slightest surprised that we are seeing very serious heatwaves and associated impacts in many parts of the world”.

...
Surface Temperature in 2017 and 2018. Source: GISS/Nasa

It is not too late to make the significant cuts needed in greenhouse gas emissions, said Mann, because the impacts progressively worsen as global warming increases.

“It is not going off a cliff, it is like walking out into a minefield”, he said. “So the argument it is too late to do something would be like saying: ‘I’m just going to keep walking’. That would be absurd – you reverse course and get off that minefield as quick as you can. It is really a question of how bad it is going to get.”

Read More:


* https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/jul/24/why-is-europe-going-through-a-heatwave


---

Germany Has Proven …

... the Modern Automobile Must Die

by Emily Atkin

Wired (August 21 2018)
This story originally appeared on The New Republic and is part of the Climate Desk collaboration.

Germany was supposed to be a model for solving global warming. In 2007, the country’s government announced that it would reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by forty percent by the year 2020. This was the kind of bold, aggressive climate goal scientists said was needed in all developed countries. If Germany could do it, it would prove the target possible.

So far, Germany has reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 27.7 percent — an astonishing achievement for a developed country with a highly developed manufacturing sector. But with a little more than a year left to go, despite dedicating $580 billion toward a low-carbon energy system, the country “is likely to fall short of its goals for reducing harmful carbon-dioxide emissions”, Bloomberg News reported on Wednesday. And the reason for that may come down not to any elaborate solar industry plans, but something much simpler: cars.

“At the time they set their goals, they were very ambitious”, Patricia Espinosa, the United Nations’ top climate change official, told Bloomberg. “What happened was that the industry – particularly the car industry – didn’t come along”.

Changing the way we power our homes and businesses is certainly important. But as Germany’s shortfall shows, the only way to achieve these necessary, aggressive emissions reductions to combat global warming is to overhaul the gas-powered automobile and the culture that surrounds it. The only question left is how to do it.

In 2010, a Nasa study declared that automobiles were officially the largest net contributor of climate change pollution in the world. “Cars, buses, and trucks release pollutants and greenhouse gases that promote warming, while emitting few aerosols that counteract it”, the study read. “In contrast, the industrial and power sectors release many of the same gases – with a larger contribution to [warming] – but they also emit sulfuric and other aerosols that cause cooling by reflecting light and altering clouds”.

“Cars, buses, and trucks release pollutants and greenhouse gases that promote warming, while emitting few aerosols that counteract it”, the study read. “In contrast, the industrial and power sectors release many of the same gases – with a larger contribution to [warming] – but they also emit sulfuric and other aerosols that cause cooling by reflecting light and altering clouds”.
sulfates and other aerosols that cause cooling by reflecting light and altering clouds”.

In other words, the power generation sector may have emitted the most greenhouse gases in total. But it also released so many sulfates and cooling aerosols that the net impact was less than the automobile industry, according to Nasa.

Since then, developed countries have cut back on those cooling aerosols for the purpose of countering regular air pollution, which has likely increased the net climate pollution of the power generation industry. But according to the Union of Concerned Scientists, “collectively, cars and trucks account for nearly one-fifth of all US emissions”, while “in total, the US transportation sector – which includes cars, trucks, planes, trains, ships, and freight – produces nearly thirty percent of all US global warming emissions ...”

In fact, transportation is now the largest source of carbon dioxide emissions in the United States – and it has been for two years, according to an analysis from the Rhodium Group.

There's a similar pattern happening in Germany. Last year, the country's greenhouse gas emissions decreased as a whole, “largely thanks to the closure of coal–fired power plants”, according to Reuters. Meanwhile, the transportation industry's emissions increased by 2.3 percent, “as car ownership expanded and the booming economy meant more heavy vehicles were on the road”. Germany's transportation sector remains the nation's second largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, but if these trends continue, it will soon become the first.

Clearly, the power generation industry is changing its ways. So why aren’t carmakers following suit?

