

# Provoking the Russian Bear: NATO Is “Cannon Fodder” for the American Empire

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

Global Research, June 06, 2016

[Silent Crow News](#) 5 June 2016

Region: [Europe](#), [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Military and WMD](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

*BALTOPS 16 is a military exercise now taking place between June 3 and June 18 in the Baltic Sea region which is in close proximity to Russia. The U.S. Naval Institute ([www.usni.org](http://www.usni.org)) released an article titled ‘Analysis: Larger NATO Baltic Sea Exercise Sends Important Message to Russia’ stated what BALTOPS 16 will consist of:*

Over the next three weeks BALTOPS 16 will draw together some 6,000 personnel, 45 warships, and 60 aircraft from 17 nations, including the United States, Germany, the U.K., the Netherlands, along with the littoral states of the Baltic States who are NATO members (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Denmark) or NATO partners (Sweden and Finland)

To make matters worse, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a military and intelligence organization mostly funded by the US government and the rest by the EU (technically paid for by taxpayers within the U.S. and the E.U.) is moving forward by placing missile defense systems in Romania, a reckless move that threatens Russia’s security. According to a recent CNN report *“The United States launched a ground-based missile defense system earlier this month in Romania. The system is meant to defend Europe against rogue states like Iran and not intended to target Moscow’s missiles, Washington has said.”* Iran is a threat to Europe? In 2014, Putin was asked about NATO’s American-made missile defense system placed in Europe to counter the Iranian threat: Here is the classic reaction from Putin:

This time, Washington’s willingness to use Romania to place its missile defense shield supposedly against Iran’s nuclear threat is not a laughing matter to the Russian government. Putin warned European countries they are now in the “crosshairs” meaning European nations will be in the middle of a possible future conflict between Russia and the US-NATO alliance. Reuters reported Putin’s reaction in a news conference that took place in Athens, Greece with Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras. Putin said *“If yesterday in those areas of Romania people simply did not know what it means to be in the cross-hairs, then today we will be forced to carry out certain measures to ensure our security.”* Putin did not leave out Poland’s participation regarding the deployment a missile defense system when he said *“It will be the same case with Poland.”* Polish Minister of Defense Antoni Macierewicz recently announced that NATO will place four battalions in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to counter the Russian threat. Poland is also recruiting 35,000 new recruits for a paramilitary force to counter any Russian incursion on its territory.

✖ Washington’s European vassal states are on the road to social, political and economic

destruction. The European Union's (EU) sanctions on Russia is one example on how farmers, working class people and various businesses are experiencing financial difficulties and even bankruptcy due to US-NATO's reckless policies against Russia.

Washington's move to place a new ground-based missile defense system in Romania with Poland's recruitment drive and the BALTOPS 16 exercise will surely raise tensions with Russia which are at an all time high since the Cold War. Russia views this move as a threat to its security with NATO's encirclement of Russia is as reckless and as dangerous as you can get in terms of escalating the possibility of a disastrous war.

The RAND Corporation Admits NATO Cannot Defeat Russian Forces



Russia is more than prepared to fight a war against NATO which would not last more than three days at best according to the Rand Corporation, a think tank based in Santa Monica, California. The Rand corporation employed well-known players in the political arena including war criminal Henry Kissinger as an advisor and George W. Bush-era Neocons such as Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (former Chairman of the board 1981-1986 and again in 1995-1996) and former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice who was a former intern and trustee. The RAND corporation report admitted that a NATO war against Russia would last between 36 and 60 hours although I personally think that NATO would not last more than 24 hours if an attack took place against the Russian Federation:

In a series of war games conducted between summer 2014 and spring 2015, the RAND Corporation examined the shape and probable outcome of a near-term Russian invasion of the Baltic states. The games' findings are unambiguous: As currently postured, NATO cannot successfully defend the territory of its most exposed members. Across multiple games using a wide range of expert participants in and out of uniform playing both sides, the longest it has taken Russian forces to reach the outskirts of the Estonian and/or Latvian capitals of Tallinn and Riga, respectively, is 60 hours

If NATO were that foolish to start a war against Russia, European countries across Western Europe would be open to Russian missile strikes crippling Europe's already fragile social and economic fabric. An attack on Russia would be the end of NATO, literally. Russia has capabilities that are far more advanced than what the U.S. and NATO forces have in their arsenal as independent geopolitical analyst and writer Pepe Escobar explains:

If push comes to nuclear shove, the S-400 and especially the S-500 anti-missile missiles would block all incoming US ICBMs, cruise missiles and stealth aircraft. Offensive drones would be blocked by drone defenses. The S-500 practically consigns to the dustbin stealth warplanes such as the F-22, F-35 and the B-2.

