

## THE FARCICAL REACTION IN THE MAINSTREAM PRESS TO THE CARLSON-PUTIN INTERVIEW.

*This article, with the exception of the discussion section, does not dwell on the interview, but rather the farcical reaction to it in the official-fake media. As CNN has stated latterly, the mainstream media, which is increasingly unpopular, has started to lose control of the narrative, that is the agenda spun by the neo-cons who believe they own and control the world. The thoughtless reactions below are yet another nail in the coffin of those demagogues who make a living by vilifying their opponents.*

The [Austin American-Statesman](#) posed the following question: *was this the most viewed interview on X* (formerly twitter) in history, estimating that within 24 hours there were 125 million clicks. After three days that rose to [185 million](#). In other words the scale of the audience was sufficiently large as to have political repercussions, but not large enough to force a real debate of the issues raised by the interview. A failure by western politicians and reporters to take the interview seriously will further damage the legitimacy of the official media.

Someone should have reminded Hilary Clinton and Boris Johnson of this. Both of these non-entities who still believe they are celebrities, deserve the Grimy Award for their devious comments. [Condescending Clinton](#) called Carlson a puppy dog and a useful idiot, adding that Putin was a consummate liar. And as for [Johnson](#), clearly on holiday yet again in his tee shirt, buffeted by the winds of change, used one of his pet phrases, it was all a *tissue of lies* said this snot-nose. This failed politician can now add to his C.V., alongside 'lying scoundrel' and 'national mass murderer' (pandemic), 'international mass murderer' (Ukraine). With a C.V. like that, only a rag like the Hail on Sunday or the Daily Hail is willing to hire him.

All the western media and politicians have shied away from engaging with the substance of the interview. Instead, they have sought to discredit the interviewer, Carlson, or disparage Putin, or challenge the credibility and motives for the interview, or have used hostile 'experts' to establish that Putin was lying. On the last point, many of these experts are paid by allegedly independent think tanks which in all cases turn out to be financed by the arms industry or government.

Beginning with discrediting. *The Financial Times* report on the interview [How Tucker Carlson Became Putin's Useful Idiot](#) is a case of not listening to the message but discrediting the messenger, Carlson. So the most popular broadcaster in the US is reduced to a *self-styled journalist*. Now mark, while most of the interview orbited around the issue of the war in the Ukraine and the run up to it, the *FT* article confines itself to Carlson's being the enemy of woke politics aligning him with Putin. The article then adds that the interview is intended to ingratiate Carlson with the Trumpian crowd. Now one can understand poor journalism when it is used by the rich to confuse the poor, but in the case of the *FT* which is written for the rich, one would expect higher journalistic standards, standards which inform rather than obfuscate.

It seems all the media without exception is now found paddling around in the gutter. It is said the first casualty of war is the truth, and it is, to which we may add, with the stretcher bearers being the media.

On the other end of the spectrum, the response by the self-styled paper of Labour in Britain, [The Mirror](#), was to quote Ken Giles - a NATO stooge and so called expert on Russia. *"Everybody involved in Tucker Carlson's Putin interview is an enemy of the US and West."* A case of either you are with us or against us at a time of war. And in case anyone is wavering in their support, this apologist for imperialism has the following to say: *"Putin also wins because of the validation he will get from the interview at home in Russia. There's a good reason he has been refusing to give interviews to genuine journalists - there is a risk they*

might ask awkward questions about Russia's genocidal conduct in its war of colonial reconquest in Ukraine, or about Putin's own status as an internationally wanted war criminal." So Russia is guilty of genocide but not Israel, because one of his employers, Chatham House, also known by its full name, *The Royal Institute of International Affairs*, or should we say, The Loyal Institute of International Affairs, has always supported the aims of British imperialism which in this case means unconditional support for Israel, as has [Starmer the Labour leader](#) who was invited to this sage institute to deliver a speech on the war in Gaza. Here are some choice extracts from Starmer's speech: *"To the 7th of October – the biggest slaughter of Jews – and that is why they were killed, do not doubt that, since the Holocaust. Men, women, children, babies murdered, mutilated and tortured by the terrorists of Hamas. Over 200 hostages, including British citizens, taken back into Gaza. Make no mistake. This is terrorism on a scale and brutality that few countries have ever experienced – certainly not this one."* Actually that is not factually true as many more Brits were killed in the colonies during Empire. Once again Starmer is repeating all the anti-Semitic Zionist tropes to justify the war in Gaza. Where he is accurate is that there was a big slaughter of Jews, but mainly by fellow Jews in uniform acting under the Hannibal Directive. *"To look away from Gaza. Knowing it is controlled by those who want to kill Jews and wipe Israel off the map. To look away from Israel. Knowing people live without the security which they deserve."* And here he is failing to address the current genocide by Zionists as recorded by the ICJ. Instead he demands that the Zionists, these ruthless occupiers who have never showed mercy towards the Palestinians, **deserve** the right to offend, which he disingenuously refers to as the right of self defense.