To American eyes, Germany may look like a public transit paradise. But the country also has a flourishing car culture that began over a hundred years ago and has only grown since then.

Behind Japan and the United States, Germany is the third-largest automobile manufacturer in the world – home to BMW, Audi, Mercedes Benz, and Volkswagen. These brands, and the economic prosperity they’ve brought to the country, shape Germany's cultural and political identities. “There is no other industry as important”, Arndt Ellinghorst, the chief of Global Automotive Research at Evercore, told CNN.

A similar phenomenon exists in the United States, where gas-guzzlers symbolize nearly every cliche point of American pride: affluence, capability for individual expression, and personal freedoms. Freedom, in particular, “is not a selling point to be easily dismissed”, Edward Humes wrote in The Atlantic in 2016. “This trusty conveyance, always there, always ready, on no schedule but its owner’s. Buses can’t do that. Trains can’t do that. Even Uber makes riders wait.”

It’s this cultural love of cars – and the political influence of the automotive industry – that has so far prevented the public pressure necessary to provoke widespread change in many developed nations. But say those barriers didn’t exist. How could developed countries tweak their automobile policies to solve climate change?

For Germany to meet emissions targets, “half of the people who now use their cars alone would have to switch to bicycles, public transport, or ride-sharing”, Heinrich.
alone would have to switch to bicycles, public transport, or ride-sharing”, Heinrich Strößenreuther, a Berlin-based consultant for mobility strategies told YaleEnvironment360’s Christian Schwagerl last fall. That would require drastic policies, like having local governments ban high-emitting cars in populated places like cities. (In fact, Germany’s car capital, Stuttgart, is considering it.) It would also require large-scale government investments in public transportation infrastructure: “A new transport system that connects bicycles, buses, trains, and shared cars, all controlled by digital platforms that allow users to move from A to B in the fastest and cheapest way – but without their own car”, Schwagerl said.

One could get away with more modest infrastructure investments if governments required carmakers to make their vehicle fleets more fuel-efficient, thereby burning less petroleum. The problem is that most automakers seek to meet those requirements by developing electric cars. If those cars are charged with electricity from a coal-fired power plant, they create “more emissions than a car that burns petrol”, energy storage expert Denes Csala pointed out last year. “For such a switch to actually reduce net emissions, the electricity that powers those cars must be renewable”.

The most effective solution would be to combine these policies. Governments would require drastic improvements in fuel efficiency for gas-powered vehicles, while investing in renewable-powered electric car infrastructure. At the same time, cities would overhaul their public transportation systems, adding more bikes, trains, buses and ride-shares. Fewer people would own cars.

At one point, the US was well on its way toward some of these changes. In 2012, President Barack Obama’s administration implemented regulations requiring automakers to nearly double the fuel economy of passenger vehicles by the year 2025. But the Trump administration announced a rollback of those regulations earlier this month. Their intention, they said, is to “Make Cars Great Again”.

The modern cars they’re seeking to preserve, and the way we use them, are far from great. Of course, there’s the climate impact – the trillions in expected economic damage from extreme weather and sea-level rise caused in part by our tailpipes. But 53,000 Americans also die prematurely from vehicle pollution each year, and accidents are among the leading causes of death in the United States. “If US roads were a war zone, they would be the most dangerous battlefield the American military has ever encountered”, Humes wrote. It’s getting more dangerous by the day.

https://www.wired.com/story/germany-proves-cars-must-die

The Anti-Empire Report #159

by William Blum

https://williamblum.org (August 17 2018)

The Mind of the Mass Media

Email exchange between myself and a leading Washington Post foreign policy reporter
July 18 2018

Dear Mr Birnbaum,

You write Trump “made no mention of Russia’s adventures in Ukraine”. Well, neither he nor Putin nor you made any mention of America’s adventures in the Ukraine, which resulted in the overthrow of the Ukrainian government in 2014, which led to the justified Russian adventure. Therefore ...?

