

The U.S. Is Destroying Europe

By <u>Eric Zuesse</u> Global Research, August 08, 2015 <u>Strategic Culture Foundation</u> 7 August 2015

Region: <u>Europe</u>, <u>Middle East & North Africa</u>, <u>USA</u> Theme: <u>Global Economy</u>, <u>US NATO War</u> <u>Agenda</u> In-depth Report: <u>NATO'S WAR ON LIBYA</u>, <u>SYRIA</u>

In Libya, Syria, Ukraine, and other countries at the periphery or edges of Europe, U.S. President Barack Obama has been pursuing a policy of destabilization, and even of bombings and other military assistance, that drives millions of refugees out of those peripheral areas and into Europe, thereby adding fuel to the far-rightwing fires of antiimmigrant rejectionism, and of resultant political destabilization, throughout Europe, not only on its peripheries, but even as far away as in northern Europe.

Shamus Cooke at Off-Guardian headlines on 3 August 2015, <u>"Obama's 'Safe Zone' in Syria</u> <u>Intended to Turn It into New Libya,"</u> and he reports that Obama has approved U.S. air support for Turkey's previously unenfoceable no-fly zone over Syria. The U.S. will now shoot down all of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's planes that are targeting the extremist-Muslim groups, including ISIS, that have taken over huge swaths of Syrian territory.

Cooke reports:

Turkey has been demanding this no-fly zone from Obama since the Syrian war started. It's been discussed throughout the conflict and even in recent months, though the intended goal was always the Syrian government. And suddenly the no-fly zone is happening — right where Turkey always wanted it — but it's being labeled an 'anti-ISIS' safe zone, instead of its proper name: 'Anti Kurdish and anti-Syrian government' safe zone.

The New York Times reported on July 27th, that,

"the plan calls for relatively moderate Syrian insurgents to take the territory, with the help of American and possibly Turkish air support."

However, the *Times*, stenographically reporting (as usual) from and for their U.S. Government sources (and so propagandizing for the U.S. Government), fails to define "relatively moderate," but all of the "relatively moderate insurgent" groups in Syria cooperate with ISIS and help them to find and decapitate, or sometimes hold for ransoms, any non-Muslims there. Under Assad, Syria has been a <u>non-clerical state</u>, and <u>has enjoyed</u> freedom of religion, but all of the Syrian opposition to Assad's rule is alien to that. The U.S. is now, <u>even more clearly than before</u>, anti-Assad, pro-Islamist.

Seymour Hersh reported in the London Review of Books on 17 April 2014, that the Obama

Administration's Libyan bombing campaign in 2011 was part of a broader program to bring sarin gas from Libya to the al-Nusra Front in Syria, in order to help produce a gas-attack upon civilians, which the U.S. Administration could then blame upon Assad, as being an excuse to bomb there just as Obama had already so successfully done in Libya. Both dictators, Gaddafi and Assad, were allied with Russia, and Assad especially has been important to Russia, as a transit-route for Russia's gas supplies, and not for Qatar's gas supplies — Qatar being the major potential threat to Russia's status as the top supplier of gas into Europe.

Obama's top goal in international relations, and throughout his military policies, has been to defeat Russia, to force a regime-change there that will make Russia part of the American empire, no longer the major nation that resists control from Washington.

Prior to the U.S. bombings of Libya in 2011, Libya was at peace and thriving. Per-capita GDP (income) in 2010 according to the IMF was \$12,357.80, but it plunged to only \$5,839.70 in 2011 — the year we bombed and destroyed the country. (Hillary Clinton famously bragged, "We came, we saw, he [Gaddafi] died!") (And, unlike in U.S. ally Saudi Arabia, that per-capita GDP was remarkably evenly distributed, and both education and health care were socialized and available to everyone, even to the poor.)

