

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

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

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

Rafael Poch De Feliu

27.05.2022

What they are explaining about the war

Three months after its inception, we have a better understanding of the accumulation of multilateral irresponsibility that has led to this war.



Ukraine was not in NATO, but NATO was in Ukraine since 2014. Three months after its inception, we have a better understanding of the accumulation of multilateral irresponsibility that has led to this war.



Emplazamientos de la OTAN en Ucrania

(Amarillo y azul): Instalaciones no oficiales de la OTAN.

(Solo en azul): Instalaciones oficiales de la OTAN.

DE ARRIBA ABAJO, COMENZANDO POR LA IZQUIERDA:

- Polígono 242 del ejército regular de Goncharovski, región de Chernigov.
- Polígono 233 del ejército regular del pueblo Malaya Liubasha, región de Rovno
- Centro internacional de mantenimiento de la paz y la seguridad de Yavoriv, región de Lviv.

REGION COSTERA DEL MAR NEGRO (De izquierda a derecha)

- Base de la flota británica de Yuzni, región de Odesa.
- Base de mando operativo de la flota de EE.UU de Ochakov, región de Nikolayev.
- Centro de observación y escucha de la isla Zmeiny.
- Centro 235 de preparación, pueblo Mijailovka, región de Nikolayev.
- Polígono 241 del ejército regular de Aleshki, región de Jerson.
- Centro de entrenamiento de tiradores de precisión de Mariupol, región de Donetsk.

ANGULO SUPERIOR DERECHO

- Campamento militar de la OTAN de Shostka, región de Sumy.

-Campamento de la OTAN, Sumy.

FUENTE: riafan.ru

Cuando el 24 de febrero Rusia invadió Ucrania desconocíamos muchos detalles de esa criminal y desgraciada aventura. Hoy, cuando los peligros de una escalada militar entre Occidente y Rusia se incrementan con las semanas hasta producir vértigo en un diario belicista de Nueva York, sabemos con certeza que aunque Ucrania no estaba en la OTAN, la OTAN estaba en Ucrania. Desde hace años. Lo que eso significaba y significa en la práctica lo sabemos, no a través de informaciones y propagandas justificatorias rusas, sino por fuentes de Estados Unidos: por declaraciones de sus personalidades e informes de sus medios de comunicación.

El rearme atlantista de Ucrania comenzó inmediatamente después de la revuelta popular y operación de cambio de régimen del invierno de 2014. Las fuerzas nacionalistas antirusas que no representaban ni a la mitad del país (obviamente ahora el panorama ha cambiado radicalmente), se hicieron entonces definitivamente con el poder en Kiev. Al derogar el precepto de no alineamiento de la Constitución ucraniana y optar abiertamente por una decidida disciplina occidental, esas fuerzas rompieron el delicado equilibrio plural entre las regiones del Oeste y el Este sobre el que reposaba la integridad territorial del país, desencadenaron una guerra civil en Donbas y también la anexión de Crimea, una reacción rusa de consolación a la debacle que los intereses de Moscú habían sufrido en Kíev y que la administración Obama leyó como un intolerable desafío militar merecedor de ejemplarizante castigo.

Según el Instituto Internacional de Investigaciones sobre la Paz de Estocolmo (SIPRI), desde entonces y hasta 2021, Ucrania incrementó su gasto militar un 142% (Rusia un 11%).

A partir de 2015, Estados Unidos se gastó 5000 millones de dólares en armas a Ucrania. En ese mismo periodo se formaron “por lo menos 10.000 hombres de las fuerzas armadas ucranianas al año “durante más de ocho años” en el cuadro de la OTAN, informó el 13 de abril *The Wall Street Journal* en un artículo titulado [“El secreto del éxito militar de Ucrania: años de entrenamiento de la OTAN”](#).



Muchos de esos, por lo menos, 80.000 hombres, fueron formados en los “estándares militares occidentales” y “tácticas modernas de combate” en la base de Yavoriv (Yavorov), cerca de Lviv.