If Russia overthrew the Mexican government would you blame the US for taking some action in Mexico?

William Blum

Dear Mr Blum,

Thanks for your note. “America’s adventures in the Ukraine”: what are you talking about? Last time I checked, it was Ukrainians in the streets of Kiev who caused Yanukovych to turn tail and run. Whether or not that was a good thing, we can leave aside, but it wasn’t the Americans who did it.

It is, however, Russian special forces who fanned out across Crimea in February and March 2014, according to Putin, and Russians who came down from Moscow who stoked conflict in eastern Ukraine in the months after, according to their own accounts.

Best, Michael Birnbaum

To MB,

I can scarcely believe your reply. Do you read nothing but the Post? Do you not know of high State Dept official Victoria Nuland and the US Ambassador in Ukraine in Maidan Square to encourage the protesters? She spoke of 5 billion (sic) dollars given to aid the protesters who were soon to overthrow the govt. She and the US Amb. spoke openly of who to choose as the next president. And he’s the one who became president. This is all on tape. I guess you never watch Russia Today (RT). God forbid! I read the Post every day. You should watch RT once in a while.

William Blum

To WB,

I was the Moscow bureau chief of the newspaper; I reported extensively in Ukraine in the months and years following the protests. My observations are not based on reading. RT is not a credible news outlet, but I certainly do read far beyond our own pages, and of course I talk to the actual actors on the ground myself – that’s my job.

And: yes, of course Nuland was in the Maidan – but encouraging the protests, as she clearly did, is not the same as sparking them or directing them, nor is playing favorites with potential successors, as she clearly did, the same as being directly responsible for overthrowing the government. I’m not saying the United States wasn’t involved in trying to shape events. So were Russia and the European Union. But Ukrainians were in the driver’s seat the whole way through. I know the guy who posted the first Facebook call to protest Yanukovych in November 2013; he’s not an American agent. RT,
meanwhile, reports fabrications and terrible falsehoods all the time. By all means consume a healthy and varied media diet – don’t stop at the US mainstream media. But ask yourself how often RT reports critically on the Russian government, and consider how that lacuna shapes the rest of their reporting. You will find plenty of reporting in the Washington Post that is critical of the US government and US foreign policy in general, and decisions in Ukraine and the Ukrainian government in specific. Our aim is to be fair, without picking sides.

Best, Michael Birnbaum

End of Exchange

Right, the United States doesn’t play indispensable roles in changes of foreign governments; never has, never will; even when they offer billions of dollars; even when they pick the new president, which, apparently, is not the same as picking sides. It should be noticed that Mr Birnbaum offers not a single example to back up his extremist claim that RT “reports fabrications and terrible falsehoods all the time”. “All the time”, no less! That should make it easy to give some examples.

For the record, I think RT is much less biased than the Post on international affairs. And, yes, it’s bias, not “fake news” that’s the main problem – Cold-War/anti-Communist/anti-Russian bias that Americans have been raised with for a full century. RT defends Russia against the countless mindless attacks from the West. Who else is there to do that? Should not the Western media be held accountable for what they broadcast? Americans are so unaccustomed to hearing the Russian side defended, or hearing it at all, that when they do it can seem rather weird.

To the casual observer, THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA indictments of July 14 of Russian intelligence agents (GRU) reinforced the argument that the Soviet government interfered in the US 2016 presidential election. Regard these indictments in proper perspective and we find that election interference is only listed as a supposed objective, with charges actually being for unlawful cyber operations, identity theft, and conspiracy to launder money by American individuals unconnected to the Russian government. So … we’re still waiting for some evidence of actual Russian interference in the election aimed at determining the winner.

The Russians Did It (continued)

Each day I spend about three hours reading The Washington Post. Amongst other things I’m looking for evidence – real, legal, courtroom-quality evidence, or at least something logical and rational – to pin down those awful Russkis for their many recent crimes, from influencing the outcome of the 2016 US presidential election to use of a nerve agent in the UK. But I do not find such evidence.

