

When dealing with a bear, hubris is suicidal

by

The Saker

on

[The Unz Review](#)



Assuming mankind finds a way not to destroy itself in the near future and assuming that there will still be historians in the 22nd or 23rd centuries, I bet you that they will look at the AngloZionist Empire and see the four following characteristics as some of its core features: lies, willful ignorance, hypocrisy, and hysterics. To illustrate my point I will use the recent ["Skripal nerve-gas assassination"](#) story as it really encompasses all of these characteristics.

I won't even bother debunking the official nonsense here as others have done a very good job of pointing out the idiocy of the official narrative. If you are truly capable of believing that "Putin" (that is the current collective designator for the Evil Empire of Mordor currently threatening all of western civilization) would order the murder of a man whom a Russian military court sentenced to only 13 years in jail (as opposed to life or death) and who was subsequently released as part of a swap with the USA, you can stop reading right now and go back to watching TV. I personally have neither the energy nor the inclination to even discuss such a self-evidently absurd theory. No, what I do want to do is use this story as a perfect illustration of the kind of society we now all live in looked at from a moral point of view. I realize that we live in a largely value-free society where moral norms have been replaced by ideological orthodoxy, but that is just one more reason for me



to write about what is taking place precisely focusing on the moral dimensions of current events.

Lies and the unapologetic denial of reality:

In a 2015 article entitled ["A society of sexually frustrated Pinocchios"](#) I wrote the following:

I see a direct cause and effect relationship between the denial of moral reality and the denial of physical reality. I can't prove that, of course, but here is my thesis: Almost from day one, the early western civilization began by, shall we say, taking liberties with the truth, which it could bend, adapt, massage and repackage to serve the ideological agenda of the day. It was not quite the full-blown and unapologetic relativism of the 19th century yet, but it was an important first step. With "principles" such as the end justifies the means and the wholesale violation of the Ten Commandments all "for the greater glory of God" the western civilization got cozy with the idea that there was no real, objective truth, only the subjective perception or even representation each person might have thereof. Fast forward another 10 centuries or so and we end up with the modern "Gayropa" (as Europe is now often referred to in Russia): not only has God been declared 'dead' and all notions of right and wrong dismissed as "cultural", but even objective reality has now been rendered contingent upon political expediency and ideological imperatives.

I went on to quote George Orwell by reminding how he defined "doublethink" in his book 1984:

*To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which canceled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, [i] **to repudiate morality while laying claim to it** (...) To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just as long as it is needed, **to deny the existence of objective reality***

and I concluded by saying that *"The necessary corollary from this state of mind is that **only appearances matter, not reality**".*

This is exactly what we are observing; not only in the silly Skripal nerve-gas assassination story but also in all the rest of the Russophobic nonsense produced by the AngloZionist propaganda machine including the ["Litvinenko polonium murder"](#) and the ["Yushchenko dioxin poisoning"](#). The fact that neither nerve-gas, nor polonium nor dioxin are in any way effective murder weapons does not matter in the least: a simple drive-by shooting, street-stabbing or, better, any "accident" is both easier to arrange and impossible to trace. Fancy assassination methods are used when access to the target is very hard or impossible (as was the case with [Ibn al-Khattab](#), whose assassination the Russians were more than happy to take credit for; this might also have been the case with the [death of Yasser Arafat](#)). But the best way of murdering somebody is to simply make the body disappear, making any subsequent investigation almost impossible. Finally, you can always subcontract the assassination to somebody else like, for example, when the CIA tried and failed, to [murder Grand Ayatollah Mohammad Hussain Fadlallah](#) by subcontracting his bombing to its local "Christian" allies, killing over 80 innocent people in the process. There is plenty of common crime in the UK and to get somebody to rob and stab Skripal would have probably been the easiest version. That's assuming that the Russians had any reason to want him dead, which they self-evidently didn't.