And this from that most disappointing of the British newspapers, [the Guardian](#), who since Julian Assange's arrest has sold its soul and integrity to the British Secret Services. *"Viewers were, at least, getting a fresh insight into Putin's personality, which on this evidence is basically that of a barroom bore who attends meetings at his local history club. And, eventually, the autocratic leader talked his way into the 21st century. He gave his version of a Russian-Ukraine conflict in which Russia is painted as an innocent party which hopes for peace."* No analysis, only psychoanalysis. One would have thought Putin was lying on a couch rather than sitting upright in a chair. And lest there we doubt the *Guardian's* fidelity to the state, they utter the obligatory but threadbare phrase; *Russia invaded without provocation*, dismissing Putin's protestations that Russia was the innocent victim, but without addressing any of the reasons Putin assembled in support of his conclusion.

Other notable responses came from the likes of leftie representative [Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez](#) who said anyone who watched the interview was a 'white supremacist'. There is only one thing worse than a white supremacist and that is a Yankee supremacist, which she is by continuously voting for war funds for Ukraine. Ah, these political charlatans.

[Chris Wallace](#) a former colleague of Carlson accuses him of not asking hard questions why Putin invaded Ukraine, when in fact Putin addressed that question. Carlson did not have to ask the question because Putin wanted to give the answer, which he did, providing 30 years of machinations and betrayals by the USA towards Russia.

Responses from the White House have been far and few between. [John Kirby](#) when asked a question admitted he was not one of the 185 million who viewed the interview in one form or another. Despite this he said he would dismiss anything said and that Americans should not be swayed by the interview. For the National Security Council coordinator for **strategic communications** (my emphasis) to dismiss this strategic interview was not only stupid and self-serving, but it was also reckless. But what do you expect from an

imperialist butcher who described the 7<sup>th</sup> of October as constituting genocidal intent on the part of Hamas but does not view the Zionist onslaught in Gaza as genocide in action, merely an exercise of the right to self-defense as stated by the State Department.

Only one paper, the [New York Times](#), the paper in turmoil over its slavish coverage of the war in Gaza, picked up on the central message in the interview, Putin's willingness to discuss peace with the USA. They admitted that Putin did not want to invade Poland et al and would prefer to end the war through negotiations rather than the force of arms. However, the Pentagon when asked said there would be no negotiations because Putin was a bad actor despite the fact that it was the USA who reneged on its pledge in 1991 not to expand NATO eastwards, who helped break up Yugoslavia raining bombs on Serbia, who attempted its first coup in Ukraine in 2004-5, who encouraged Ukraine to support Georgia in their war with Russia in 2008, who stirred up trouble in the Caucasus, who engineered the successful coup in 2014, then the farce of Minsk 1 & 2 which was nothing more than a ruse to buy time to rebuild the Ukraine army, and finally sent Prime Minister Johnson to scupper the emerging peace treaty agreed in Turkey, and yet despite this glaring history, it is the White House who claims it is the Russians who are the bad actors. There is a word for that in New York - chutzpah.

#### **Discussion: The interview itself.**

Many commentators, not only the usual suspects, but those more disposed towards Putin and with a better grasp of the facts, agreed that Putin rambled on for too long about the history of Russia and the brotherly connections between Russia and the Ukraine. Perhaps it was Putin's way of expressing his resentment at the Anglo Saxons bringing bloodletting to the lands of the Slavs. This is not an academic debate. The new Ukrainian Chief of Staff recently appointed by Zelensky is [Oleksandr Syrskyi](#) was born in Russia and his parents and brother continue to live in Russia. This confirms Putin's view of the interpenetration of Slav people in the region and at the same time it refutes his assertion that ethnicity is dominant, as we are about to see.

I have a different take on ethnicity. I see a thread of naivety running through the whole interview. The USSR did not collapse because of the lack of patriotism. The coup in 2014 did not succeed because of the re-discovery of Ukrainian nationalism. So what joined the two – the machinations of the CIA – without a doubt, but there was something more fundamental that made the CIA project possible in the first place, and that was the attraction in both cases by the wealthier West. The populations in both Russia and Ukraine believed economic prosperity came from the West rather than from the East. Living standards rather than patriotic slogans motivated them. Russian workers were seduced into believing every German worker owned a Volkswagen Golf, and each year, they enjoyed a summer vacation on a beach and a winter vacation in a ski lodge.