Each day brings headlines like these:

“US to add economic sanctions on Russia: Attack with nerve agent on former spy in England forces White House to act”

“Is Russia exploiting new Facebook goal?”
Experts: Trump team lacks urgency on Russian threat

These are all from the same day, August 9, which led me to thinking of doing this article, but similar stories can be found any day in the Post and in major newspapers anywhere in America. None of the articles begins to explain how Russia did these things, or even WHY. Motivation appears to have become a lost pursuit in the American mass media. The one thing sometimes mentioned, which I think may have some credibility, is Russia’s preference of Trump over Hillary Clinton in 2016. But this doesn’t begin to explain how Russia could pull off any of the electoral magic it’s accused of, which would be feasible only if the United States were a backward, Third World, Banana Republic.

There’s the Facebook ads, as well as all the other ads ... The people who are influenced by this story – have they read many of the actual ads? Many are pro-Clinton or anti-Trump; many are both; many are neither. It's one big mess, the only rational explanation of this which I’ve read is that they come from money-making websites, “click-bait” sites as they’re known, which earn money simply by attracting visitors.

As to the nerve agents, it makes more sense if the UK or the CIA did it to make the Russians look bad, because the anti-Russian scandal which followed was totally predictable. Why would Russia choose the time of the World Cup in Moscow – of which all of Russia was immensely proud – to bring such notoriety down upon their head? But that would have been an ideal time for their enemies to want to embarrass them.

However, I have no doubt that the great majority of Americans who follow the news each day believe the official stories about the Russians. They’re particularly impressed with the fact that every US intelligence agency supports the official stories. They would not be impressed at all if told that a dozen Russian intelligence agencies all disputed the charges. Group-think is alive and well all over the world. As is Cold War II.

But We’re the Good Guys, Ain’t We?

For a defender of US foreign policy there’s very little that causes extreme heartburn more than someone implying a “moral equivalence” between American behavior and that of Russia. That was the case during Cold War I and it’s the same now in Cold War II. It just drives them up the wall.

After the United States passed a law last year requiring TV station RT (Russia Today) to register as a “foreign agent”, the Russians passed their own law allowing authorities to require foreign media to register as a “foreign agent”. Senator John McCain denounced the new Russian law, saying there is “no equivalence” between RT and networks such as Voice of America, CNN, and the BBC, whose journalists “seek the truth, debunk lies, and hold governments accountable”. By contrast, he said, “RT’s propagandists debunk the truth, spread lies, and seek to undermine democratic governments in order to further Vladimir Putin’s agenda”. {1}

And here is Tom Malinowski, former Assistant Secretary of State for democracy, human rights, and labor (2014~2017) – last year he reported that Putin had “charged that the US government had interfered ‘aggressively’ in Russia’s 2012 presidential vote”, claiming that Washington had “gathered opposition forces and financed them”. Putin, wrote Malinowski, “apparently got President Trump to agree to a mutual commitment that neither country would interfere in the other’s elections”.


“Is this moral equivalence fair?” Malinowski asked and answered: “In short, no. Russia’s interference in the United States’ 2016 election could not have been more different from what the United States does to promote democracy in other countries”.

How do you satirize such officials and such high-school beliefs?

We also have the case of the US government agency, National Endowment for Democracy (“NED”), which has interfered in more elections than the CIA or God. Indeed, the man who helped draft the legislation establishing NED, Allen Weinstein, declared in 1991: “A lot of what we do today was done covertly 25 years ago by the CIA”.

On April 12 2018 the presidents of two of NED’s wings wrote: “A specious narrative has come back into circulation: that Moscow’s campaign of political warfare is no different from US-supported democracy assistance”.