But here is the important thing: every single criminal or intelligence specialist in the West understands all of the above. But that does not stop the Ziomeia from publishing articles like this one ["A Brief History of Attempted Russian Assassinations by Poison"](#) which also lists people poisoned by Russians:

1. Skripal by **nerve gas**
2. Litvinenko by **polonium**
3. Kara-Murza poisoned not once, but TWICE, by an **unknown poison**, he survived!
4. Markov poisoned by **ricin** and the Bulgarians with "speculated KGB assistance"



5. Khattab by **sarin or a sarin-derivative**
6. Yushchenko by **dioxin**
7. Perepilichny by "a rare, **toxic flower**, gelsemium" (I kid you not, check the article!)
8. Moskalenko by **mercury**
9. Politkovskaya who was shot, but who once felt "ill after drinking some **tea that she believed contained poison**"

The only possible conclusion from this list is this: there is some kind of secret lab in Russia where completely incompetent chemists try every poison known to man, not on rats or on mice, but on high profile AngloZionist-supported political activists, preferably before an important political event.

Right.

By the way, the gas allegedly used in the attack, "Novichok", was [manufactured in Uzbekistan and the cleanup of the factory producing it was made by, you guessed it, a US company](#). Just saying...

In any halfway honest and halfway educated society, those kind of articles should result in the idiot writing it being summarily fired for gross incompetence and the paper/journal posting it being discredited forever. But in our world, the clown who wrote that nonsense ([Elias Groll](#), a Harvard graduate and – listen to this – a specialist of "*cyberspace and its conflicts and controversies*" (*sic*)) is a staff writer of the [award-winning Foreign Policy magazine](#).

So what does it tell us, and future historians, when this kind of crap is written by a staff writer of an "award winning" media outlet? Does it not show that our society has now reached a stage in its decay (I can't call that "development") where lies become the norm? Not only are even grotesque and *prima facie* absurd lies accepted, they are expected (if only because they reinforce the current ideological Zeitgeist. The result? Our society is now packed with first, zombified ideological drones who actually believe any type of officially proclaimed of nonsense and, second, by cowards who lack the basic courage to denounce even that which they themselves know to be false.

Lies, however ridiculous and self-evidently stupid, have become the main ingredient of the modern political discourse. Everybody knows this and nobody cares. When challenged on this, the typical defense used is always the same: "you are the only person saying this – I sure ever heard this before!".

Willful ignorance as a universal cop-out

We all know the type. You tell somebody that his/her theory makes absolutely no sense or is not supported by facts and the reply you get is some vaguely worded refusal to engage in an disputation. Initially, you might be tempted to believe that, indeed, your interlocutor is not too bright and not too well read, but eventually you realize that there is something very different happening: the modern man actually makes a very determined effort not to be capable of logical thought and not to be informed of the basic facts of the case. And what is true for specific individuals is even more true of our society as a whole. Let's take one simple example: Operation Gladio:

"[Gladio](#)" is really an open secret by now. Excellent [books](#) and [videos](#) have been written about this and even the [BBC has made a two and a half hour long video about it](#). There is even [an entire website](#) dedicated to the story of this huge, continent-wide, terrorist organization specializing in false flag operations. That's right: a NATO-run terrorist network in western Europe involved in false flag massacres like the [infamous Bologna train station bombing](#). No, not the Soviet KGB backing the Baader-Meinhof Red Army Faction or the Red Brigades in Italy. No, [the USA and West European](#) governments organizing, funding and operating a terrorist network directed at the people of Western, not Eastern, Europe. Yes, at their own people! In theory, everybody should know about this, the information is available everywhere, even on the hyper-politically correct [Wikipedia](#). But, again, nobody cares.

The end of the Cold War was marked by a seemingly endless series of events which all provided a pretext for AngloZionist interventions (from the Markale massacres in Bosnia, to the Srebrenica

"genocide", to the Racak massacre Kosovo, to the "best" and biggest one of them all, 9/11 of course). Yet almost nobody wondered if the same people or, at least, the same kind of people who committed all the Gladio crimes might be involved. Quite the opposite: each one of these events was accompanied by a huge propaganda campaign mindlessly endorsing and even promoting the official narrative, even when it self-evidently made no sense whatsoever (like 2 aircraft burning down 3 steel towers). As for Gladio, it was conveniently "forgotten".

