

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد 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

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/washington-the-war-criminal-capital-of-the-world-is-driving-the-world-to-nuclear-war-paul-craig-roberts/5535472>

“Washington, the War Criminal Capital of the World is Driving the World to Nuclear War”: Paul Craig Roberts

By Dr. Paul Craig Roberts

7/12/2016

A Reuters news report by Robin Emmott and Sabine Siebold shows how devoid the West is of honest, intelligent and responsible journalists and government officials.

First we will examine the dishonesty or incompetence of the reporters and then that of Western government officials.

Emmott and Siebold describe NATO as a “Western defense alliance.” Since the Clinton regime NATO has been an alliance for waging offensive war, a war crime under the Nuremberg rules established by the United States. Under the NATO banner a number of countries have been bombed, invaded, and had their governments overthrown by Washington acting under the cover of NATO.

These destroyed countries posed no threat whatsoever to the countries of the NATO alliance and undertook no aggressive actions against NATO members. How is it possible that Reuters’ reporters and editors are not aware of this?

Why do they call an instrument of Washington’s aggression a “defense alliance”?

Emmott and Siebold report that “Russian aggression” is the reason NATO is deploying 3,000 to 4,000 troops in the Baltic states and Poland. In other words, something that does not exist—Russian aggression toward the Baltics and Poland—is assumed to be a fact that must be countered with military deployments.

The reporters do not question whether this insignificant number of NATO troops constitutes a defense or a provocation. The number of troops would have to be 100 times greater before the force even begins to approach a defensive force. What then is the purpose of the 3,000 or 4,000 NATO troops?

Every informed person knows that there is no need of a defense force against Russia in the Baltics and Poland. Aside from this fact, only an absolute idiot could think that three or four thousand troops constitutes a defense against the Russian Army.



In June 1941 Operation Barbarossa (image right) hit Russia with an invasion of *four million troops*, the majority German component of which were probably the most highly trained and disciplined troops in military history, excepting only the Spartans. By the time that the Americans and British got around to the Normandy invasion, the Russian Army had chewed up the Wehrmacht. There were only a few divisions at 40% strength to resist the Normandy invasion. By the time the Russian Army got to Berlin, the German resistance consisted of armed children.

The Reuters reporters raise no question about President Obama’s statement that 1,000 of this insignificant force will be Americans in order “to enhance our forward presence in central and eastern Europe.” Why does the United States need a “forward presence” in central and eastern Europe? What does a US “forward presence” in central and eastern Europe represent except an insane recklessness? One thousand US troops are good for nothing except a provocation.

Emmott and Siebold report with a straight face without laughter or question unverifiable accusations of Russian aggression by White House Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes, Polish Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski, President Obama, and head of NATO's military committee, Czech General Petr Pavel.

Gen. Pavel "said Russia was attempting to restore its status as a world power, an effort that included using its military."

Obama said it is necessary to "keep sanctions on Moscow in place until it fully complies with the ceasefire agreement in Ukraine."

Waszczykowski said:

"We have to reject any type of wishful thinking with regard to pragmatic cooperation with Russia as long as Russia keeps on invading its neighbors."

Rhodes threatened Russia with a NATO response to Russia's "continued aggression."

These statements are propagandistic. If those who made the statements actually believe them, they are too imbecilic to be trusted with public offices.

Is it possible that the Czech general does not know that Russia has used its military only to repel a Washington-inspired Georgian invasion of South Ossetia and against ISIS in Syria, which the US, UK, and France also claim to be doing? After repelling the Georgian invasion, Russia withdrew its forces. After dealing ISIS a setback in Syria, Russia withdrew and was forced to return by Washington's resupply of ISIS.

Can the Polish Foreign Minister identify the countries that "Russia keeps on invading"?

Does the President of the United States really not know that Russia is not a party to the ceasefire agreement in Ukraine? This is an agreement between the breakaway republics and the government in Kiev. Washington has done everything possible to discourage Kiev from keeping the agreement Kiev signed.

