

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم  
بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد  
از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

By Mónica Peralta Ramos  
26.10.2022

## The logic of chaos



Sources: The Rocket to the Moon

*The United States is playing the hegemonic dominance of the world*

"The post-Cold War period has come to an end... The challenge could not be greater. The actions we take will now define whether this will be an era of conflict or the beginning of a more prosperous and stable future." With these words, Jake Sullivan, National Security Advisor of the US government, summarized last week the role of the United States in defense of the current global order threatened by the advance of "authoritarian" powers. According to him, China and Russia believe that democracy is in decline and try to impose a multipolar order according to their interests. This will not happen, he said: democracies and countries allied to the United States "know that we are the best bet to defend" freedom in the world [1]. What is at stake, then, is the hegemonic dominance of the United States.

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

In this context, the foreign policy of the Joe Biden administration excludes all negotiation and the recognition of mistakes. The axis of its strategy is to escalate conflicts without limits to impose US interests.

This strategy ignores basic facts from the past. Among them, the Russian missile crisis placed in Cuba in 1962 when President John Fitzgerald Kennedy negotiated an agreement with the Russian government, agreeing to withdraw the missiles that the United States had placed in Turkey and Italy and that led the Russians to place missiles in Cuba [2]. The current foreign policy also omits that the Russian claim to secure borders was recognized by different American governments, even in the midst of the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Today this demand is ignored and a political "regime change" is openly promoted in Russia to ensure the security of "the West". This means escalating the war in Ukraine, even at the risk of a nuclear confrontation. For US policy, negotiating peace in Ukraine increases the risks of a nuclear catastrophe because it is synonymous with "weakness" [3].

This emptying of the meaning of concepts is neither casual nor innocent. Behind this operation lies a manipulation of public opinion that inoculates confusion and false information and fosters chaos, seeking to replace reflective capacity and dissent with subliminal and passive acceptance. It is a way of exerting control over what is thought, nullifying the immediate perception of the dangers that are run and destroying the memory of past events. This narrative makes invisible the degree reached in nuclear development in recent decades, the relationship of power between nuclear powers and its possible consequences for humanity. However, to the extent that the story contradicts reality, the space for questioning and change is opened.

En la década de los 90 del siglo pasado, Estados Unidos y Rusia consideraban que una guerra nuclear aseguraba la mutua destrucción (MAD= *mutal assured destruction* [4]). Por ese entonces regía el tratado de misiles antibalísticos (ABM Treaty), firmado en 1972 para poner límites a la carrera armamentista, impidiendo la construcción y despliegue de misiles antibalísticos de defensa. Este descansaba en la premisa de que si una potencia construía una defensa estratégica, la otra construiría fuerzas nucleares ofensivas para contrarrestarla y la escalada nuclear no tendría límite alguno [5]. En 2001, bajo la presidencia de George W. Bush, Estados Unidos puso fin a su participación en el tratado. De ahí en más, las negociaciones para restituirlo quedaron empantanadas y Rusia

profundizó el desarrollo de tecnologías que le permitieron construir un sistema escalonado de defensa nuclear [6]. Según expertos en el tema, este sistema es de gran eficiencia, mientras que los sistemas norteamericanos de intercepción de misiles intercontinentales no pueden impedir un ataque nuclear limitado [7].

## **Elecciones en Estados Unidos**

Recent surveys show a growing discontent of the population with the economic situation, inflation and the inability of the government to contain it [8]. At the same time, they show that Donald Trump's candidacy for president in 2024 would put an end to Biden's aspiration to renew his mandate, while concern is widespread about the advance of *Wokism* [9] in schools and the lack of interest in the war in Ukraine [10]. These and other issues have moved some Democratic leaders, including former President Barack Obama, to lament *Wokism*, suggest more connection between the Democratic leadership and the immediate problems of the people [11] and consider negotiating the end of the war in Ukraine [12].

Other phenomena indicate concern in the world of corporations and opposition to some government policies. In this sense, the dispute between technological monopolies for control of markets and political discourse begins to gain importance. David Oliver Sacks, founder of PayPal and with a strong presence in the world of high technology, recently published an explosive note [13] in support of Elon Musk, who for some time has questioned government policies and tries to buy Twitter. In his note, Sacks defends Musk and accuses the government of expressing an alliance "between the *neocons* who dominate foreign policy" and a "left" of the Democratic Party that encourages *Wokism*. The government and the networks seek to "cancel the debate of political problems (...) demonize dissent, smear the opposition and close as ideologically unacceptable the paths that lead to de-escalation of conflict and towards peace" in Ukraine. Alluding to the possibility of a nuclear conflict, Sacks warns that "cooperation between media, social media and foreign policy prevents the discussion of alternatives. They trap us in an escalation that leads to the Third Woke War." On Friday, it emerged that the government and intelligence agencies are studying the possibility of blocking Musk's purchase of Twitter and investigating whether his technology corporations threaten national security, in which case they are in danger of being expropriated [14].