There is a simple principle in psychology, including, and especially in criminal psychology which I would like to prominently restate here:

The best predictor of future behavior is past behavior

Every criminalist knows that and this is why criminal investigators place so much importance on the "modus operandi", i.e. the particular way or method a suspect or a criminal chooses in the course of the execution of his/her crimes. That is also something which everybody knows. So let's summarize this in a simple thesis:

Western regimes have a long and well-established track record of regularly executing bloody false-flag operations in pursuit of political objectives, especially those providing them with a pretext to justify an illegal military aggression.

Frankly, I submit that the thesis above is really established not only by a preponderance of evidence but beyond a reasonable doubt. Right?

Maybe. But that is also completely irrelevant because nobody gives a damn! Not the reporters who lie for a living nor, even less so, the brainwashed zombies who read their nonsense and take it seriously. [The CIA tried to kill Fidel Castro over 600 times](#) – who cares?! All we know is that the good folks at Langley would never, ever, kill a Russian in the UK, out of respect for international law, probably...

That willful ignorance easily defeats history, facts or logic.

Here is a simple question a journalist could ask: "would the type of people who had no problems blowing up an large train station, or bringing down three buildings in downtown New York, have any hesitation in using a goofy method to try kill a useless Russian ex-spy if that could justify further hostile actions against a country which they desperately need to demonize to justify and preserve the current AngloZionist world order?". The answer I think is self-evident. The question shall therefore not be asked. Instead, [soy-boys](#) from Foreign Policy mag will tell us about how the Russians use exotic flowers to kill high visibility opponents whose death would serve no conceivable political goal.

Hypocrisy as a core attribute of the modern man

Willful ignorance is important, of course, but it is not enough. For one thing, being ignorant, while useful to dismiss a fact-based and/or logical argument, is not something useful to establish your moral superiority or the legality of your actions. Empire requires much more than just obedience from its subject: what is also absolutely indispensable is a very strong sense of superiority which can be relied upon when committing a hostile action against the other guy. And nothing is as solid a foundation for a sense of superiority than the unapologetic reliance on brazen hypocrisy. Let's take a fresh example: the latest US threats to attack Syria (again).

Irrespective of the fact that the USA themselves have certified Syria free of chemical weapons and irrespective of the fact that US officials are still saying that they have no evidence that the Syrian government was involved in any chemical attack on Khan Shaykhun, the USA [is now preparing to strike Syria again](#) in "response" to [future](#) chemical attacks! Yes, you read that right. The AngloZionists are now announcing their false flags in advance! In fact, by the time this analysis is published the attack will probably already have occurred. The "best" part of this all is that Nikki Haley has now announced to the UN Security Council that [the US will act without any UN Security](#)

[Council approval](#). What the USA is declaring is this: "we reserve the right to violate international law at any time and for any reason we deem sufficient". In the very same statement, Nikki Haley also called the Syrian government an "outlaw regime". This is not a joke, [check it out for yourself](#). The reaction in "democratic" Europe: [declaring that *Russia* \(not the US\) is a rogue state](#). QED.

This entire circus is only made possible by the fact that the western elites have all turned into "*great supine protoplasmic invertebrate jellies*" (to use the [wonderful words of Boris Johnson](#)) and that absolutely nobody has the courage, or decency, to call all this what it really is: an obscene display of total hypocrisy and wholesale violation of all norms of international law. The French philosopher Alain Soral is quite right when he says that modern "journalists are either unemployed or prostitutes" (he spoke about the French media - *un journaliste français c'est soit une pute soit un chômeur* - but this fully applies to all the western media). Except that I would extend it to the entire Western Establishment.