Yavoriv is a huge 200-square-kilometer training camp (three times the Paris metropolitan area), which was the subject of a notorious Russian missile attack on March 13. At first there were formed units of the National Guard and then of the regular army. When the war began, "at least eight NATO countries" were training Ukrainian military personnel in Yavoriv. What has been learned from this extensive training and modernization work "has had a significant impact" on the course of the war, said NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg.

The CIA also formed elite Ukrainian intelligence and intelligence units on U.S. soil. The program struggled because the contingent was suspected of being infiltrated by Russian informants, which demanded information restrictions and security leaks, security correspondent Zach Dorfman reported in January. The Russians were up to date with that

CIA work. The head of special operations of Ukrainian intelligence, Colonel Maksim Shapoval, linked to that program, died on June 27, 2017 in Kiev, in an attack with a limpet bomb placed under his car. The attack was attributed to the Russian secret services and considered a response to other attacks committed by Shapoval in Donbas.

While all this was happening, two fundamental processes were taking place in parallel. The first, the active rejection of the United States, and as a consequence of the Ukrainians, of the "Minsk Agreements", the peace formula signed between Russia and Ukraine, and arbitrated by France and Germany that these two countries let languish. The second, the unilateral withdrawal of the United States, in 2019, from the agreement banning intermediate-range nuclear weapons (INF), signed in 1987 by Reagan and Gorbachev and which was a milestone for the end of the cold war in Europe.

After hearing for years that NATO's Eastward enlargement was not against Russia and that the missile batteries deployed in Romania and Poland were "against Iran," (which lacked, and lacks, such long-range missiles), the Russians attended with double irritation the explanations that Trump's National Security Adviser, The insane John Bolton, offered in Moscow in October 2018: the withdrawal of the INF is not against Russia, Bolton told them, but against China, in order to be able to deploy those tactical nuclear weapons in Asia. Bolton's assertion that they no longer considered Russia "a threat" and that what mattered in Washington was China did nothing but hurt the self-conscious pride of great power that came unless from the Russian leadership.



John Bolton

In March 2021, Ukraine approved a new military strategy that directly targets the military reconquest of Crimea and Donbas, which from the point of view of international law was completely legitimate, since both regions were Ukrainian territory, but which for practical purposes amounted to an announcement of war preparations against Russia.

In September of the same year, the United States and Ukraine signed an agreement pledging military aid to restore Ukraine's "territorial integrity," as announced by the purpose of Kiev's new military doctrine.

In February the war begins, after the U.S. The US will not react to Moscow's diplomatic proposal (neutrality of Ukraine, withdrawal of NATO military infrastructure from Russia's environment, among other aspects) and that the Ukrainian President declare at the Munich Security Conference his right to have nuclear weapons in the future.

Three months before the start of the Russian invasion, in November 2021, CIA Director William Burns had visited Moscow with a clear message. Putin was at his Black Sea residence in Sochi, but Burns warned that if the invasion preparations detected in Washington were executed, there would be a strong Western reaction. From Moscow, Burns spoke by phone with Putin. Without bothering to deny Washington's suspicions of invasion, the Russian president "slowly recited to him a list of grievances about how the United States had for years ignored Russian security interests." Regarding Ukraine, Putin told him that "[it was not a real country](#)" (WSJ, April 1), that is, the idea that the Russian president has defended on several occasions, and that deserves a small explanation.

[According to a fairly common view in Russia](#), a Ukraine hostile to Russia that denies its internal ethnolinguistic, cultural and religious pluralism, has no right to existence on its current borders. Such a country, considered a traitor, can be dismembered, with its eastern part linked to Russia in one way or another, a western piece of subcarpathian Ruthenia incorporated into Hungary (a scenario that, surely, Putin has transmitted to Orban on his last visit to Moscow), another to Poland, and the rest, if anything remains, for a hostile but harmless Ukrainian state, without access to the sea and unleashed, but geographically isolated, in its irremediable Russophobia. All this was already implicit in 1994 when Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn mentioned the "false Leninist borders of Ukraine", unjustifiable because "they break millions of ties of family and friendship", in his pamphlet "*The Russian Question at the End of the Twentieth Century*".