The bottom line is that Russia – in terms of hypersonic missile development – is about four generations ahead of the US, if we measure it by the development of the S-300, S-400 and S-500 systems. As a working hypothesis, we could describe the next system – already in the drawing boards – as the S-600. It would take the US military at least ten years to develop and roll out a new weapons system, which in military terms represents a generation. Every Pentagon planner worth his pension plan should know that

NATO is responsible for creating disasters in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Ukraine and the former Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia was the start of NATO's belligerence in the name of "*humanitarian interventions*" during what was known as the Kosovo War. NATO claimed that the Albanian population in Kosovo was persecuted by Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) which was the state of the union between two republics (Serbia and Montenegro) of the former Yugoslavia which broke up in 1991. NATO sought authorization from the United Nations Security Council to proceed with military action but Russia and China opposed and threatened to veto the move. NATO went on to launch military strikes with Washington's approval against the FRY without UN authorization and called it a "*humanitarian intervention*." The FRY rightly called it an illegal war of aggression that resulted in more than 12,000 civilian deaths where the majority of victims were Albanians followed by Serbs, Roma and other ethnic groups. After the war in Yugoslavia, NATO began to see itself as a global military force and expanded beyond Europe (with Washington's permission of course) into Central Asia, East and North Africa, the Middle East and even as far as the Indian Ocean.

The purpose for NATO is to carry out the American Empire's dirty work which serves Washington's strategy for dominating Eurasia. You can also call NATO "America's Cannon Fodder in waiting" since they are at the frontline against Russia waiting to commit suicide.

#### Europe's Refugee Crises and NATO's Interventions in the Middle East and North Africa

The Pentagon utilizes NATO against its perceived enemies which have contributed to numerous geopolitical disasters including the most recent "*humanitarian intervention*" of Libya. The stupidity of NATO's interventionist policies in Libya and now Syria resulted in a refugee crisis into the European Union with Libyans and Syrians leading the way. The refugee crisis is steering tensions among EU citizens who are angry at the refugees, but not at NATO "*humanitarian interventions*" in North Africa and the Middle East. One of the most absurd statements on the EU's refugee crisis was by NATO's Supreme Allied Commander General Philip Breedlove which was reported by the *Financial Times* on March 1st, 2016:

Asked at a Senate hearing whether Russia was aggravating the Syrian refugee crisis in order to divide countries in the EU, he replied: "I can't find any other reason for them [air strikes against civilians] other than to cause refugees to be on the move and make them someone else's problem." He added: "I use the term weaponisation of immigration"

Russia is now accused of "*Weaponising*" immigrants by General Breedlove is absurd. Let's take a closer look why immigrants are coming from the Middle East and North Africa in the first place. The majority of immigrants are coming from Syria and then there is Afghanistan, Kosovo, Libya, Albania, Mali and Somalia which experienced some form of US-NATO led "*humanitarian interventions*". Then Eritrea and Nigeria were also nations contributing refugees to the European Union. The US government is responsible for creating the refugee crisis into Europe, not Russia. Let's not forget what General Wesley Clark admitted to in 2007 in an interview with Amy Goodman of *Democracy Now* when he was told by someone in the Pentagon that "*We're going to take out seven countries in 5 years, starting with Iraq, and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and, finishing off, Iran.*"

