

NATO's Proxy War on Russia Through Ukraine Appears to be Winding Down

By Andrew Korybko

Global Research, November 22, 2023

Region: Europe, Russia and FSU

Theme: Intelligence, US NATO War Agenda

In-depth Report: **UKRAINE REPORT**

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), click here.

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on <u>Instagram</u> and <u>Twitter</u> and subscribe to our <u>Telegram Channel</u>. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Considering all the disadvantageous dynamics that are rapidly converging nowadays, there's little doubt that NATO's proxy war on Russia is winding down, though that doesn't automatically mean that the conflict will soon freeze.

The failure of Ukraine's counteroffensive, Russia's victory over NATO in the "race of logistics", the West's prioritization of aid to Israel amidst its war with Hamas, US congressional dysfunction, and the upcoming election season have combined to create a crisis for NATO's proxy war on Russia through Ukraine. These analyses from late August onward will bring everyone up to speed about what's happening if they haven't been closely following this New Cold War conflict in recent months:

- 18 August: "A Vicious Blame Game Is Breaking Out After The Counteroffensive Predictably Failed"
- 20 August: "<u>US Policymakers Are Caught In A Dilemma Of Their Own Making</u> After The Failed Counteroffensive"
- 25 August: "The NYT & WSJ's Critical Articles About Kiev's Counteroffensive Explain Why It Failed"
- 3 September: "<u>Top Canadian Media Revealed That Poor Medical Equipment</u> Endangers One Million Ukrainian Troops"
- 7 September: "Poland's Top Military Official Accidentally Discredited NATO On Several Counts"
- 9 September: "WaPo Reported That Ukrainians Are Distrustful Of The West & Flirting With A Ceasefire"
- 14 September: "Why Was Zelensky Overly Defensive In His Latest Interview With The Economist?"
- 14 September: "The New York Times Confirmed That Russia Is Far Ahead Of NATO In The Race Of Logistics"
- 31 October: "Time Magazine Shared Some 'Politically Inconvenient' Truths About

Ukraine"

- 3 November: "<u>Ukraine's Commander-In-Chief Made A Last-Ditch Appeal For American Aid"</u>
- 5 November: "The New York Times Wants Everyone To Know About The Growing Zelensky-Zaluzhny Rivalry"
- 8 November: "The Latest Reports Suggest That Secret Talks Are Taking Place
 Between The US & Russia"
- 14 November: "The Western Public Should Heed The Former NATO Supreme Commander's Words About Ukraine"
- 19 November: "Zelensky Is Desperate To Preemptively Discredit Potentially Forthcoming Protests Against Him"

And here's a spree of reports from over the past few days showing how much everything has changed:

- 16 November: "End 'magical thinking' about defeating Russia US experts"
- 16 November: "US Abrams tanks made no difference Zelensky"
- 17 November: "Zelensky fears a new 'Maidan' Bloomberg"
- 17 November: "Biden signs funding bill that excludes Ukraine"
- 18 November: "Bidens welcomed the Russians deputy PM"
- 18 November: "Zelensky's top aide criticizes slow delivery of Western arms"
- 19 November: "Ukraine must brace for loss of US support ex-ambassador"
- 19 November: "Bloomberg outlines how Russia has shrugged off sanctions"
- 19 November: "Top Zelensky aide questions Ukraine's 'survival'"
- 20 November: "Time running short for US military aid to Ukraine NBC"
- 20 November: "Zelensky demands 'rapid changes'"
- 20 November: "Ukraine 'utterly dependent' on US aid Treasury secretary"
- 20 November: "STAY OUT: Zelensky warns Ukraine generals that getting involved in politics puts country's unity at risk"
- 20 November: "Ukraine 'concerned' by Western push for Russia talks security chief"
- 21 November: "No 'silver bullet' for Ukraine Washington"
- 21 November: "Ukraine in 'big trouble' ABC News"

That spree of reports adds credence to the assessment that this proxy war appears to be winding down.

The top takeaways are that:

- 1) Western financial and military aid is indeed evaporating;
- 2) Ukraine is now freaking out and fearmongering about the future;
- 3) political rivalries in that country are intensifying;
- 4) the West is indeed pressuring Ukraine to enter into peace talks with Russia aimed at freezing the conflict; and
- 5) organic grassroots protests might break out across Ukraine sometime soon. This isn't how everything was supposed to be, however, since Kiev promised an altogether different future.

It seems like so long ago, but just six months back the West was hyping everyone up about what to expect from Kiev's then-upcoming counteroffensive, which was supposed to be a Clausewitzian masterstroke that would showcase the West's military superiority. Instead of Russian being chased back into its pre-2014 borders, however, the New York Times admitted in late September that "Russia now controls nearly 200 square miles more territory in Ukraine compared with the start of the year."

Quite clearly, that one country on its own was able to withstand the proxy war onslaught of the "more than 50 nations" that Biden recently boasted had joined the US in arming Ukraine. Even against those odds, it was ultimately Russia – and not Ukraine – that successfully launched its own counteroffensive by expanding the area under its control by 200 square miles. Western stockpiles have been depleted and what's left is earmarked for Israel, however, so that metric might multiply by early next year.

If the front ends up collapsing in the opposite direction than the West expected would happen just half a year ago, then this New Cold War bloc might feel pressured to launch a conventional on-the-ground intervention to safeguard some of the gains that its people paid over \$160 billion to secure. In that scenario, the risk of World War III breaking out by miscalculation would spike, which no responsible policymaker wants to have happen. After all, for as <u>radical</u> as the Western elite is, it's not suicidal.

Russia is also aware of what's at stake if it manages to achieve a breakthrough across the coming months should the front collapse as a result of Ukraine's multidimensional troubles, which is why it appears to still be committed to President Putin's <u>strong signals</u> from this summer about negotiating peace. So long as Zelensky refuses to comply with his Western patrons' demands in this respect, however, the abovementioned scenario will remain credible and could materialize sooner than later.

Therein lies the significance of his growing rivalry with Commander-in-Chief Zaluzhny. Ukraine's top military official could either orchestrate a military coup with the West's approval – irrespective of whether it follows the outbreak of organic grassroots protests – or be deposed by Zelensky with their approval as a reward for recommencing meaningful peace talks with Russia in some capacity. However it unfolds, Zaluzhny is expected to play a major role in the coming months, whether as a "hero" or "villain".

Considering all the disadvantageous dynamics that are rapidly converging nowadays, there's little doubt that NATO's proxy war on Russia is winding down, though that doesn't automatically mean that the conflict will soon freeze. It'll likely continue even if only at a low scale as peace talks, including potentially secret ones, take place (unless the omnipotent threat of a black swan materializes). For all intents and purposes, however, this proxy war will probably be fought at a different tempo from now on.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on <u>Andrew Korybko's Newsletter</u>.

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the

relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from The Daily Stormer

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © Andrew Korybko, Global Research, 2023

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Andrew Korybko

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca