


## Russian Bear or Russian Mouse?

by Paul Craig Roberts via cyd - OpEd News *Monday, Sep 19 2016, 10:01pm*

international / prose / post

### Will Russia Surrender?

The Russian government's sincere and diligent effort to prevent chaos in Syria and additional massive refugee flow into Europe, all the while avoiding conflict with Washington and its vassals, has been brought to an end by Washington's intentional attack on a known Syrian army position, thus wrecking the cease-fire agreement that Russia sacrificed so much to achieve.



***Hesitant and overly cautious Putin may become known as the RUIN of Russia***

The response to this fact by the Obama regime's ambassador to the UN, Samantha Power, reveals that Washington will lie to the hilt in order to achieve its agenda of reducing Syria to the same chaos as Washington has reduced Iraq and Libya. Washington, and Washington alone, is responsible for the war in Syria. When the British Parliament and the Russian government blocked Obama's intended US invasion of Syria, the Obama regime armed and financed jihadist mercenaries to invade Syria, pretending that the jihadists were Syrian rebels fighting for democracy in Syria. Samantha Power turned history upside down and [blames the war on Russia's intervention](#) at the request of the Syrian government against the ISIL jihadists that Washington sent to destabilize Syria. What Samantha means is that if Russia had not come to the aid of Syria, Washington and ISIL would already have destroyed Syria, and there would be no war.

Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, Russia's ambassador to the UN, said that in his 40 years of diplomacy he had never seen such a [high-handed and demagogic performance](#) as Samantha's. Churkin seemed to imply that such an unrealistic and twisted response to known facts as Samantha delivered leaves him without hope of any successful diplomatic outcome.

If the Russian government has finally arrived at the conclusion that Washington is determined to destroy political stability in Syria and to replace it with chaos, it has taken a long time.

The Russian government has studiously avoided this conclusion, because once diplomacy is acknowledged as useless, force confronts force. In today's context that means thermo-nuclear war and the end of life on Earth.

This is the reason that the Russian government has replied diplomatically to Washington's coercive provocations, offering Washington cooperation in place of conflict.

However, Washington wants conflict. The Russians have pretended that Washington has a common interest with Russia in combating terrorism, but terrorism is Washington's tool for destabilizing Syria, then Iran, and then the Muslim provinces of the Russian Federation and China.

Washington wants hegemony not cooperation. Now that Samantha Power has made this so clear that the Russian government can no longer pretend otherwise, what will Russia (and China) do?

If Russia and China are not ready for the war that Washington is bringing to them, will they retreat in the face of the aggression, sacrificing Syria, the break-away Russian provinces from Ukraine, and the various disputed island issues in the Pacific Ocean while they gather their strength? Or will they decide to break-up the NATO alliance by making the cost of conflict very clear to Washington's European vassals? Clearly, Europe has nothing to gain from Washington's aggression against Russia and China.

Or is Russia unable to do anything now that diplomacy is a proven dead-end?

Perhaps this is the over-riding question. As far as someone who is not a member of the Russian government can tell, Russia is not completely in control of its destiny. Elements in the Russian government known as "Atlanticist Integrationists" believe that it is more important for Russia to be part of the West and to be integrated into the Western system than to be a sovereign country. They argue that if formerly great powers, such as Great Britain, Germany, and France, can profit from being American vassals, so can Russia.

Atlanticist Integrationists claim that Russia's strategic nuclear capability and land mass means that Russia can maintain some sovereignty and only partially submit as a vassal. One problem with this position is that it assumes the neoconservatives are content with less than complete hegemony and would not capitalize on Russia's weakened position to achieve full hegemony.

The Russian government probably still has hopes that at least some European governments will recognize their responsibility to avoid war and exit NATO, thus removing political cover for Washington's aggression. Possibly there is some such hope, but the main European political figures are bought-and-paid-for by Washington. As a high US government official told me as long ago as the 1970s, "we own them; they belong to us."

Not much hope can be found in the European media. Udo Ulfkotte, a former editor of Germany's Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, published a book in which he said that [every significant European journalist was on the CIA's payroll](#).

With politicians and media bought off, where can European leadership come from?

Europeans have become accustomed to their role as hired vassals. As no European politician or newspaper editor can assume that an act of rebellion would succeed, they are more likely to enjoy their life enriched by American gratuities than to take a risk for humanity.

The wider question is whether the extant socio-politico-economic systems can act on behalf of humanity. It is not clear that capitalist civilizations are capable of being humane, because worth is based on money, which makes greed and power the overpowering factors. It is possible that human evil and incompetence have destroyed not only the planet's environment but also humane social systems. Globalism is not a scheme for cooperation. It is Washington's scheme for American domination.

Copyright applies.

*[Nevertheless Mr Roberts, a sad fact remains and that is that corporate controlled war hawks (neocons) have been advised by the best marketers and PR 'crowd controllers' in the world that Russia and China would step down in the face of a nuclear holocaust. It is this belief -- which flies in the face of sanity -- that propels Washington to dangerously provoke Russia and China, as it is clear that the Sino-Russian alliance is easily capable of reducing continental America and western Europe to ashes in minutes, notwithstanding that the alliance would suffer unimaginable harm. However, if a 'victory' were to be assigned it would go to the Russian-Chinese as the huge geographic expanses and sheer population numbers would ensure their survival, compare to the highly concentrated populations of the USA and western Europe, which would be vaporised. And so if reason does not prevail, which it will not, then a pre-emptive strike must be seriously considered as indeed Washington is planning such an insane act itself. Put simply, Russia and China have no choice, though little consolation could be taken from such a 'victory.'*

*When it becomes crystal clear that an opponent is hell-bent on domination via war then it is better to strike first and the sooner the better -- freedom or death are now the only choices as slavery is untenable.*

*If the world were aware of the REALITY of the current situation it would rein in the criminal psychopaths that have hijacked their peace, well-being, freedom and prosperity. However, western populations are already profoundly enslaved, socially and psychologically, and I would think it futile to appeal to such a useless, ignorant mass. So war it is, unfortunately.]*

<http://tinyurl.com/hfuyh2p>

---

Jungle Drum Prose/Poetry. <http://jungledrum.lingama.net/news/story-2361.html>