

NATO and 'News' Media Pump for World War III, Nuclear War

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, June 29, 2016

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

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Media Disinformation](#),
[US NATO War Agenda](#)

INTRODUCTION

America's announcement that Russia has committed 'aggression' against America, is an announcement that America is at war against Russia; and here is how America's 'news' media have said that it's the case — that Russia has aggressed — even as the U.S. government is still only preparing to attack Russia, and isn't yet ready actually to invade that country.

Right now, this propaganda is *only* psychological warfare, preparation of the U.S. public to accept that America's invasion of Russia, when it comes, will be 'defensive,' not 'offensive'. This psychological framing of the big invasion, in advance, is important in order for the American people to believe, when the invasion comes, that it's some sort of 'just' war, not an aggression, and conquest, *by NATO* — America and its allies — *against* Russia. (At least some people in the global aristocracy are already buying [nuclear-proof bomb-shelters](#), because they're sufficiently well-connected to know what's *not* being published.)

DISSECTING A KEY DECEPTION

On June 16th, Adam Johnson at FAIR (Fairness & Accuracy In Reporting) headlined ["'Allegedly' Disappears as Russians Blamed for DNC Hack"](#), and he broke an enormously important news story about the *Washington Post's* propaganda for the U.S. to go to war against Russia. It concerned the question of whether the Russian government had been, as the *Post's* reporter Ellen Nakajima alleged, caught red-handed in a cyberattack against both the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and the U.S. government (particularly former U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton).

In Adam Johnson's opening, here was his blockbuster:

—

While the Post story by Ellen Nakashima was sourced to "committee officials and security experts who responded to the breach" — i.e., CrowdStrike, the security firm hired by the DNC — that attribution dropped out of the headline, presenting Russian government culpability as an unquestioned fact. This framing was echoed by dozens of media outlets who picked up on the story and uncritically presented Russian guilt in their headlines without qualification:

■ *Russian Government Hackers Broke Into DNC Servers, Stole Trump Oppo (Politico, [6/14/16](#))*

- *Russia Hacked DNC Network, Accessed Trump Research (MSNBC, [6/14/16](#))*
- *Russians Steal Research on Trump in Hack of US Democratic Party (Reuters, [6/14/16](#))*
- *Russian Government-Affiliated Hackers Breach DNC, Take Research on Donald Trump (Fox, [6/14/16](#))*
- *Russia Hacks Democratic National Committee, Trump Info Compromised (USA Today, [6/14/16](#))*
- *Russian government hackers steal DNC files on Donald Trump (The Guardian, [6/14/16](#))*
- *Russians Hacked DNC Computers to Steal Opposition Research on Trump (Talking Points Memo, [6/14/16](#))*
- *Russian Spies Hacked Into the DNC's Donald Trump Files (Slate, [6/14/16](#))*
- *What Russia's DNC Hack Tells Us About Hillary Clinton's Private Email Server (Forbes, [6/15/16](#))*

Russian government hackers steal DNC files on Donald Trump

Hackers lurked in systems since at least last summer but only recently exfiltrated files on his business dealings and past political statements, investigators said

Here was the opening sentence of Nakashima's 'news' report:

Russian government hackers penetrated the computer network of the Democratic National Committee and gained access to the entire database of opposition research on GOP presidential candidate Donald Trump, according to committee officials and security experts who responded to the breach.

Here was the headline: "[Russian government hackers penetrated DNC, stole opposition research on Trump](#)".

National Security

Russian government hackers penetrated DNC, stole opposition research on Trump

Russian government hackers caught in DNC's networks

WE TOOK THE DRAMA

No evidence has ever been published indicating that either the story's opening clause or its headline is true; and, [the person who did the hacking](#) says he's not associated with the Russian government. Consequently, this 'news' story in the *Washington Post* is at least dubious, and is likely false.

The real question about the story, however, is: why was it published by a prominent U.S.