Can National Security Adviser Rhodes tell us where "continued aggression by Russia" is occurring? What countries are being invaded and overrun?

How can there be so much Russian aggression and no evidence of it?



Recently, President Putin dressed down to their faces the Western media whores who are fanning the flames of World War III by repeating without question Washington's propagandistic lies. These lies are reckless. They endanger all life on planet Earth.

During my lifetime, American presidents worked to reduce tensions between the two major nuclear powers. JFK worked with Khrushchev to defuse the dangerous situation arising from the placement of US missiles in Turkey and, in response, the placement of Russian missiles in Cuba.

President Nixon brought forth SALT I, the strategic arms limitation treaty, and the ABM Treaty.

President Carter crafted SALT II.

President Reagan negotiated with Gorbachev the end of the Cold War, the most promising achievement of the 20th century.

The Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama regimes have done everything possible to raise the tensions between nuclear powers to heights beyond those of the most dangerous days of the Cold War.

The evil Clinton regime broke the word of the government of the United States, *thereby destroying the honor of the US government*, by taking NATO to Russia's borders.

The evil George W. Bush regime pulled the US out of the ABM Treaty and rewrote US war doctrine in order to elevate nuclear weapons from a retaliatory weapon to a *first strike weapon*. This insane act put the Russians on notice.

The evil Obama regime intends to place nuclear missiles on Russia's borders in Poland and Romania and engineered a coup in Ukraine with the intent of depriving Russia of its Black Sea naval base in Crimea, Russia's only warm water port.

Faced with a Russophobic Washington-installed government in Ukraine, the Russian population in Crimea, a Russian province since the 1700s, voted practically unanimously to rejoin Russia, where Crimea had resided until Khrushchev reassigned the Russian province to Ukraine in the mid 20th century. The Russian government's acceptance of the wishes of its own people were propagandistically misrepresented by Washington and the prostitutes as "Russian invasion and annexation of Crimea." This lie is where the myth of "Russian invasion" came from. Russian

military forces were already present in Crimea, because when Russia granted independence to Ukraine, Russia retained a long-term lease on the Russian naval base in Crimea. As all international observers testified, the vote was independent of the Russian military presence.

The White House Fool said that the vote in Crimea was meaningless because all of Ukraine did not get to vote. The Fool was too ignorant to know that by this laughable charge he discredited the American Revolution because the British people didn't get to vote. For the precise same reason that The Fool wants Crimea returned to Kiev, the US must be returned to Britain. I doubt that the British would have us. Who wants a war criminal nation drowning in its own hubris?

The world is now faced with the prospect that insouciant Americans will elect a crazed and incompetent criminal or semi-criminal as their president, a person who has declared the President of Russia to be "the new Hitler." The stupid bitch's statement *is a declaration of nuclear war*, and this dangerous, reckless, incompetent, careless person has been selected by the Democratic Party as the next POTUS !!!

The ignorance and stupidity of the American people will destroy the world.

Little wonder that Vladimir Putin, the only responsible world leader other than the president of China, is desperate that the Western media understand that their **irresponsible negligence to the truth is helping Washington drive the world to nuclear war.**

Putin does not want war. He is doing everything in his power to avoid it. But Putin is not going to surrender Russia to Washington. The trip-point of World War III will be the installation of Washington's missiles in Poland and Romania. As Putin recently made clear to the imbecilic Western journalists, these missiles can easily and secretly be changed from anti-ballistic missiles to nuclear attack missiles that can strike their Russian targets within 5 or fewer minutes of launch, thus depriving Russia of its retaliatory deterrent. *Once these missiles are in place, Washington can issue orders to Russia.*

Whatever the evil men and women in Washington who are gambling with the life of the planet think, Russia is not going to accept these missiles.

Where does world leadership reside? In Washington, the war criminal capital of the world that is driving the world to nuclear war, or in Russia whose leadership accepts countless affronts and provocations in an effort to avoid war?