

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نیاشد تن من مباد بدین بوم ویر زنده یک تن مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/05/21/showdown-in-ukraine/print>

## Showdown in Ukraine

**Putin vs. Comrade Wolf**

by MIKE WHITNEY

MAY 21, 2014

“Comrade Wolf knows who to eat, and he eats without listening to anyone.” – Russian President Vladimir Putin referring to the United States

The Ukraine crisis has its roots in a policy that dates back nearly 20 years. The origins of the policy can be traced to a 1997 article in Foreign Policy magazine by Zbigniew Brzezinski, titled “A Geostrategy for Eurasia.” The article makes the case that the United States needs to forcefully establish itself in Central Asia in order to maintain its position as the world’s only superpower. While many readers may be familiar with Brzezinski’s thinking on these matters, they might not know what he has to say about Russia, which is particularly illuminating given that the recent uptick in violence has less to do with Ukraine than it does with Washington’s proxy-war on Russia. Here’s what Brzezinski says:

“Russia’s longer-term role in Eurasia will depend largely on its self-definition...Russia’s first priority should be to modernize itself rather than to engage in a futile effort to regain its status as

a global power. Given the country's size and diversity, a decentralized political system and free-market economics would be most likely to unleash the creative potential of the Russian people and Russia's vast natural resources. A loosely confederated Russia — composed of a European Russia, a Siberian Republic, and a Far Eastern Republic — would also find it easier to cultivate closer economic relations with its neighbors. Each of the confederated entities would be able to tap its local creative potential, stifled for centuries by Moscow's heavy bureaucratic hand. In turn, a decentralized Russia would be less susceptible to imperial mobilization." Zbigniew Brzezinski, *A Geostrategy for Eurasia*, *Foreign Affairs*, 76:5, September/October 1997.

So is this the goal of US policy, to create "A loosely confederated Russia" whose economy can be subsumed into America's market-based system?

Notice how easily Brzezinski chops Russia into smaller, bite-size statelets that pose no threat to US imperial expansion. Brzezinski undoubtedly envisions a Russia that will sell its vast resources in petrodollars and recycle them into US Treasuries further enriching the corrupt rent-skimmers in Washington and Wall Street. He foresees a Russia that will abdicate its historic role in the world and have no say-so in shaping global policy. He imagines a compliant Russia that will help facilitate US imperial ambitions in Asia, even to the point where it will pay to police its own people on behalf of US oligarchs, weapons manufacturers, oil magnates, and 1 percenters. Here's the paragraph in Brzezinski's piece that sums up Washington's objectives in Ukraine, Russia and beyond. It is fittingly headlined with the following words in bold print:

#### **"TRANSCONTINENTAL SECURITY**

"Defining the substance and institutionalizing the form of a trans-Eurasian security system could become the major architectural initiative of the next century. The core of the new transcontinental security framework could be a standing committee composed of the major Eurasian powers, with America, Europe, China, Japan, a confederated Russia, and India collectively addressing critical issues for Eurasia's stability. The emergence of such a transcontinental system could gradually relieve America of some of its burdens, while perpetuating beyond a generation its decisive role as Eurasia's arbitrator. Geostrategic success in that venture would be a fitting legacy to America's role as the first and only global superpower." Zbigniew Brzezinski, "A Geostrategy for Eurasia," *Foreign Affairs*

Translation: The United States will police the world, dispatch troublemakers, and eliminate potential threats wherever it finds them. It will impose its neoliberal dogma (Austerity, privatization, structural adjustment, anti labor reforms, etc) across-the-board and on all

participants. Also, minor partners—"Europe, China, Japan, a confederated Russia, and India"—will be expected to provide security for their own people at their own expense in order to "relieve America of some of its burdens."

Nice, eh? So you even have to pay for your own jailers.

And what is "Transcontinental Security" anyway? Isn't it just a fancy way of saying "one world government"?

Indeed, it is. It's the very same thing. Here's more from Brzezinski:

"Failure to widen NATO...would shatter the concept of an expanding Europe... Worse, it could reignite dormant Russian political aspirations in Central Europe."

This is an oddly convoluted statement. In the first sentence, Brzezinski supports the idea of an "expanding Europe", and then in the next breath, he worries that Russia might want to do the same thing. It's another case of the pot calling the kettle black.

What's clear, is that—in Brzezinski's mind—EU and NATO expansion will help Washington achieve its hegemonic aspirations. That's all that matters. Here's what he says:

"Europe is America's essential geopolitical bridgehead in Eurasia...A wider Europe and an enlarged NATO will serve the short-term and longer-term interests of U.S. policy... A politically defined Europe is also essential to Russia's assimilation into a system of global cooperation."

"Bridgehead"? In other words, Europe is just a means to an end. But what would that "end" be?

Global domination. Isn't that what he's talking about?

Of course, it is.