'news' medium, and then trumpeted in other prominent U.S. 'news' media, as if this allegation were established as being true, or even as if there were any sound reason to believe it to *be* true? Or, to put this matter another (and broader) way: Are the U.S. major 'news' media as untrustworthy now as they were when they stenographically transmitted to the U.S. public, as being 'news', the U.S. government's mere propaganda line, that [Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction still existed, and that he was only six months away from having a nuclear weapon](#)? (The attack against Iraq was thus, likewise, portrayed as being a 'defensive' act — not as being 100% aggression and unjustifiable, *which it was*.) Going back now to the first version of that question (why it was published by a prominent U.S. 'news' medium):

As I had [reported on June 15th](#):

On Tuesday, June 14th, [NATO announced](#) that if a NATO member country becomes the victim of a cyber attack by persons in a non-NATO country such as Russia or China, then NATO's Article V "[collective defense](#)" provision requires each NATO member country to join that NATO member country if it decides to strike back against the attacking country.

Or, as Germany's *Die Zeit* [had headlined the matter](#): "NATO Declares Cyberspace War Zone." (You didn't see that reported in U.S. 'news' media, did you? It's very important news — as my report about the matter explained in detail, but *Die Zeit*'s did not. But at least they *reported* the *fact* — namely, that NATO had just announced a *new policy*: that a cyberattack constitutes now an act of war, an invasion which triggers Article V; that, for Russia to cyberattack a NATO country, would be Russian aggression, and would trigger NATO's mutual-defense provision.)

In other words: the *Washington Post*'s story, which was immediately spread by other 'news' media, was alleging something to have occurred, that in NATO's new doctrine constitutes an act of war against the United States by Russia. (Never mind: espionage is actually routine, and the U.S. government commits it even against allies such as Germany, and even taps into phone conversations of German Chancellor Angela Merkel who is more of [a soldier for the U.S.](#) than an enemy of the U.S. — but Germany is a fellow NATO member and so this new NATO doctrine doesn't provide authorization for U.S. espionage against Germany to be treated as cause for Germany to invade the U.S. and to be joined by the rest of the NATO alliance in attacking the United States.

NATO is the *anti-Russia* military club; it's designed *to conquer Russia*, certainly *not* to defend one NATO member against another. When a nation joins NATO, they're already slaves of the U.S. government. Like Obama repeatedly says, ["The United States is and remains the one indispensable nation."](#) The government in any nation that joins or stays in NATO, knows that their nation is "dispensable," and they accept this: they have to, in order to be a part of NATO, which the U.S. controls. So: Obama could publicly tell this to America's military, and no one would even blink at it; America's exceptionalism is accepted as being not only real, but good.)

And, since what the *Washington Post*'s story was alleging there, has been called false by the person who did the hacking, the *Post*'s implication that Russia committed an act which NATO's new policy labels as an act of war against the United States, isn't only unfounded and likely false; it's also mentally preparing the American public to go along marching

toward nuclear oblivion, on that dubious basis — like America had marched into war against Iraq in 2003, on the basis of [lies from the government and its stenographic press](#), but an invasion of Russia would be much worse than George W. Bush's invasions were.

American 'news' media — the same 'news' media that had been in 2002 'reporting about 'Saddam's WMD' etc. — are now [speculating](#) that the person who claims to have done the hack is lying to say he's not an agent of the Russian government. In other words, the presumption by the U.S. government and its agents, is simply taken as fact. No mention is being made by these 'news' media, that NATO simultaneously with that hacking-event, has changed its policy so as to enable NATO to invade Russia on the basis of the presumption that Russia did the hack. Are those two events' simultaneity — the policy-change, and the 'Russian' hack — merely coincidental? And are the public not supposed to notice that NATO's policy-change is declaring espionage to be aggression — 'justification' for NATO to launch an attack, essentially NATO's outlawing espionage on the part of any nation that *isn't* in NATO? People aren't supposed to even notice this?

All of this goes back to NATO's alleged 'justification' for its now [\(very provocatively\) pouring U.S. troops and nuclear weapons onto and near Russia's borders with Romania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Poland](#) (nations selected by Obama for their having rabidly anti-Russian leaderships): that 'justification' being Russia's having supposedly 'seized' Crimea from Ukraine — which allegation against Russia is a [lie](#), and which isn't even NATO's business, because Ukraine isn't yet a NATO member, and therefore isn't covered by NATO's promise (Article V) to go to war to defend any NATO member against any invader. (The aristocracy's propaganda is based upon the assumption that the public are simply fools: people aren't supposed to recognize that even if Russia *had* invaded Ukraine, NATO has no business in this matter.)

And all of that goes back, in turn, to ["How America Double-Crossed Russia And Shamed The West"](#) — yet another lie by the U.S. government, that one having been made by U.S. President George Herbert Walker Bush in 1990, and now threatening to blossom into a full-fledged nuclear war: World War III.

