

Communications breakdown

By Paul Craig Roberts, 20 March 2019

Writing for Americans, unless for their entertainment, is a challenging undertaking. One reason is that many, especially of the younger generations, no longer have a concept of objective truth.

For them “truth” is simply a bias reflecting one’s race, gender, upbringing or predisposition. Emotion overwhelms fact. Biases are not considered to be equal. Some are worthy and some are not. The biases of white people are defined as “hate speech,” “white supremacy,” and “hate crimes.” Today America has many self-hating whites, especially in the media and Democratic Party.

Another reason is that many Americans confuse an explanation with a justification. An explanation of an event is seen as a justification of the event. For example, if one provides an explanation of slavery the assumption is that the writer approves of slavery. A defence of a disapproved category is taken as a demonstration of your own unworthiness. For example, if you defend white people from the propagandistic accusations levelled at them by Identity Politics, you are a “white supremacist.”

Yet another reason is that some races and genders have succeeded in defining any criticism of themselves as an expression of bias. For example, criticism of Israel’s mistreatment of the Palestinians or of the Israel Lobby’s power makes one an “anti-semite.” Similarly, if you criticize a black person, you are a racist and your argument is dismissed as an expression of your bias. If you criticize a woman, you are a misogynist, and your criticism of a woman proves it.

If you express scepticism of false flag events, you are dismissed as a “conspiracy theorist.”

Another reason is that American patriots regard criticism of US policies, especially wars, as anti-American and as taking the side of the enemy against one’s own country. To prevent a recurrence of the Vietnam war protests, when Washington invaded Afghanistan and Iraq the Bush regime came up with the slogan, “Support the Troops.” If you criticized the wars, you weren’t supporting the troops and were aligning yourself with the enemy: “You are with us or against us.” When President Trump met with President Putin, CIA director John Brennan accused Trump of treason. When US Representative Tulsi Gabbard met with Assad of Syria, she was accused of supporting dictatorship. (If her critics had accused her of meeting with Assad because she was a bimbo who didn’t know any better, her critics would have been dismissed as misogynists.)

In a world such as this, honest ordinary language is risky as many are not attending to the cogency of the analysis but looking for indications of racism and sexism. Exposure of government deceptions gets one branded “anti-American” with the result that people cling more tightly to the lie that deceives them.

It has always been the case that readers look for writers who reinforce their beliefs by telling them what they want to hear. The king kills the messenger who brings unwanted news. Consequently, there are few messengers. The result is a dysfunctional democracy in which the agendas of those who control explanations dominate.

For the most part, readers of this website are different. They are a self-selected group who are motivated to escape being controlled by official explanations. To their purpose I lend my knowledge and experience. The website has a devoted readership as your response to my March quarterly appeal testifies.

A few of you are impatient for solutions, but there can be no solutions until there is recognition of the problems. Moreover, every solution can be interpreted as favouring some interest group

with its advocate being dismissed as a servant of the favoured group. For example, President Reagan's solution to stagflation was accused of being a scheme for the rich. The people have to find solutions, but first they must be informed. As this article makes clear, that is a difficult enough undertaking.