What makes the Ukrainian crisis so hard to understand, is that the media conceals the policy behind the impenetrable fog of daily events. Once the fog lifts though, it's easy to see who's causing all the trouble. It's the party that's calling the shots from abroad, the good old US of A.

Putin doesn't want this war and neither do most Ukrainians. The whole thing was conjured up by Uncle Sam and his minions to stop the flow of Russian gas to Europe, to push NATO further eastward, and to break the Russian Federation into little pieces. That's what it's really all about.

And these madmen are willing to raze Ukraine to the ground and kill every living organism within a 3,000 mile radius of Kiev to get their way. After all, isn't that what they did in Iraq? They sure did. And did I mention that, according to this week's Wall Street Journal, "Iraq's Oil Output Surged to Highest Level in Over 30 Years" with all the usual suspects raking in hefty profits.

The point is, if they'd did it in Iraq, they'll do it in Ukraine too. Because what Washington cares about is constituents not carnage. Carnage they can handle.

Brzezinski is not the only one supporting the current policy either. There's also fellow traveler, Hillary Clinton. In fact, it was Secretary of State Clinton who first used the term "pivot" in a 2011 article in Foreign Policy Magazine titled "America's Pacific Century". Clinton's op-ed described a "rebalancing" plan that would open up new markets to US corporations and Wall Street, control the flow of vital resources, and "forge a broad-based military presence" across the continent. Here's an excerpt from the text of Clinton's seminal speech:

"The future of politics will be decided in Asia, not Afghanistan or Iraq, and the United States will be right at the center of the action.

As the war in Iraq winds down and America begins to withdraw its forces from Afghanistan, the United States stands at a pivot point. Over the last 10 years, we have allocated immense resources to those two theaters. In the next 10 years, we need to be smart and systematic about where we invest time and energy, so that we put ourselves in the best position to sustain our leadership, secure our interests, and advance our values. One of the most important tasks of American statecraft over the next decade will therefore be to lock in a substantially increased investment — diplomatic, economic, strategic, and otherwise — in the Asia-Pacific region...

Harnessing Asia's growth and dynamism is central to American economic and strategic interests and a key priority for President Obama. Open markets in Asia provide the United States with unprecedented opportunities for investment, trade, and access to cutting-edge technology.....American firms (need) to tap into the vast and growing consumer base of Asia...The region already generates more than half of global output and nearly half of global trade. As we strive to meet President Obama's goal of doubling exports by 2015, we are looking for opportunities to do even more business in Asia...

...as I talk with business leaders across our own nation, I hear how important it is for the United States to expand our exports and our investment opportunities in Asia's dynamic markets."

(“America’s Pacific Century”, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton”, Foreign Policy Magazine, 2011)

“Harnessing Asia’s growth and dynamism is central to American economic and strategic interests and a key priority for President Obama”?

Does that sound like someone who wants to cultivate a mutually-beneficial relationship with their trading partners or someone who wants to move in, take over and run the show?

Washington’s plan to shift its attention from the Middle East to Asia is all about money. Clinton even says so herself. She says, “The region generates more than half of global output and nearly half of global trade...Asia’s markets ... provide the United States with unprecedented opportunities for investment, trade, and...a vast and growing consumer base.”

Money, money, money. The upside-profit potential is limitless which is why Madame Clinton wants to plant Old Glory right in “the center of the action”, so US corporations can rake in the dough without fear of reprisal.

Brzezinski says the same thing in his magnum opus “The Grand Chessboard” Here’s an excerpt:

“A power that dominates Eurasia would control two of the world’s three most advanced and economically productive regions. A mere glance at the map also suggests that control over Eurasia would almost automatically entail Africa’s subordination, rendering the Western Hemisphere and Oceania (Australia) geopolitically peripheral to the world’s central continent. About 75 per cent of the world’s people live in Eurasia, and most of the world’s physical wealth is there as well, both in its enterprises and underneath its soil. Eurasia accounts for about three-fourths of the world’s known energy resources.” (Zbigniew Brzezinski, “The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And It’s Geostrategic Imperatives”, page 31)

Get the picture? It’s a gold rush! Having successfully looted every last farthing from the battered US middle class and left the economy in a ghastly shambles, Brzezinski, Clinton and Co. are headed for greener pastures in Central Asia, home of the world’s largest oil producing nation, boundless reserves in the Caspian Basin, and zillions of voracious consumers who’ll need everything from I Pads to leisure wear, all graciously provided by US-owned corporations. Chaching!

So don't get tripped up on the daily events in Ukraine. This isn't a clash between pro-government forces and anti-government activists. This is the next big phase of Washington's plan to conquer the world, a plan that will inevitably pit Moscow against the amassed military power of the United States of America. This is David vs. Goliath, Mother Russia vs. the Great Satan, Vladie Putin vs. Comrade Wolf.