“Democracy assistance”, you see, is what they call NED’s election-interferences and government-overthrows. The authors continue: “This narrative is churned out by propaganda outlets such as RT and Sputnik [radio station] … it is deployed by isolationists who propound a US retreat from global leadership”.

“Isolationists” is what conservatives call critics of US foreign policy whose arguments they can’t easily dismiss, so they imply that such people just don’t want the US to be involved in anything abroad.

And “global leadership” is what they call being first in election-interferences and government-overthrows.

**What God Giveth, Trump Taketh Away?**

The White House sends out a newsletter, “1600 daily”, each day to subscribers about what’s new in the marvelous world inhabited by Donald J Trump. On July 25 it reported about the president’s talk before the Veterans of Foreign Wars national convention in Missouri: “We don’t apologize for America anymore. We stand up for America. And we stand up for our National Anthem”, the President said to “a thundering ovation”.

At the same time, the newsletter informed us that the State Department is bringing together religious leaders and others for the first-ever Ministerial to Advance Religious Freedom. “The goal is simple”, we are told, “to promote the God-given human right to believe what you choose”.

Aha! I see. But what about those who believe that standing for the National Anthem implies support for America’s racism or police brutality? Is it not a God-given human right to believe such a thing and “take a knee” in protest?

Or is it the devil that puts such evil ideas into our heads?

The argument I like to use when speaking to those who don’t accept the idea that extreme weather phenomena are largely man-made is this:

Well, we can proceed in one of two ways:
1. We can do our best to limit the greenhouse effect by curtailing greenhouse gas emissions (carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide) into the atmosphere, and if it turns out that these emissions were not in fact a significant cause of the widespread extreme weather phenomena, then we’ve wasted a lot of time, effort, and money (although other benefits to the ecosystem would still accrue).

2. We can do nothing at all to curtail the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and if it turns out that these emissions were in fact the leading cause of all the extreme weather phenomena, then we’ve lost the earth and life as we know it.

So, are you a gambler?

Irony of ironies … Misfortune of misfortunes … We have a leader who has zero interest in such things; indeed, the man is unequivocally contemptuous of the very idea of the need to modify individual or social behavior for the sake of the environment. And one after another he’s appointed his soulmates to head government agencies concerned with the environment.

What is it that motivates such people? I think it’s mainly that they realize that blame for much of environmental damage can be traced, directly or indirectly, to corporate profit-seeking behavior, an ideology to which they are firmly committed.

Notes:

{1} The Washington Post (November 16 2017)

{2} Ibid (July 23 2017)

{3} Ibid (September 22 1991)


{5} Washington Post (April 02 2018)
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From Baltic Sea to Black Sea

Russia aims for a win-win

A major summit featuring Germany, Russia, France, and Turkey is on the way – call it an expanded Eurovision

by Pepe Escobar

Asia Times (August 20 2018)

When Russian President Vladimir Putin, fresh from his star turn at the wedding of Austrian Prime Minister Karin Kneissl, showed up at the eighteenth century Meseberg Palace north of Berlin on Saturday afternoon for a face-to-face with German chancellor Angela Merkel, that was a surprise of sorts; the meeting had been announced only a few days earlier.

They talked for three hours over a multi-course menu; the Iran nuclear deal; the endless stalemate in Ukraine; the humanitarian angle in Syria; the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

Angela Merkel is not part of The Sanctioned supergroup – thus not in the same league as multi-instrumentalists Putin, Xi, Rouhani, and Erdogan. She’s been only tariffed by solo act Trump, not sanctioned. She’s no Suzi Quatro, not to mention Joan Jett, although she
might entertain rompin’ across I hate myself / for loving you when facing Putin. She’s more like a staid back-up singer from Estonia at the Eurovision song contest.

So no wonder that when the real surprise surfaced at Meseberg, it bore a vague resemblance to a remixed Eurovision song contest.

As confirmed to Asia Times by diplomatic sources, a top summit featuring Germany, Russia, France, and Turkey is on the way. Call it an expanded Eurovision – with Turkey included due to (wobbling) Nato membership.