More recently, on 15 February 2015, reporter Leila Fadel of NPR bannered <u>"With Oil Fields</u> <u>Under Attack, Libya's Economic Future Looks Bleak."</u> She announced: "The man in charge looks at production and knows the future is bleak. 'We cannot produce. We are losing 80 percent of our production,' says Mustapha Sanallah, the chairman of Libya's National Oil Corporation."

Under instructions from Washington, the IMF hasn't been reliably reporting Libya's GDP figures after 2011, but instead shows that things there were immediately restored to normal (even to better than normal: \$13,580.55 per-capita GDP) in 2012, but everybody knows that it's false; even NPR is, in effect, reporting that it's not true. The <u>CIA estimates</u> that Libya's per-capita GDP was a ridiculous \$23,900 in 2012 (they give no figures for the years before that), and says Libya's per-capita GDP has declined only slightly thereafter. None of the official estimates are at all trustworthy, though the Atlantic Council at least made an effort to explain things honestly, headlining in their latest systematic report about Libya's economy, on 23 January 2014, <u>"Libya: Facing Economic Collapse in 2014."</u>

Libya has become Europe's big problem. Millions of Libyans are fleeing the chaos there. Some of them are fleeing across the Mediterranean and ending up in refugee camps in southern Italy; and some are escaping to elsewhere in Europe.

And Syria is now yet another nation that's being destroyed in order to conquer Russia. Even the reliably propagandistic *New York Times* is acknowledging, in its 'news' reporting, that, "both the Turks and the Syrian insurgents see defeating President Bashar al-Assad of Syria as their first priority." So: U.S. bombers will be enforcing a no-fly-zone over parts of Syria in order to bring down Russia's ally Bashar al-Assad and replace his secular government by an Islamic government — and the 'anti-ISIS' thing is just for show; it's PR, propaganda. The public cares far more about defeating ISIS than about defeating Russia; but that's not the way America's aristocracy views things. Their objective is extending America's empire extending their own empire. Similarly, <u>Obama overthrew the neutralist government of Viktor Yanukovych in Ukraine in</u> <u>February 2014, but that was under the fake cover of 'democracy' demonstrations,</u> instead of under the fake cover of 'opposing Islamic terrorism' or whatever other phrases that the U.S. Government uses to fool suckers about America's installation of, and support to, a rabidly anti-Russia, racist-fascist, or nazi, government next door to Russia, in Ukraine. Just as Libya had been at peace before the U.S. invaded and destroyed it, and just as Syria had been at peace before the U.S and Turkey invaded and destroyed it, Ukraine too was at peace before the U.S. perpetrated its coup there and <u>installed nazis and an ethnic cleansing campaign</u> <u>there, and destroyed Ukraine too.</u>

Like with Libya before the overthrow of Gaddafi there, or Syria before the current effort to overthrow Assad there, or the more recent successful overthrow of Ukraine's democratically elected President Viktor Yanukovych, it's all aimed to defeat Russia.

The fact that all of Europe is sharing in the devastation that Obama and other American conservatives — imperialists, even — impose, is of little if any concern to the powers-that-be in Washington DC, but, if it matters at all to them, then perhaps it's another appealing aspect of this broader operation: By weakening European nations, and not only nations in the Middle East, Obama's war against Russia is yet further establishing America to be "the last man standing," at the end of the chaos and destruction that America causes.

Consequently, for example, in terms of U.S. international strategy, the fact that <u>the</u> <u>economic sanctions against Russia are enormously harming the economies of European</u> <u>nations</u> is good, not bad.

There are two ways to win, at any game: One is by improving one's own performance. The other is by weakening the performances by all of one's competitors. The United States is now relying almost entirely upon the latter type of strategy.

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of <u>They're Not Even Close</u>: <u>The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records</u>, <u>1910-2010</u>, and of <u>CHRIST'S</u> <u>VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity</u>.

The original source of this article is <u>Strategic Culture Foundation</u> Copyright © <u>Eric Zuesse</u>, <u>Strategic Culture Foundation</u>, 2015

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

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

<u>www.globalresearch.ca</u> 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