The U.S. and its allies including Israel, Turkey and Saudi Arabia and other Gulf puppet states were all involved in creating the civil war in Syria in 2011 through a proxy opposition group

to oust President Bashar al-Assad. The “protests” were orchestrated by a covert operation led by US-NATO-Israeli intelligence agencies to create chaos in order to fault the Syrian government through propaganda. Washington and Israel want to destabilize Syria as a Nation State and break-up Syria into several small nation-states easier for the governments of the U.S. and Israel to control. Israel’s interest in destabilizing Syria goes back decades, perhaps as far back when the State of Israel was declared a new independent state in 1948. However, in September 24, 2010 *Wikileaks* published an email sent to U.S. Presidential hopeful Hillary Clinton from Alec Ross, a Senior Advisor for Innovation to Clinton when she was Secretary of State titled ‘1st known case of a successful social media campaign in Syria’, Ross wrote “When Jared and I went to Syria, it was because we knew that Syrian society was growing increasingly young (population will double in 17 years) and digital and that this was going to create disruptions in society that we could potential harness for our purposes.” It is evident that Washington had its designs on Syria before the 2011 protests occurred. Professor Michel Chossudovsky, Director and founder of Global Research published an article asking the question of who was actually behind the protests. The article titled ‘Five Years Ago: The US-NATO-Israel Sponsored Al Qaeda Insurgency in Syria. Who Was Behind The 2011 “Protest Movement”?’ Stated the following facts on who was actually involved in the process:

From Day One, the Islamist “freedom fighters” were supported, trained and equipped by NATO and Turkey’s High Command. According to Israeli intelligence sources (Debka, August 14, 2011):

NATO headquarters in Brussels and the Turkish high command are meanwhile drawing up plans for their first military step in Syria, which is to arm the rebels with weapons for combating the tanks and helicopters spearheading the Assad regime’s crackdown on dissent. ... NATO strategists are thinking more in terms of pouring large quantities of anti-tank and anti-air rockets, mortars and heavy machine guns into the protest centers for beating back the government armored forces. (DEBKAfile, NATO to give rebels anti-tank weapons, August 14, 2011)

This initiative, which was also supported by Saudi Arabia and Qatar, involved a process of organized recruitment of thousands of jihadist “freedom fighters”, reminiscent of the enlistment of Mujahideen to wage the CIA’s jihad (holy war) in the heyday of the Soviet-Afghan war:

Also discussed in Brussels and Ankara, our sources report, is a campaign to enlist thousands of Muslim volunteers in Middle East countries and the Muslim world to fight alongside the Syrian rebels. The Turkish army would house these volunteers, train them and secure their passage into Syria. (Ibid, emphasis added) These mercenaries were subsequently integrated into US and allied sponsored terrorist organizations including Al Nusra and ISIS. The Daraa “protest movement” on March 17-18 had all the appearances of a staged event involving covert support to Islamic terrorists by Mossad and/or Western intelligence

US-NATO’s “humanitarian intervention” in Libya was also part of Washington’s strategic goal. Removing President Muammar Gaddafi from power was to control Libya’s natural resources and for the Western powers to remain in the African Continent as a dominant force politically and economically. The West also wanted Africa to use its currencies instead of Gaddafi’s plan for the gold dinar. The West preferred their corporations and their special interest groups to exploit Libya’s natural resources and its gold reserves. Refugees are also coming from Kosovo (Is this where a statue of U.S. President of Bill Clinton is located?); Mali,

Albania and several other countries where some sort of US-NATO involvement took place, but Washington and the main-stream media insist that Russia is to blame.

All of the countries just mentioned contributed to Europe's refugee crisis leads us to conclude that it was the US government and its NATO patsies who intervened in one way or another that caused the crisis. Who believes General Breedlove's nonsense? What is insane is that NATO's interventions in the Middle East and North Africa affects Europe's borders due to the EU's new immigration policies which eventually puts a strain on the economy. The European taxpayers eventually end up paying for the housing, food and other benefits for the refugees.

US-NATO actions are the cause and effect due to its "*humanitarian interventions.*" Wars breed death and destruction. Wars also breed mass migrations of families who flee their war torn countries in search of safety and new economic opportunities to survive. NATO is truly sowing the seeds of destruction for Europe and the rest of the world. When will the European citizenry stop NATO's irresponsible foreign interventions that are not only destroying Nation-states in various regions in the world, but their own territories as well? Maybe they should blame European politicians in Brussels that allowed this crisis to happen in the first place? Would that change anything? I doubt it; besides, NATO is just a gaggle of vassal states that are mainly controlled by American politicians, Wall Street, corporations and special interests groups located across the Atlantic Ocean.