Ostensibly, the summit would be on Syria – according to the Kremlin. That does not cut it – as Syria is already being discussed in detail in Astana by Russia, Iran, and Turkey.

Yet as The Sanctioned and The Tariffed share the stage, what they do embody is defiance of solo act Trump. The idea for the one-off top billing came from the Robert Plant-esque Sanctioned member Erdogan, even with a date attached – September 7. An ever cautious Merkel only went as far as admitting the summit “could make sense – this must be well-prepared, so there is no date yet”.

The fact is multinational sherpas are already working on it. In parallel, the finance ministers of Turkey and France not only agreed to confront sanctions on Turkey, but to come up with further bilateral economic cooperation. Sun King Macron is dying for his star turn at The Tariffed to go platinum.

**I Stream, You Stream, We All Do Nord Stream**

From Russia’s perspective, the very complex game goes way beyond a revamped Eurovision contest; it’s all about the geopolitical battle in the intermarium – between the Baltic and the Black Sea.

Putin was keen to stress the 9.5 billion euro (US$10.8 billion) Nord Stream 2 is a “purely economic project”, which does not necessarily imply transit of gas through Ukraine will stop: “I am aware of the Federal Chancellor’s position. All that matters to us is that this transit is economically feasible … and makes economic sense.”

Gazprom – a partner in Nord Stream 2 with other Western European energy giants – had concluded already by 2015 that a Ukraine transit makes no economic sense whatsoever. Merkel though – after investing so much in the Maidan scenario – remains an immovable object; even after Nord Stream 2 is online, she insists Ukraine “should play its part in gas transit to Europe”.

Putin is always forced to exhibit Lao Tzu levels of patience when re-explaining the Ukraine charade: “In the context of the settlement of the Ukrainian crisis, which, unfortunately, does not make headway at all, we are inclined to stress the lack of alternative to implementation of the Minsk agreements, to note our interest in working within the Normandy format and the contact group, our readiness to continue cooperating with the UN special monitoring mission”.

Kiev sabotages the Minsk agreements non-stop – and that’s why there’s “no stable ceasefire”, as even Merkel admits.

So Putin had to revert to the obvious: Nord Stream 2 “will make it possible to improve the European gas transportation system, diversify supply routes and minimize transit
risks, and, most importantly, to meet Europe’s growing demand for energy”.

Nord Stream 2 – from Russia along the Baltic Sea bed all the way to German shores – should be ready by the end of 2019. The new gas pipeline doubles the capacity of the original Nord Stream and follows the same route. According to a recent poll, Nord Stream 2 was approved by 66% of Germans. So the Trump solo act dream of having Europeans buying “vast amounts” of made in USA liquefied natural gas (“LNG”) now looks as much a mirage as a Pink Floyd reunion.

I See a Sea and I Want It Painted Black

The Nord Stream 2 angle proved that Putin and Merkel broadly agree on Baltic geoeconomics. They also agree on preserving the JCPOA, also known as the Iran nuclear deal. And yet Merkel adds a conditionality that comes straight from the Beltway: Germany is “following Iran’s activities with concern, be it the missile program or the situation in Syria”. You can take the girl out of exceptional tariffs, but you can’t take exceptionalism out of the girl.

The preferred Syria angle when The Sanctioned meet The Tariffed is now humanitarian – certainly less contentious than delving on who’s actually winning the war, why, and how.

Putin stressed there are millions of Syrian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey, “potentially a huge burden” for Europe: “That’s why we have to do everything to get these people back home” and restore “basic services” such as healthcare or water supplies. And “I think that everyone is interested in this, including Europe”. Merkel agrees.

And then there’s Sanctioned superstar Erdogan and his unpredictable outbursts: The hammer of the gods / We’ll drive our ships to new lands / To fight the horde, and sing and cry / Valhalla, I am coming!

