

Lobbying for War “To Save the US Economy”

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, March 10, 2011

[Washington's Blog](#) 10 March 2011

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [US NATO War](#)

[Agenda](#)

[Former Goldman Sachs Analyst Charles Nenner Joins Marc Faber and Gerald Celente in Predicting Major War](#)

I [noted](#) in 2009:

The claim that America would launch more wars to help the economy is outrageous, right?

Certainly.

But leading economist Marc Faber has repeatedly [said](#) that the American government will start new wars in response to the economic crisis:

- [“The next thing the government will do to distract the attention of the people on bad economic conditions is they’ll start a war somewhere.”](#)
- [“If the global economy doesn’t recover, usually people go to war.”](#)

Is Faber crazy?

Maybe. But [top trend forecaster](#) Gerald Celente agrees.

As Antiwar’s Justin Raimondo [writes](#):

As [Gerald Celente](#), one of the few economic forecasters who predicted the ‘08 crash, [put it](#) the other day, “Governments seem to be emboldened by their failures.” What the late Gen. William E. Odom trenchantly described as “the worst strategic disaster in American military history” – the invasion of Iraq – is being followed up by a far larger military operation, one that will burden us for many years to come. This certainly seems like evidence in support of the Celente thesis, and the man who predicted the 1987 stock market crash, the fall of the Soviet Union, the dot-com bust, the gold bull market, the 2001 recession, the real estate bubble, the “Panic of ‘08,” and now is talking about the inevitable popping of the “bailout bubble,” has more [bad news](#):

“Given the pattern of governments to parlay egregious failures into mega-failures, the classic trend they follow, when all else fails, is to take their nation to war.”

As the economic crisis escalates and the debt-based central banking system shows it can no longer re-inflate the bubble by creating assets out of thin air, an economic and political rationale for war is easy to come by; for if the Keynesian doctrine that government spending is the only way to lift us out of an economic depression is true, then surely military expenditures are the quickest way to inject “life” into a failing system. This doesn’t work, economically, since the crisis is only masked by the wartime atmosphere of emergency and “temporary” privation. Politically, however, it is a lifesaver for our ruling elite, which is at pains to deflect blame away from itself and on to some “foreign” target.

It’s the oldest trick in the book, and it’s being played out right before our eyes, as the U.S. prepares to send even more troops to the Afghan front and is threatening Iran with draconian economic sanctions, a step or two away from outright war.

A looming economic depression and the horrific prospect of another major war – the worst-case scenario seems to be unfolding, like a recurring nightmare ...

Forecaster Celente has identified several bubbles, the latest being the “bailout bubble,” slated to pop at any time, yet there may be another bubble to follow what Celente calls “the mother of all bubbles,” one that will implode with a resounding crash heard ‘round the world – the bubble of empire.

Our current foreign policy of global hegemonism and unbridled aggression is simply not sustainable, not when we are on the verge of becoming what we used to call a Third World country, one that is bankrupt and faces the prospect of a radical lowering of living standards. Unless, of course, the “crisis” atmosphere can be sustained almost indefinitely.

George W. Bush had 9/11 to fall back on, but that song is getting older every time they play it. Our new president needs to come up with an equivalent, one that will divert our attention away from Goldman Sachs and toward some overseas enemy who is somehow to be held responsible for our present predicament.

It is said that FDR’s New Deal didn’t get us out of the Great Depression, but [World War II did](#). The truth is that, in wartime, when people are expected to sacrifice for the duration of the “emergency,” economic problems are anesthetized out of existence by liberal doses of nationalist chest-beating and moral righteousness. Shortages and plunging living standards were masked by a wartime rationing system and greatly lowered expectations. And just as World War II inured us to the economic ravages wrought by our thieving elites, so World War III will provide plenty of cover for a virtual takeover of all industry by the government and the demonization of all political opposition as “terrorist”.

An impossible science-fictional scenario? Or a reasonable projection of present trends? Celente, whose record of predictions is impressive, to say the least, sees war with Iran as the equivalent of World War III, with economic, social, and political consequences that will send what is left of our empire into a tailspin. This is the popping of the “hyperpower” bubble, the conceit that we – the last superpower left standing – will somehow

defy history and common sense and avoid the fate of all empires:
decline and fall.

I certainly hope Faber and Calente are wrong. But they are both very smart guys who have been right on many of their forecasts for decades. Even when their predictions have been viewed as extremely controversial at the time, many of them have turned out to be right.

Yesterday, former Goldman Sachs technical analyst Charles Nenner – who has made some big accurate calls, and counts major hedge funds, banks, brokerage houses, and high net worth individuals as clients. – told Fox News that there will be “a major war starting at the end of 2012 to 2013”, which will drive the Dow to 5,000.

Therefore, says Nenner:

I told my clients and pension funds and big firms and hedge funds to almost go out of the market, almost totally out of the market.

As I have [repeatedly documented](#), influential Americans are lobbying for war in order to save the American economy – what is often called “military Keynesianism”. But as many economists have shown, war is – contrary to commonly-accepted myth – actually bad for the economy.

Of course, someone other than the U.S. might start a war.

Given that [bad economic policies are leading to unrest globally](#), it is impossible to predict where a spark might land which leads to a wider conflagration.

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)
Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2011

[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

