

The Democrats “Russia Hacking” Campaign is Political Suicide

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, December 13, 2016

[CounterPunch](#) 12 December 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

The Democratic Party is doing incalculable damage to itself by shapeshifting into the party of baseless conspiracy theories, groundless accusations, and sour grapes. Hillary Clinton was already the most distrusted presidential candidate in party history. Now she's become the de facto flag-bearer for the nutso-clique of aspiring propagandists at the CIA, the New York Times and Bezo's Military Digest. How is that going to improve the party's prospects for the long term?

It won't, because the vast majority of Americans do not want to align themselves with a party of buck-passing juveniles that have no vision for the future but want to devote all their energy to kooky witch-hunts that further prove they are unfit for high office.

The reason Hillary Clinton lost the election is because she is a polarizing, untrustworthy warmonger. Period. Putin had nothing to do with it.



And the same rule applies to the major media that has attached itself leech-like to this pathetic fairytale. Here's a clip from the Times headline story connecting FSB-agent Trump with the evil Kremlin:

American intelligence agencies have told the White House they have “high confidence” that the Russian government was behind the [theft of emails and documents](#) from the [Democratic National Committee](#). ...

The attack on the congressional committee's system appears to have come from an entity known as “Fancy Bear,” which is connected to the G.R.U., the Russian military intelligence service, according to an official involved in the forensic investigation...

Clinton campaign officials have suggested that President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia could be trying to tilt the election to Mr. Trump, who has expressed admiration for the Russian leader. ([Computer Systems Used by Clinton Campaign Are Said to Be Hacked, Apparently by Russians](#), New York Times)

If there was a Pulitzer Prize for fearmongering innuendo or spurious accusations, the Times would win it hands-down. As it happens, readers have to delve much deeper into the article to find this shocking disclaimer:

But the campaign officials acknowledge that they have no evidence. The

Trump campaign has dismissed the accusations about Russia as a deliberate distraction.....

No evidence???

They got nothing. NOTHING!

All they have is a few anonymous agents who refuse to identify themselves speculating on alleged hacking incidents that (they surmise) were the work of Vladimir P. Strangelove in his remote Soviet Cyber-war bunker. That's not even enough material for a decent spy thriller.

But, of course, all this bunkum about "Fancy Bear" and "Russian military intelligence" and the "high confidence" of (unnamed) US intelligence agents is enough to scare the hell out of many readers and leave them with the impression that the Kremlin is up to its old Cold War tricks again. The Times editors are wise enough to know that it's quite easy to tap into 40-years of anti-Soviet brainwashing and convince the gullible sheeple that Washington and Moscow are still mortal enemies. It would have been helpful if the Times had given the story a bit of context, that is, pointed out that the US has relentlessly expanded NATO eastward establishing military bases in all of the former Soviet satellite states, toppled the Moscow-friendly regime in Ukraine, and built nuclear weapons sites in east Europe just a few hundred miles from Moscow.

The Times writers might have also noted that this latest propaganda campaign against Russia could very well be the result of Moscow's triumph over US-backed militants in Syria that are facing a decisive defeat due in large part to Russian involvement. In other words, the Times and the other US propaganda organs are functioning as they always do, whipping up public sentiment against the "evildoers" so Washington can drag the country into another imperial war of expansion. The whole "hacking" mantra fits perfectly with the Pentagon's hybrid war strategy which manipulates information in order to shape public perceptions and gain support for another round of genocidal violence in some far-flung location. (Raqqa, perhaps?)

Do you think that bloodthirsty Hillary would be on-board with such a plan?

Of course she would. Hillary never met a war she didn't like.

But let's cut to the chase: Putin didn't lose the election for Hillary. Obama did. People wanted change, and they didn't get it, so they moved on to Door Number 2: Donald Trump. Take a look at these three short clips from a recent survey from PEW Research and you'll get a feel for what really happened in the election:

The Republican Party made deep inroads into America's middle-class communities in 2016. Although many middle-class areas voted for Barack Obama in 2008, they overwhelmingly favored Donald Trump in 2016, a shift that was a key to his victory.....In 2016, Trump successfully defended all 27 middle-class areas won by Republicans in 2008. In a dramatic shift, however, Hillary Clinton lost in 18 of the 30 middle-class areas won by Democrats in 2008...

Overall, Democrats experienced widespread erosion in support from 2008 to 2016. Their share of the vote fell in 196 of the 221 metropolitan areas examined. The loss in support was sufficiently large to move 37 areas from the Democratic column to the Republican column...

Not coincidentally, Democrats also were more likely to have lost ground in manufacturing-dependent areas. Of the 56 communities with a relatively large share of manufacturing jobs, Trump picked up victories in 15 metro areas that had supported Obama in 2008 and held onto another 29, leaving only 12 communities in the Democrats' column. ([GOP gained ground in middle-class communities in 2016](#), Pew Research)

Get it? The Dems lost ground everywhere because Obama didn't deliver the goods. That's reason number one. Second, Hillary didn't address the issues that ordinary working people really care about. And what they care about is the economy. Money, security, jobs. Is that hard to understand?

People are afraid because things are getting worse not better. Their standards of living are slipping, they're worried about their retirement, their jobs, their health care, and the pile of debt their kids have accumulated to go to college. They've lost confidence in the media, the congress, the courts and the president who promised change but never lifted a finger for working people his entire time in office.

That's why Hillary lost, just look at the research.

The Democrats have no vision for the future, and without vision, the party will disintegrate which is precisely what's happening. The Democratic Party is disintegrating before our very eyes. This latest "Russian hacking" diversion is just speeding along the process.

Mike Whitney lives in Washington state. He is a contributor to [Hopeless: Barack Obama and the Politics of Illusion](#) (AK Press). Hopeless is also available in a [Kindle edition](#). He can be reached at fergiwhitney@msn.com.

The original source of this article is [CounterPunch](#)
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), [CounterPunch](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

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