What’s certain for now is that an IMF bailout of Turkey simply won’t happen; Erdogan can’t possibly sell it to his local audience. Options on the horizon come down to Qatar – $15 billion in investments already committed – and China ready to deepen Turkey’s connectivity to the New Silk Roads/Belt and Road Initiative (“BRI”).

During the Obama administration, Cold War 2.0 was launched on Russia by transposing the old Iron Curtain across the intermarium, from the Baltic to the Black Sea. A post-Maidan anti-Russian Ukraine – which borders the Black Sea – is a central part of the strategy.

Yet now Turkey provides Moscow with the perfect opening to smash the geopolitical chessboard and destroy the concerted offensive – which includes key elements from relentless Nato expansion to sanctions as no holds barred economic war.

What goes on in Turkey way extrapolates a bunch of European banks exposed to Ankara’s debt and possible domino contagion of emerging markets. The heart of the action concerns the Black Sea.

The primary role of an anti-Russian Kiev is to break the expansion of the Eurasia Economic Union (“EAEU”). The primary role of Turkey in Nato is to break Eurasia integration, namely, by spoiling the geopolitical interests between BRI, EAEU, and the
The “moderate rebel” disaster in Syria frustrated the Beltway plan of blocking Russia out of the Eastern Mediterranean. Crimea reverting back to Russia frustrated the Beltway strategy of controlling the Black Sea. Even Eurosivion back-up singer Merkel is starting to get a glimpse of the complexities inbuilt in the Syria-Ukraine unified front.

The whole mystique of The Sanctioned will develop on how, and if, they will be able to star in their own right by performing as a supergroup. The ultimate chess move of the Russian multi-instrumentalist may be to make Turkey at least indifferent to Nato – and run the Black Sea as a Russo-Turk condo. Can you hear that Paint it Black groove echoing around the Kremlin?


---

**America, the Tyranny of the Stupid**

by Gordon Duff

New Eastern Outlook (August 26 2018)

People around the world are convinced that the United States is a nation run by criminal psychopaths and morons. A greater fear is that world leaders mistakenly assume that their American counterparts who do and say insane things continually are, in actuality, normal people operating inside some “master plan”.

Then, when time and time again, no such plan materializes, and it is demonstrated that America has blundered into a diplomatic, economic, or military morass, for some...
unknown reason, a “reset” occurs, and the wrong assumptions are again made.

At every level, humanity errs in assuming that those in command are there because of talent and worth or that, because America is so wealthy and powerful, that its people are such because of moral and intellectual superiority.

Blind acceptance of exceptionalism is, in itself, a dangerous disease.

If you ask an average American what their IQ is, they are quick to answer. Invariably they will say, “140” or more. Yet, when you look at American society, at America’s culture, the idea of a nation of Mensa types is unrealistic. Americans aren’t much more stupid than other people, just much more dangerous.

Truth is, the average American has an IQ of around 96. It used to be 100, the number established as a “mean”. About forty percent of Americans run between sixty and 85, enough to function at basic levels but with intelligence low enough to impair higher functions such as judgment and critical reasoning.

This is where the real problem is, of that forty percent, a significant number graduate from universities and of those who come from higher socio-economic backgrounds, like those with inherited money, they get not just Ivy League degrees, but often make it through “diploma mill” fake graduate programs at the Wharton School of Business, Yale, and Harvard.

In Britain, of course, “idiots”, and the quotes are out of kindness because “idiot” is a real term with a real definition and applies quite nicely, go to Eaton, then Oxford or Cambridge.

Where it comes to play in America is the manner those of limited capability are channeled into military command, into government, into teaching positions even in universities, and into the White House itself.

Thus, real talent, “brilliance” as it were, is replaced by “cleverness” and even various forms of moral deficiency on the spectrum of social psychopathy.