Under normal conditions that mentality would have dissolved over time, or would have been the heritage of politically marginal radical sectors in Moscow, but the 2014 rupture in Kiev with its affirmation of a "traitorous" Ukraine in Moscow's eyes and decidedly hostile to Russia, as well as Russia's own internal problems, placed it at the center of Moscow power...

Returning to the CIA director, in mid-January Burns secretly traveled to Kiev to expose to President Zelensky what they knew of the impending Russian attack, with a rapid advance towards Kiev from Belarus. The Russians were to occupy the Antonov airport of Hostomel, near Kiev, with special airborne troops, in order to use it to land forces there to take the capital. The Ukrainians were also given information about the targets of the first wave of Russian missiles to destroy Ukrainian aviation and air defense in the early hours. These reports saved some resources by changing their location, and disrupting hostomel's operation.

From the outset, NATO set its eyes (satellite information) and ears (interception of transmissions) on the Ukrainian military, with an intense flow of real-time information.

"U.S. intelligence has shared detailed information since before the invasion began ... and now it is working closely together with that of other partners to repel the Russian invasion," *Wall Street Journal* said on Sunday. NBC reported on April 26 that a Russian transport plane packed with special forces was shot down in the early days of the invasion. At the end of that same month, *The Washington Post* revealed that the coordinates had been provided to sink with missiles, on April 14, the cruiser "Moskva", flagship of the Russian Black Sea fleet, a fact that the Russians do not attribute to an attack but to an "accident" so as not to lose face. *The New York Times* reported shortly after that the high mortality of Russian high commands in the campaign, twelve generals in just three months according to the newspaper, was due to information on coordinates of command posts and schedules in which the presence of high commands in them was known.

All this we did not know on February 24, it had been underway for many years and gives greater plausibility to the Russian arguments about the reasons for the invasion as "preventive war".

In his May 9 victory day speech, Putin repeated the arguments already made in the early hours of February 24 when he said that an attack on Russia "was only a matter of time":

"In December we proposed to sign an agreement on security guarantees ... that took into account the interests of both parties. All in vain. (...) Another punitive operation was being prepared in Donbas, an invasion of our historic lands, including Crimea. Kiev declared that it could be done with nuclear weapons. The NATO bloc was carrying out an active military strengthening along our borders. An unacceptable threat was being created. We had all the evidence that a confrontation with the neo-Nazis and banderistas supported by the United States and its vassals was inevitable. We saw how the military infrastructures were increased with hundreds of foreign advisers and regular shipments of modern weapons by NATO countries. The threat increased with the days. Russia launched a pre-emptive strike against this aggression. It was an imposed, correct decision by an independent, strong and sovereign country."



Bucha, Ukraine, in an April 5 image.

Be that as it may, the "*right decision*" has cost the lives or terrible injuries of thousands of soldiers and civilians, 13 million displaced and the estimate that a third of the country's infrastructure has been destroyed. Not to mention the effect of sanctions on Russia and the European Union, its submission to NATO, the international isolation of Russia (only nuanced by the possibility of the development of an anti-Western bloc in the world in the medium and long term, uncertain consolation) and the problems of hunger and food insecurity that are announced in Africa and the Middle East. And as a big issue, the war between *combatant empires* definitively taking over from the necessary concertation against climate change in the priorities of the rulers of the great powers. In short: a full-

blown planetary catastrophe with years, if not decades, apart from priorities and fundamental objectives for the whole of humanity.

