




The Public Are All Alone: Understanding How the Enemy of Your Enemy Is Not Your Friend

by

Eric Zuesse

on

[Strategic Culture](#)



In political matters, the public are taught to believe that some political Party is "good", and that the others are "bad"; but the reality in recent times, at least in the United States, has instead been that both Parties are rotten to the core (as will be clear from the linked documentation provided here).

Belief in this myth (that the opposition between Parties is between "good" "friend" versus "bad" "enemy") is based upon the common adage that "The enemy of my enemy is my friend." One side is believed, and ones that contradict it are disbelieved - considered to be lying, distorting: bad. But, maybe, both (or all) Parties are deceiving; maybe all of them are enemies of the public, but just in different ways; maybe each of them is trying to control the country in the interests of (and so to obtain the most financial support from) the aristocracy, while all of them are actually against the public.



Can it really be *false* that "The enemy of my enemy is my friend?" Not only *can be*, but often *is*. And no one is able to vote intelligently without recognizing this fundamental political fact.

It's true between entire nations, too - not only within nations.

For example: Hitler and Stalin were enemies of each other, but neither of them was a friend of America (except that Stalin did more than anyone else to defeat Hitler, and thereby saved the world, though the U.S. - far less a factor than the U.S.S.R. was in defeating Hitler - still refuses to acknowledge the fact that Stalin did more than anyone else did to prevent the entire world's becoming dictatorships; so, whatever democracy exists today, is a result of that dictator, Stalin, even more than it's a result of either FDR or Churchill).

What about internally, then?

Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump became enemies of each other, but neither of them had ever really been a friend of the American public: both of them were instead liars who would, and did, do everything they could to grab control (on the aristocracy's behalf, who financed their respective campaigns) over what is supposed to be *our* Government, in a democracy. That's just a sad fact about reality, which both of America's political Parties deny (because they both need those voters, not *merely* those mega-donations; they need the public to believe that the Party cares about them).

Most of the American public have been successfully deceived by the "news"-media, and by the "history"-books (likewise published by agents for the aristocracy), to believe that the U.S. Government serves the public-interest, and not the interest of the centi-millionaires and especially billionaires, who finance political campaigns. But it's no truer than it's true that the enemy of your enemy is necessarily your friend: *both* enemies of each other *can be* your enemies, too. The difference here is that the enmity between the aristocracy and the public is basically intrinsic, whereas the enmities between (Republican versus Democratic, or any other divisions between) aristocrats, are basically *personal* - these are matters of business, instead of matters of state. They are, in a sense, different business-plans - competing business-plans. But they are all assisting the aristocracy, to control the public, so as to advance the interests of the aristocracy. They're all competing for the aristocracy's support, and deceiving for the public's support. Two blatant recent examples displaying this were America's invasion in 2003 that destroyed Iraq, and America's invasion in 2011 that destroyed Libya. Did either of those invasions advance the interests of the American public? But [the owners of Lockheed Martin and other "defense" contractors blossomed after 9/11](#). In fact: [U.S. arms-exports are at record highs](#).

[The now-proven reality in America is that the U.S. Government really does represent those billionaires and centi-millionaires, and not the public. It's a now-proven reality, that the U.S. isn't a democracy but a dictatorship](#) - albeit, a two-Party one, with a real competition between billionaire and centi-millionaire Republicans on the one hand, versus billionaire and centi-millionaire Democrats on the other. But all billionaires and centi-millionaires are takers (that's how they came to be super-rich, even the ones who didn't inherit it from their parents), who (notwithstanding any "charity" they may establish to avoid taxes while extending their control) receive from the public far more than they give to the public; and, so, there is actually an intrinsic class-war - not at all like Karl Marx famously said, between the bourgeoisie (including small-business owners) versus the proletariat (including some centi-millionaires and billionaires who became super-wealthy from being [movie-stars](#) or [athletic stars](#) and who don't necessarily actually control any business at all, and so they're "proletariats"), but instead between the aristocracy versus the public: the ancient and permanent class-conflict. It's the entire aristocracy-of-wealth (which is maybe half of the nation's wealth) that's arrayed against the public (the poorer 99+% of the people). (In fact, Marx - the promoter of the view that the bourgeoisie are the public's enemies - had aristocratic sponsors, and he would have remained obscure and died poor, if he had instead blamed the aristocracy, *not* "the bourgeoisie" - which is mainly the middle class - as being the exploiting-class. Marx, too, was an agent of aristocracy. He succeeded and became famous because he had aristocratic sponsors. Otherwise, his name would have simply been forgotten.)

Anyway, the American public are now alone. No Government represents *our* interests. It's now been



[proven that America's Government doesn't represent us](#); and it's not even the *business* of any other Government in the world to represent us; so, no foreign government does, either. [No Government represents us.](#)

In order to understand any aristocracy, one must understand what gives rise to almost all wars, because almost all wars throughout history have been between contending aristocracies - between the aristocracies of different nations. Each aristocracy needs to be able to fool its national public, to believe that they're fighting against the foreign public, when, in fact, they're fighting against the foreign aristocracy, and they're fighting for the home-nation's aristocracy - they are, almost always, fighting for one aristocracy, against another aristocracy. Any public who would know that this is the reality, would just as soon commit a democratic revolution, against the local aristocracy, as go to war for the local one, against the foreign ones. This is the reason why, in every dictatorship, the local centi-millionaires and billionaires buy up all of the "news" media that inform, or (on essential matters) misinform, their audiences about international relations, and about who did what to whom and why. They hire only "reporters" who comply with whatever deceptions the owners feel to be necessary, in order to be able to attract sponsorships from other aristocrats' corporations and "charities". But, the aristocrats themselves are actually all in this together, because their mutually shared enemy is the public. Without deceiving the public about essential matters, no national news-medium would be able to attract the sponsorships it needs in order to grow, or even to survive.

The public thinks it's fighting an international war, when, in fact, they're fighting for the local aristocracy (and its allied aristocracies), against foreign aristocracies (and their allied aristocracies). This has been true since the dawn of human civilization. Only the weapons are bigger now, and the alliances (in the World Wars) are now global. (But, of course, if there is another World War, then all of human civilization will immediately end, and not long thereafter, all human and most other forms of life will also end.)

An excellent example of the real class-war, and of its international nature, is James Bamford's 3 April 2012 masterful and pioneering article in Wired, ["Shady Companies With Ties to Israel Wiretap the U.S. for the NSA"](#). He documented that even very high-up people in America's NSA were kept out of the loop when joint U.S.-and-Israeli intelligence-agencies and private corporations were creating the present 1984-ish, "Big Brother" reality, in (at least) those countries (but, actually, the Saudis, and probably a few others, were also on the inside - the aristocracies not *merely* of those two countries, U.S. and Israel, are in the alliance).

The "Deep State" isn't merely one nation's aristocracy and its agents; it is basically a form of actually international gang-warfare. That's what got us into invading and destroying Iraq 2003, Libya 2011, Syria 2012-, Ukraine (by [coup 2014](#)), and so many other nations. It wasn't done in order to serve the America public's interests. That's just the standard lie - and it keeps going on, and on. Maybe until we invade Russia.