

Colonel Wilkerson: Oligarchy Controls U.S. War-Making

Who Is Really Responsible for America's Wars?

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, May 13, 2014

[Washington's Blog](#)

Region: [USA](#)

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

Americans are starting to understand that the U.S. is an [oligarchy, rather than a democracy or a republic](#). (Even the chair of the Federal Reserve [can't really disagree](#).)

That's true of war-making and foreign policy, as well.

Consummate insider Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson – former chief of staff to Colin Powell, the guy who wrote Powell's famous speech on Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, and now distinguished adjunct professor of Government and Public Policy at William & Mary – notes:

Who's behind the White House, and who's therefore behind U.S. foreign policy, more or less? I think the answer today is the oligarchs. Which would be the same answer, – incidentally, ironically, if you will – for Putin in Russia. The people who own the wealth, the people who therefore have the power and who more or less (and I'm not being too facetious here) buy the president and thus buy American foreign policy.

Indeed, we have [thoroughly documented](#) that war is bad for the economy and makes us poor. But war is very good for a handful of [defense contractors](#) and [banksters](#) who make huge sums from backing unnecessary war.

Wilkerson explains that war profiteers feed off conflict:

INTERVIEWER: One of the things that always hits me is that – once you look at the predictions of who would win in world war 2 – mostly what I've seen is that by 1940 or '41 it was pretty clear Hitler was going to lose. If you're in the German monopoly capitalist class doing analysis, you're thinking, "Now this is not going to lead to anything good for us. Why aren't we bailing?" But the forces of refusing to accept the reality of it were far too strong.

COLONEL WILKERSON: That's a good point. I would say – and I don't subscribe to conspiracy theories, normally – but I would say there *were* forces behind that shadow, if you will, who were doing quite well. Swiss, Germans, Americans and others who were more or less *feeding* off the conflict, and got very *wealthy* feeding off the conflict. Just as they did off of World War 1, even more predominately with respect to the United States, in particular. German reparations and so forth. We made a *ton* of money off of World War 1. And we really didn't contribute a whole lot, if you remember. We were really only there substantially for a very short period of time, roughly April 1917 until Armistice Day. So, there *is* a group which is interested in this kind of thing – and this group alarms probably more than any other in the world, particularly in my own country – that is *interested in a constant state of war*, or as near a constant state as possible. Because they sit behind *all* the belligerents and make

money.

(Indeed, bankers profits so much from war that they often [back both sides](#). For example, American banks [funded the Nazis during WWII](#) when America was in the middle of a war against German).

Interestingly, Wilkerson points out that war profiteers can make a financial killing simply by stirring up *volatility*:

In some respects this shadow behind the power that makes money off war period – no matter *who's* the belligerent – makes money off that *volatility* now.

Especially with computers that are able to assist them in doing so. Like currency manipulation, for example, or just general speculation. With computers, you can do it at lightning speed. And you can do it in a nanosecond. And you can make *billions* in that nanosecond. And you don't care about what you're doing to the real economy because you're raking in the dough.

In other words, destabilizing countries and creating chaos can make modern war profiteers rich.

And Wilkerson- who was an eyewitness to the end of the Cold War – points out that big American defense contractors are largely responsible for our current dispute with Russia:

Jim Baker and George H.W. Bush really accomplished what, I think, is one of the real diplomatic feats of the 20th century: the reunification of Germany, whether we agree with it or not. And they did it without a shot being fired....One of the reasons they could do it is that they assured Gorbachev and later Yeltsin that NATO that they would be quiescent, it wouldn't move, it wouldn't threaten Russia. In fact, I was *there* when they promised the Russians that they were going to make them a member [of NATO]. An observer first, and then a memberWell that fell apart when they perceived right quickly that we weren't really serious. And then we start – under *pressure from Lockheed Martin, and Raytheon and others* – to sell weapons to Poland, and weapons to Georgia, and weapons to Romania, and everyone else we could bring into the fold. Under those pressures and others we started to expand NATO, and stuck *both* our fingers in the Russian eyes, so to speak, *immediately*. It's clear to me why Putin has responded to Georgia and why he's now responding to Crimea and Ukraine. That's what great powers *do* when they get concerned about their so-called "near abroad".

[Additional background](#). And [see this](#).

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)

Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's Blog](#)

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