Are these essential facts, including the relevant historical facts, being reported by the 'news' media to the American public, so as to enable us to vote knowledgeably in elections? Hillary Clinton supports — and Donald Trump, that 'dangerous' man, opposes — America's overthrowing Russia's allies, such as Saddam Hussein, Muammar Gaddafi, Bashar al Assad, and Viktor Yanukovych, but do most voters know anything about the *realities* here? Can a person *reasonably* say that such a country as the U.S. is a [democracy](#), if the voters have no idea of what the main issue in this 'election' actually is? The main issue, this time around, is the buildup to World War III — and Clinton's campaign says that the nation will be safer with her finger on the nuclear button, than with Trump's finger on it. Both of the Presidential candidates are disliked by the American public; Bernie Sanders and John Kasich were liked by the American public (they were the only two Presidential candidates who had net-positive approval-ratings from the American public), but America's 'democracy' has eliminated Sanders and Kasich and includes only those two candidates — Clinton and Trump — neither of whom is liked and respected by the public. This is today's American '[democracy](#)', in which the preferred candidates get eliminated from the competition.

So: is our government trying to drive the world into a 'pretext' to 'justify' the U.S. to invade Russia?

[Why](#) would it be doing that?

The same 'news' media that served the U.S. government to 'justify', on the basis of [lies](#), an invasion of Iraq in 2003, is now 'justifying' an invasion of Russia, perhaps to occur in 2017. [Why](#) would they be doing that?

[Here](#) is information about why U.S. academics are highly dependent upon not publishing, nor accepting for publication, anything that would reveal to the public what's really going on.

It seems that, every day, the *real* news is looking more and more like ["The End of M.A.D. — The Beginning of Madness"](#). But most Americans don't even know what "M.A.D." (the system that has been preventing nuclear war) *was*. Meanwhile, the U.S. 'news' media are keeping these developments as secret, as hidden from and *misunderstood by* the public, as is possible to do.

Two things the U.S. aristocracy are essentially united upon are:

(1) the U.S. government's effort to conquer Russia;

(2) not allowing their 'news' media to report either about that fact, or about any news-medium's reporting about either that effort, or the pervasive control of America's 'news' media by the aristocracy, which 'news' media not only are owned by members of the aristocracy, but are funded by advertisements from other members of the aristocracy, whose companies pay to advertise in them.

So: none of them want to cover this — and they don't cover it. For example, how many Americans know that it was a U.S. [coup](#) that [in February 2014 overthrew the democratically elected President of Ukraine](#) next-door to Russia, and replaced him with a fascist, rabidly anti-Russian, regime, [appointed by the Obama Administration](#), and that Crimeans had voted 75% for that overthrown President and so sought to abandon Ukraine and to rejoin Russia (from which they had been yanked by the Soviet dictator in 1954) — more than 90% of them voted for that, because they were terrified of the U.S.-installed regime: how many Americans know that? It's not reported in America, because the U.S. aristocracy don't want the public to know it — they want Americans [to think that Russia 'seized' Crimea](#). That deception is essential because [it's the alleged reason for NATO's being at war against Russia](#). There is no *truthful* reason for NATO's war against Russia — none whatsoever.

In other words, the reality of the 'news' media in the United States is: in order for a 'news' medium to be able to acquire a large audience, what's key is financial support of that 'news' medium by the aristocracy. Without that, no 'news' medium in the U.S. can acquire a large audience. American 'news' media are virtually entirely controlled by the U.S. (and allied)[aristocracy](#). They [separate themselves from the public](#), even more than masters were separated from their serfs. Though in rhetoric they express caring and concern about the public, in reality they have none whatsoever. In fact, the invasion that their agent Barack Obama is working towards would harm the public enormously more than even the invasions by their agent George W. Bush did. But the public know little to nothing about it, and misunderstand the little that they do know about it. And this ignorance and misunderstanding by the public provides the aristocracy the freedom they want, to surround Russia with nuclear weapons and hostile armies, until Russia will give in to the U.S. government's demands — as if Russia will have no alternative but to do that. (But that's

why aristocrats are buying bomb-shelters, their Plan B, *just in case*.)