As of May 1, the U.S. Congress had earmarked a total of \$13.67 billion in aid to Ukraine in the first two months. To this are added the money for weapons from England and the European Union, as well as the disaster and risks, for both, that emerge from the insane declared objective of the European sanctions formulated in May by the foolish President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen: "to raze, step by step, the industrial base of Russia".

Against this background, there have been statements and recognitions by Western personalities about the true nature of this war for months. Asked last March whether the United States and Russia were in a *proxy war* in Ukraine, former CIA Director Leon Panetta replied in a televised interview: "We can say it or not, but it's about that."

On his April 24 visit to Kiev, U.S. Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin, a man in the arms industry, also confirmed this by explaining to his Ukrainian interlocutors that, "the task of our meeting is to talk about what will allow us to win this war." The first-person use of the plural clears up any doubt as to who is waging such a war. Around the same time, the *New York Times* editorial explained that the goal of the war "is to bring Russia to its knees" and in the meantime Congress has already approved \$40 billion more in aid to Ukraine, including \$23 billion for military aid. Added to the 13.67 billion of the first phase, the aid amounts to 53 billion, almost on par with Russia's military budget. Never has a country received so much aid from the United States in the last twenty years.

The conclusion of all this is obvious: it is not only an atrocious and unjustifiable war of Russia against Ukraine, it is, in addition and above all, a NATO war against Russia for the moment on the territory of Ukraine and with Ukraine as a victim and instrument. Why "*for now*" on the territory of Ukraine?

"In the environment of President Zelensky it is said that there will be a Ukrainian military counteroffensive in mid-June," capable of expanding to Russian territory, presidential adviser Olexij Arestovich told the German newspaper *Die Welt*. "By then the Ukrainians will have more weapons received from abroad. Before it's unlikely," he says.

"The Ukrainian counteroffensive needs medium- and long-range missile systems, large-caliber artillery and aviation," Gen. Kyrylo Budanov, the 36-year-old who heads Ukrainian military intelligence, told the *Wall Street Journal* on Sunday.

In social networks and media, a stupidity triumphs incapable of measuring the risks and consequences of what is proposed. On Russian TV, energetic journalists and analysts frivolize with the ability to "eliminate Britain" from a single Russian "Sarmat" nuclear missile. In the opposite camp, the delirium of Russian liberal-Stalinists opposed to Putin, many of them in exile and working for Atlanticist organizations, knows no bounds in calling for the dismantling of their own country, even the risk of nuclear war. It is a new example of the kind of opposition that autocratic regimes have always generated in Russia.

They return with their nefarious Western advisory councils of the nineties's "shock therapy" in Russia like the incompetent fanatic Anders Aslund: "my humble advice to NATO would be: 1-Give as soon as possible the maximum possible weapons to Ukraine, 2-Open the Black Sea ports to navigation 3- Preemptively bomb the most important Russian cities to ensure that Putin will not use chemical or nuclear weapons, "- Says.

"The United States should show that it can win a nuclear war," writes Seth Crossy, President of the Yorktown Institute in the *Wall Street Journal*.

Faced with this spectacle, even the warmongering *New York Times* feels the vertigo of the consequences of that "bringing Russia to its knees" proclaimed in its April editorial as the target of the war. With an eye on inflation and the Democratic disaster that is announced for the "midterm" elections in November, the newspaper notes in its editorial of May 19, that "the conflict may take a more unpredictable trajectory and potential escalation", wonders if that is "in the interest of the United States", estimates that "a decisive victory of Ukraine over Russia in which all the territory taken by Russia since 2014 is recovered. it is not a realistic goal," he advises Biden that he should "explain the limits" to Zelensky, and finally recalls that the adversary, "is still a nuclear superpower."

Three months after its inception, we have a better understanding of the accumulation of multilateral irresponsibility that has led to this war.

Rafael Poch de Feliu

Edited by María Piedad Ossaba

Source: RAFAEL POCH DE FELIU– Blog, May 24, 2022

La Pluma.net 25.05.2022