The toxic mix of patriotism and religion came afterwards in Russia. A void had to be filled after the collapse of the USSR in order to consummate and make irreversible the counter-revolution. The extent of that void can be measured by the catastrophic fall in life expectancy, the greatest fall outside a major war, which did not reverse until 2005: "[Male life expectancy at birth](#) in Russia fell by six years between 1991 and 1994, from an already-low 63.4 years to 57.4 years over that period, an almost unprecedented decrease in life expectancy in three years" The increase in life expectancy coincided with the rejuvenation of the Russian economy around this time as it overcame the biggest flight of capital in modern times matched only by the flight of capital from South Africa after the ending of Apartheid.

As an aside, history smiles at ironies. In the 1990s and later, it was the attraction of the German economic miracle that drove politics in the East. But now the tables have been turned. Germany is in terminal decline shackled to the sinking US century while it is Russia that is powering ahead looking East and to China. Could it be the case that by the end of the decade it will be German workers who look enviously at Russian workers driving Chinese EV cars and flying in Russian and Chinese jetliners to far-off places?

But having acknowledged his acute grasp of Russian and regional history, the naivety spread to his grasp of present-day geo-politics. He seemed to be surprised by the political ineptness and shallow thinking of Western Political Leaders. This is a trite observation, because these imperialist connivers always mask their underlying strategic intentions with the inessential. Accordingly what was left unsaid was more important. Putin should have been straight with Carlson by saying; look the USA is determined to maintain its hegemony by all means. To this end they must stop China, and attempting to ruin Russia is part of the project, because as long as Russia is able to defend itself, this prevents the encirclement of China. Therefore until and unless the USA recognizes its loss of hegemony is inevitable, it will refuse to accept any other nation as its equal or partner. And Putin could have underscored this inevitability by saying how he taught the neocons this lesson in the Ukraine, where the Pentagon and NATO having thrown their best punch only ended up breaking their fist.

Instead he emphasized he was a man of peace. The only saving grace in waving the olive branch was to disabuse the notion that Putin was a frothing at the mouth, red eyed, horned war mongerer as portrayed by the infantile and mischievous Western Press. And perhaps that was his ploy, his psych op. But once again trying to mollify the West will not work. The USA will act with every means, in common with all the Empires before it, to prevent the sun setting on its century, until by force of arms, it is forced to concede. And Putin, the historian, should know this. The only question is whether this force of arms will be wielded by another nation or by the international working class.

## **Conclusion.**

The neocons are in trouble. They have failed in the Ukraine, and their darling spoilt child - the Zionists - are out of control, ruining the carefully cultivated Hollywood image of a USA defending a rules based world order upon which civilized behaviour depends. Putin shrugged his shoulders when Carlson asked him why Russia did not go on the propaganda offensive, saying this was a waste of time because US corporations controlled the global dissemination of information. He is not incorrect, but that global media is beginning to come apart. Many users do not trust the [national media](#) and within the media the junior reporting ranks are in conflict with the higher ups laying down strict guidelines on reporting, making a mockery of the claim that a *free press* exists in the USA. The push back over the allegation of Hamas mass rapes in the New York Times being one example.

Clearly, Carlson's interview will further undermine the credibility of the neocons, accelerating rather than initiating a process already underway. This is what makes his interview so important. As the [Munich Security Index 2024](#) reveals, fear of China and Russia no longer takes the top spot of concerns as they did last year. The neo-cons are finding less and less cover to hide under, as disaffection grows. Like a jilted lover who is the last to find out about they have been betrayed, so too with neocons like Clinton and Johnson, who are so full of themselves they cannot feel the ground move under their feet as support for them rushes away.

Carlson is a reactionary and therefore a counter revolutionary. But he does represent a fault line in US imperialism and its objectives. The majority position encapsulating both the grandees in the Democratic Party and the Republican Party holds that both Russia and China could and should be engaged simultaneously. This view was based on an over-estimation of the capacity of the United States and an under-estimation of their adversaries. Then there was the minority view, whose sole major political proponent is Donald Trump, where the stated position is to focus solely on China while trying to wean Russia away from China.

Hence Trump's contrarian position on the Ukraine and NATO. Because Carlson subscribes to this view his interview had the purpose of rehabilitating Putin as a steppingstone to improving relations between the US and Russia. He has said repeatedly that he had been trying to get this interview for three years but was frustrated from achieving this goal by the CIA spying on him. Had he interviewed Putin three years ago he would have had a better chance influencing the perception of Russia. But now the die has been cast. China and Russia are joined by the hip and Russia sees its future in the East not in the West, (which makes a mockery of the stupids like the SWP who damn Putin for his imperialist ambitions in the western direction).

Historians will look back to the fall of the US Empire and the reasons for its fall and conclude that one of the primary causes was the failure to separate Russia from China despite Carlson's valiant and unstated efforts.

Brian Green, 13<sup>th</sup> February 2024.