If it sounds crazy, it is; but [the pattern for this was set in the buildup toward World War I. Aristocrats are simply crazy about their power](#). That's what Obama was displaying when [he said](#), "The United States is and remains the one indispensable nation. That has been true for the century passed and it will be true for the century to come." In other words: Russia is "dispensable," just like any other country (Iraq, Libya, Syria, Ukraine, Brazil, etc.) that refuses to be controlled by the U.S. aristocracy. The only difference this time around is nuclear weapons; but, now, with the concept of '[nuclear primacy](#)', even that is now considered, by the U.S. aristocracy, to be no *fundamental* change, after all, away from the pre-nuclear era; and, so, Obama is playing [the role in the buildup to WW III that Kaiser Wilhelm had played in the buildup to WW I](#) — he's the demander who won't even take "yes" for an answer: he needs to *conquer* any foreign power who resists him.

✖ Russian President Vladimir Putin is terrified by Obama, but has made clear that he will never allow Russia to become a U.S. vassal state like Ukraine and the other ones that America has taken are (like Hillary Clinton's exultation at conquering one of Russia's allies — the killing of Gaddafi — was: "[We came, we saw, he died. Ha, ha!!](#)"). Putin is now saying flat-out no to that: he's saying, America's aristocracy might get rid of other governments that don't become America's stooges, but not of Russia's government. He is saying that Russia will not be conquered, that it's not going to become part of America's empire.

On June 18th, Russia's Tass News Agency [published this about Putin's statements that day](#) (he was talking then about America's building an anti-missile system to eliminate the nuclear missiles that Russia would be sending in retaliation against a NATO blitz-invasion of Russia — an anti-missile system that [Obama has always promised is to protect against missiles from Iran or North Korea, not from Russia](#) — Putin was saying that it's actually being built in order to *disable* Russia's ability to *defend itself*, Russia's ability to strike back against a NATO-U.S. invasion):

—

"There's no [nuclear] threat [from Iran], and the missile defense system [in Europe] is still being built, so we were right when we said they are deceiving us, they are not sincere with us [by] referring to the alleged Iranian nuclear threat during the construction of the missile defense system," Putin said.

"It is like this actually — they tried to deceive us once again," he said at a meeting with the heads of global information agencies.

"We know approximately which year the Americans will get a new missile that will have a range of not 500 kilometers but more, and from that moment they will start threatening our nuclear potential. We know what will be going on by years. And they know that we know," Putin underscored.

He stated that the United States, "despite all our objections, all our proposals on real cooperation, does not want to cooperate with us, rejects our proposals and acts in accordance with its plan."

"You may believe me or not, but we have suggested specific variants of cooperation, they have all really been rejected," Putin said.

He recalled that missile defense system elements have been built in Romania. "What have they constantly said? 'We need to protect ourselves from Iran's

nuclear threat.' Where's the Iranian nuclear threat? There's none!" Putin said.

—
✖ Obama simply ignores Putin's objections, and [refuses to speak with him](#). And his 'news' media (both Democratic and Republican) refuse to report the matter. So, the reality is publishable only outside the Western mainstream (and even most of its 'alternative') press. Westerners know [only what their aristocracy allow them to know](#). And the buildup to nuclear war isn't publishable, in the West.

The closest that we come to it is [a puff-piece book review in the New York Review of Books about a former U.S. Secretary of Defense's memoir](#) espousing the need to get rid of nuclear weapons: it's like Obama's Nobel Peace Prize — it is divorced from the reality of [America's aggressive plan, since 1990, to surround and ultimately conquer Russia](#); it's divorced from the plan that Obama himself is now racing forward, 'Peace Prize' or no. You're not supposed to know anything about it. But you do know now, even if you didn't before. And word of it can be spread to people who don't know about it, only by sending them the URL of this article, so that they (just like you) can click onto the links here, on any allegation they doubt, and find out for themselves, what the documentation behind any questionable allegation here is. And then, each of you can discuss it, and come to your own *individual* conclusions about these matters.

America's 'news' media are like those in the Soviet Union were: only by means of [samizdat](#) (prohibited literature) can the truth come to be known. That's the reality: the reality is unpublishable, in the West. What the Soviet Union was — a [dictatorship](#) — the U.S. now is. The economy isn't like the Soviets', but the political rule, by some form of [crony aristocracy](#), is, regardless of whether one calls it the [nomenklatura](#), or the [fasces](#). Anyway: When the U.S.S.R. ended in 1991, Russia and the U.S.A. switched sides. And we're not supposed to know this. But now we do.

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 Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 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