

The U.S. Can't Win the War It Is Provoking

by James Hanisch

April 6, 2015

There was a time (as recently as the close of the Second World War) when the United States enjoyed an unquestioned technological, economic, financial, and military superiority throughout the world. Reveling in the title of “the world’s only superpower,” some of America’s most headstrong leaders went so far as to proclaim “the end of history.” But those faddishly coined expressions make little sense today. Times have changed, and those heady days are gone — or should be gone.

Nevertheless, for much of America the headiness remains, though clearly the world’s leadership in the various sectors of power is now shared with (or has passed over to) other nations. Many in the U.S. seem not to have noticed that in recent decades technology has been no respecter of borders; that their own nation’s key jobs — in fact, virtually the whole of their nation’s industrial and manufacturing base — have been “off-shored” (given away); that their currency’s value is supported not by real wealth or by strong economic activity, but rather merely on what amounts to an elaborate arrangement of smoke and mirrors; and that their nation’s military has been both over-extended and eviscerated. A painful lesson seems to lie ahead for America, by which a more humble bearing is found now to be in order. As an older saying goes, “Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.”

Regarding the military sector, The Heritage Foundation has examined the U.S. armed forces’ current ability to effectively conduct operations on demand, and has characterized the common theme of its findings across the various service branches as “force degradation.” In its recently published *2015 Index of U.S. Military Strength*, the status of American military power is assessed in terms of force size, modernization programs, unit readiness, and functional combat power on land, sea, and air. The verdict: “the current Joint Force is ... aged and shrinking in its capacity for operations.” In the Executive Summary of the *Index*, we find this candid prognosis:

Overall, the *Index* concludes that the current U.S. military force is adequate to meeting the demands of a single major regional conflict while also attending to various presence and engagement activities. Clearly, this is what the military is doing now and has done for the past two decades, but *it would be very hard-pressed to do more and certainly would be ill-equipped to handle two, near-simultaneous major regional contingencies*. The consistent decline in funding and the consequent shrinking of the force are putting it under significant pressure. Essential maintenance is being deferred; fewer units (mostly the Navy’s platforms and the Special Operations Forces community) are being cycled through operational deployments more often and for longer periods; and old equipment is being extended while programmed replacements are problematic. The cumulative effect of such factors has resulted in a U.S. military that is *marginally able to meet the demands of defending America’s vital national interests*.¹

Such an assessment comes as no surprise, especially in the present White House administration. It has not been long since similar warnings were in the headlines, coming from the mouths of America’s own top generals — a number of whom have publicly alleged that President Obama’s ultimate goal seems to be to “destroy U.S. military superiority” to the “advantage of our global enemies.”² When we add to this assessment the flatly insane foreign policy of the neoconservative War Party, relentlessly pushing toward war in pursuit of American hegemony, the world can only tremble for its future.

¹ The Heritage Foundation, *2015 Index of U.S. Military Strength*, Executive Summary (emphasis added); <http://index.heritage.org/militarystrength/about/executive-summary/>

² Cf. F. Michael Maloof, “General: Obama Purposely Weakening U.S. Military,” *WorldNetDaily*, November 25, 2013; <http://www.wnd.com/2013/11/general-obama-purposely-weakening-u-s-military/>

In our time, any armed conflict between major powers is likely to devolve into a catastrophic nuclear war — a prospect which should make every nation anxious to maintain peace. But even barring this prospect, how is it possible that at a juncture when the U.S. military is admittedly ill-prepared to take on simultaneous major commitments, there is no respite to the neoconservative’s widespread provocations for war? We continue to see a drive for extending NATO into Eastern Europe, and for placing military bases on Russia’s border. We see Western leaders calling the President of Russia “the new Hitler,” and accusing him of all sorts of crimes. We see Washington forcing Europe to impose economic sanctions on Russia that are based on patent lies and false accusations. And at the same time we see Washington provoking China through a similar hostile encirclement with its “pivot to Asia.”

Behind all of the headlines, however, the picture is darker still. Reagan-era Cabinet member Dr. Paul Craig Roberts explains:

The neoconservative doctrine of US world hegemony is a threat to the sovereignty of every country. ... Independent governments are targeted for destabilization. The Obama regime overthrew the reformist government in Honduras and currently is at work destabilizing Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Argentina, and most likely also Armenia and the former Central Asian Soviet Republics. ... [T]he neoconservatives were preoccupied for a decade with their wars in the Middle East, creating a US Africa Command, organizing color revolutions, exiting disarmament treaties, surrounding Russia with military bases, and “pivoting to Asia” to surround China with new air and naval bases....

The neoconservatives are responsible for the Clinton regime’s attacks on Yugoslavia and Serbia. Neoconservatives, especially Paul Wolfowitz, are responsible for the George W. Bush regime’s invasion of Iraq. The neoconservatives are responsible for the overthrow and murder of Gaddafi in Libya, the assault on Syria, the propaganda against Iran, the drone attacks on Pakistan and Yemen, the color revolutions in former Soviet Republics, the attempted “Green Revolution” in Iran, the coup in Ukraine, and the demonization of Vladimir Putin.

... [According to reports from Armenia and Kyrgyzstan,] Washington has financed NGOs and is cultivating politicians in Armenia and the former Soviet Central Asian Republics. If the information is correct, Russia can expect more “color revolutions” or coups in other former territories of the Soviet Union. Perhaps China faces a similar threat in Uyghurstan.³

It all amounts, as Dr. Roberts summarizes in another place, to a vain and failed attempt to keep the United States in its one-time place as the world’s sole superpower, capable of dictating its own agenda to the rest of the world — at the cost of recklessly threatening us all with nuclear Armageddon. The destruction and enslavement predicted by Our Lady of Fatima is America’s inevitable (and perhaps very near) future if Our Lady’s request for the Consecration of Russia is not speedily fulfilled.

For more information, see [“FOX NEWS Report — Defense Cuts Degrading Military, US No Longer Able to Fight Two Wars at Same Time”](#) and [“The World Is on the Brink of a Nuclear War”](#).

³ Dr. Paul Craig Roberts, “The Neoconservative Threat to World Order,” February 26, 2015; <http://www.paulcraigroberts.org/2015/02/26/neoconservative-threat-world-order-paul-craig-roberts/>