When the world watches America, “on the bus to ‘Crazy-Town’ “, it is always assumed that the worst, even if that “worst” is true, must be denied, rationalized away. Even in America itself, those of talent, out of a need to simply turn away from an unpleasant truth, too often look for any sign that psychopathic morons in government and the military or, worse still, controlling social media giants and tech companies, are “normal”.

This form of denial, “normalizing” the abnormal, exalting the idiot, mistaking clownishness for hidden genius, very hidden genius, is in itself a disease, a weakness, a failing, and a threat to the survival of the human species.

It is no secret that the world itself and certainly the United States is ruled by economic elites whose positions are entirely inherited, elites with a stranglehold on political and economic life. Their origins, the banking families of Europe’s Middle Ages or the “Robber Barons” of the nineteenth century, perhaps the shipping families that carried opium and slaves, those and more, have left America with an elite ruling class that has long demonstrated moral depravity.
Through social manipulation this group, that controlled the eugenics movement during the 1920s and 1930s, has learned that they don’t need to use selective breeding to create slaves, but that it can be done through the education system which they control through foundations and think tanks.

To an extent, it is demonstrable that the Nazi reign of terror was financed and engineered by America’s elites, the Bush, Harriman, Rockefeller, Farish, and Walker families partnered with Hitler and IG Farben. Auschwitz was one of his efforts and what began as eugenics became mass murder under Hitler only to reappear as “Google” and “Facebook” decades later. In between, foundations rewrote history, recreated a “dumbed down” education system and society.

In American government, congress walled itself in with rules that stifled change and debate, gave all control of the few, committee heads from remote and backward districts who ruled America on behalf of ruling elites for generations.

Key to keeping it all working has been the reengineering of every institution to favor the “morally flexible” of limited intelligence, a nation of semi-literate legislators, doctors, judges, law enforcement officials, college professors, admirals and generals, and even captains of industry.

The result has been fifty years of declining wages, lowered life expectancy despite scientific advances, a society at war with itself, radicalized, superstitious, and easily controlled.

Fostering all of it is the general human weakness of denialism, the need to ignore seemingly unsurmountable challenges when simply “going along with the program” allows for survival and where “being part of the problem” can offer great rewards.

Behind it all is the fake narrative, an endless droning of jingoism and phony patriotism, of exceptionalism and behind that is always fear.

To an extent, technology itself is the enemy. A century ago, when America was a burgeoning industrial giant, teeming millions worked in factories. The hierarchy there wasn’t so much factory owners or thuggish supervisors, Ford Motor Company actually hired violent felons to oversee workers.

It took real talent, even brilliance, to design tools, create innovations, improve processes, all of which was done by real elites among the working classes. Whoever may have thought they were “in charge”, without tool and die makers nothing happened.

With all of that gone, CAD systems, robotics, a world of devices and “apps”, an America with fake universities giving out fake degrees, a military that passes out fake medals to fake heroes by the score who fight equally fake wars, whatever remained of a natural elite, an “offset” as it were, has disappeared.

By the mid-1970s, under the guise of creating opportunities for minorities, the bar was lowered, allowing the least talented to rise and the potentially threatening few of capability to be contained and stifled. This wasn’t by accident and had absolutely nothing to do with opportunity or equality.

It had everything to do with compliance and with building a society where moral questions would go unanswered, unasked, and would eventually disappear.
questions would go unanswered, unasked, and would eventually disappear.

The reality, a congress where an IQ of seventy is not unheard of, military academies where psychopathic behavior is promoted and those who exhibit the most deviant tendencies are “fast tracked” to command.

Journalism and its partner industry, “entertainment” is so much worse.

None of it was done by accident.

________

Gordon Duff is a Marine combat veteran of the Vietnam War that has worked on veterans and POW issues for decades and consulted with governments challenged by security issues. He’s a senior editor and chairman of the board of Veterans Today, especially for the online magazine New Eastern Outlook.
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### Why Must Venezuela be Destroyed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>(86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>(87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>(61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>(81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>(88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>(65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>(86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2008</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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