I would further argue that foreign aggression and hypocrisy have become the two essential pillars for the survival of the AngloZionist empire: the first one being an economic and political imperative, the 2nd one being the prerequisite for the public justification of the first one. But sometimes even that is not enough, especially when the lies are self-evidently absurd. Then the final, quasi-miraculous element is always brought in: hysterics.

Hysteria as the highest form of (pseudo-)liberalism

I don't particularly care for the distinction usually made between liberals and conservatives, at least not unless the context and these terms is carefully and accurately defined. I certainly don't place myself on that continuum nor do find it analytically helpful.

The theoretical meaning of these concepts is, however, quite different from what is mostly understood under these labels, especially when people use them to identify themselves. That is to say that while I am not at all sure that those who think of themselves as, say, liberals are in any way truly liberal, I do think that people who would identify themselves as "liberals" often (mostly?) share a number of characteristics, the foremost of which is a very strong propensity to function at, and engage in, an hysterical mode of discourse and action.

The Google definition of hysteria is "*exaggerated or uncontrollable emotion or excitement, especially among a group of people (...) whose symptoms include conversion of psychological stress into physical symptoms (somatization), selective amnesia, shallow volatile emotions, and overdramatic or attention-seeking behavior*". Is that not a perfect description of US politicians, especially the (putatively) "liberal" ones? Just think of the way US Democrats have capitalized on such (non-)issues as "Russian interference" (externally) or "gun control" (internally) and you will see that the so-called "liberals" never get off a high-emotional pitch. The best example of all, really, is their reaction to the election of Donald Trump instead of their cult-leader Hillary: it has been over a year since Trump has been elected and yet the liberal ziomeia and its consumers are still in full-blown hysteria mode (with ["pussyhats"](#), ["sky-screams"](#) and all). In a conversation you can literally drown such a liberal with facts, statistics, expert testimonies, etc. and achieve absolutely no result whatsoever because the liberal lives in an ideological comfort zone which he/she is categorically unwilling and, in fact, unable, to abandon, even temporarily. This is what makes liberals such a **perfect** audience for false-flag operations: they simply won't process the narrative presented to them in a logical manner but will immediately react to it in a strongly emotional manner, usually with the urge to immediately "do something".

That "do something" is usually expressed in the application of violence (externally) and the imposition of bans/restrictions/regulations (internally). You can try to explain to that liberal that the very last thing the Russians would ever want to do is to use a stupid method to try to kill a person who is of absolutely no interest to them, or to explain to that liberal that the very last thing the Syrian government would ever do in the course of its successful liberation of its national territory from "good terrorists" would be to use chemical weapons of any kind - but you would never achieve anything: Trump must be impeached, the Russians sanctioned and the Syrians bombed, end of argument.



I am quite aware that there are a lot of self-described "conservatives" who have fully joined this chorus of hysterical liberals in all their demands, but these "conservatives" are not only acting out of character, they are simply caving in to the social pressure of the day, being the "*great supine protoplasmic invertebrate jellies*" mentioned above. Again, I am not discussing real liberals or real conservatives here (regardless of what these terms really mean), I am talking about those who, for whatever reason, chose to place that label upon themselves even if they personally have only a very vague idea of what this label is supposed to mean.

So there we have it: an Empire built (and maintained) on lies, accepted on the basis ignorance, justified by hypocrisy and energized by hysterics. This is what the "Western world" stands for nowadays. And while there is definitely a vocal minority of "resisters" (from the Left and the Right - also two categories I don't find analytically helpful - and from many other schools of political thought), the sad reality is that the vast majority of people around us accept this and see no reason to denounce it, nevermind doing something about it. That is why "they" got away with 9/11 and why "they" will continue to get away with future false-flags because the people lied to, realize, at least on some level, that they are being lied to and yet they simply don't care. Truly, the Orwellian slogans of 1984 "*war is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength*" perfectly fit our world. However, when dealing with the proverbial Russian bear, there is one lesson of history which western leaders really should never forget and which they should also turn into a slogan: *when dealing with a bear, hubris is suicidal*.