## **Energy crisis and conflicts between allies**

The relationship between Saudi Arabia and the United States began to deteriorate between 2014 and 2016, when the former embarked on a price war to limit the growing power of the American unconventional oil industry [15]. These days, Biden pressured Saudi Arabia to increase oil production for at least a month, in order to prevent these prices from affecting the vote of the population in November. The kingdom rejected the proposal, and together with OPEC+ cut production. Given this, Biden has to draw on the country's strategic oil reserves fund to control domestic prices in the weeks leading up to the election. The fund is very empty, so this places them in a situation of great vulnerability to a possible emergency.

In retaliation, the Biden administration threatens to eliminate military aid and enforce NOPEC [16] against Saudi Arabia and OPEC+ countries. This would deal a blow to the kingdom's economy and defense: 75% of its military equipment comes from the United States. If NOPEC is implemented, the U.S. government could dismember Aramco – Saudi Arabia's oil corporation – and seize all Saudi (and OPEC+) assets that are in dollars.

All this implies an economic war against a strategic ally that for decades has pledged to trade its oil revenues in dollars in exchange for US military security. This agreement gave rise to the "petrodollar", which allowed the United States to maintain the dollar as an international reserve currency with the guarantee of the US Treasury, after Richard Nixon put an end to the dollar's backing in gold. Now, and given the risk of NOPEC being applied, Saudi Arabia and the OPEC+ countries could massively divest their holdings of US Treasury Bills. If this were to happen, there would be a debacle in the bond market and the global financial market, with its consequent impact on the value of the dollar and its role as an international reserve currency.

On the other hand, the sanctions promoted by the US government against Russia triggered a process that led to the realization of the historic objective of replacing Russian gas with more expensive US liquefied gas [17]. However, this victory was pyrrhic: it motivated a Russian response that led to an unexpected energy crisis. Today, Germany, the economic engine of Europe, is facing the abyss of deindustrialization and the import of American liquefied gas more expensive than the Russian accelerates European conflicts.

The European Community, a vital ally of the United States, is corroded by growing internal divisions among its member countries over subsidies and debt financing and the energy crisis. At the same time, governments are threatened by a social protest against the rising cost of life and energy, which is already jeopardizing political stability in France and England. Political tensions are also growing between some European governments and the US government over the prices to be paid for liquefied gas imported from the United States [18].

On the other hand, while the suspicious attack on the Russian Nord Stream 1 and 2 gas pipelines increased American control over European gas supplies, the United States is now contemplating the possibility of cutting exports to control domestic gas prices. This occurs in parallel with the lack in the world of available liquefied natural gas that can meet European demand in the coming years. Russia's decision to strengthen the pipeline carrying Russian gas to Turkey has been accepted by the latter, which now becomes a possible gas distribution point to Europe. This augurs well for an intensification of conflicts between European countries and between them and the leadership of the European Community, which responds blindly to the US government.

In this context, the words of the Indian Minister of Defense resonate strongly: his country does not believe in the justice and viability of a hierarchical global order where a few countries consider the others to be "their satellites". Instead, it aspires to a global order based on respect for the sovereignty and development of all nations [19].

Full article: <https://www.elcohetalaluna.com/la-logica-del-caos/>

Notes:

[1] zero hedge.com, 12/10/2022.

[2] "The real cuban missile crisis", theatlantic.com, January/February 2013.

[3] Among other examples, businessinsider.com,

15/10/2022; <https://twitter.com/apmassaro3/status/1580506710443462656>, Paul

Massaro, U.S. government official in the European Commission for Cooperation and Security (Helsinki Commission); Alexander Vindman, former director of European Affairs in the National Security Council during the administration of Donald Trump and

with outstanding participation in the management of the political trial against the former President: <https://twitter.com/AVindman/status/1582004044557869056>.

[4] A military national security strategy based on the premise that the use of nuclear weapons by an attacker against another nuclear power capable of responding on the same terms will cause the annihilation of both.

[5] <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002-07/news/us-withdraws-abm-treaty-global-response-muted>.

[6] <http://foreignpolicy.com/2018/03/01/putins-nuclear-powered-cruise-missile-is-biggerthan-trumps/>, 01/03/2018.

[7] <https://radiation.thesocialelect.com/does-the-us-have-an-anti-missile-system>.

[8] zerohedge.com, 20/10/2022.

[9] Phenomenon analyzed in the last note.

[10] Harvard CAPS/Harris Poll, zerohedge.com, 10/17/2022.

[11] dailymail.co.uk, 16/10/2022.

[12] [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m\\_IOpjrd760](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m_IOpjrd760), 33:20 to 37:51.

[13] David Oliver Sacks, newsweek.com, 04/10/2022.

[14] bloomberg.com, 21/10/2022; zerohedge.com, 21/10/2022.

[15] reuters.com, 08/10/2018.

[16] An antitrust law especially directed against oil countries.

[17] Something we have analyzed in several previous notes.

[18] Among others, Robert Habeck, cnbc.com, 05/10/2022.

[19] Hindustantimes.com, 18/10/2022.

**Rebellion 25.10.2022**