Can NATO's War against Russia be its Last War?

Russia will not attack NATO forces on its borders nor will they allow an attack on its territory by NATO forces even if it means launching its nuclear weapons to protect itself. An article published by Dmitry Orlov, editor and founder of [www.cluborlov.blogspot.org](http://www.cluborlov.blogspot.org) with a collaboration of Russian scholars, authors and bloggers including Evgenia Gurevich, Ph.D.(<http://thesaker.ru>), Scientist Victor Katsap, PhD, Sr. (NuFlare Technology America, Inc), Andrei Kozhev, Serge Lubomudrov and the The Saker (A. Raevsky) titled 'A Russian Warning' starts with an introduction of their concerns regarding war against Russia and China by the US-NATO alliance:

*We, the undersigned, are Russians living and working in the USA. We have been watching with increasing anxiety as the current US and NATO policies have set us on an extremely dangerous collision course with the Russian Federation, as well as with China*

The article clearly states what the consequences of such a devastating war would be:

The US leadership has done everything it could to push the situation to the brink of disaster. First, its anti-Russian policies have convinced the Russian leadership that making concessions or negotiating with the West is futile. It has become apparent that the West will always support any individual, movement or government that is anti-Russian, be it tax-cheating Russian oligarchs, convicted Ukrainian war criminals, Saudi-supported Wahhabi terrorists in Chechnya or cathedral-desecrating punks in Moscow. Now that NATO, in violation of its previous promises, has expanded right up to the Russian border, with US forces deployed in the Baltic states, within artillery range of St. Petersburg, Russia's second-largest city, the Russians have nowhere left to retreat. They will not attack; nor will they back down or surrender. The Russian leadership enjoys over 80% of popular support; the remaining 20% seems to feel that it is being too soft in opposing Western encroachment. But Russia will retaliate, and a provocation or a simple mistake could trigger a sequence of



events that will end with millions of Americans dead and the US in ruins.

Unlike many Americans, who see war as an exciting, victorious foreign adventure, the Russians hate and fear war. But they are also ready for it, and they have been preparing for war for several years now. Their preparations have been most effective. Unlike the US, which squanders untold billions on dubious overpriced arms programs such as the F-35 joint task fighter, the Russians are extremely stingy with their defense rubles, getting as much as 10 times the bang for the buck compared to the bloated US defense industry. While it is true that the Russian economy has suffered from low energy prices, it is far from being in shambles, and a return to growth is expected as early as next year. Senator John McCain once called Russia "A gas station masquerading as a country." Well, he lied. Yes, Russia is the world's largest oil producer and second-largest oil exporter, but it is also world's largest exporter of grain and nuclear power technology. It is as advanced and sophisticated a society as the United States. Russia's armed forces, both conventional and nuclear, are now ready to fight, and they are more than a match for the US and NATO, especially if a war erupts anywhere near the Russian border

I agree with their assessment because the U.S. military would lose another war (they have lost several wars throughout their entire history). Not only because their war record signifies their losing streak, the U.S. does not have the strength, the advanced technology they claim they have (as in the case of the failed Air Force F-35 program which was flawed and cost more than a trillion dollars to produce), the moral authority or on the "*Right Side*" of history to start a war against Russia and China.

For Now, Washington (a bully in its own right) will continue to target smaller, weaker nations with their terrorists who they fund, train and manage in the Middle East and Africa. They will continue to destabilize governments through "regime change" in Latin America as they recently did in Brazil and are in the process of targeting Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia through their Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) or controlled "opposition groups" allied with Washington and Wall Street. The American Empire will continue to rape and pillage the planet's resources; after all, the American Empire follows the typical patterns of past empires who committed similar crimes against humanity.

As for NATO forces on Russia's borders, they would be destroyed in less than three days if they were foolish enough to follow Washington's orders, then again Vassal states have no say in their own foreign or domestic affairs in the first place. NATO is a willing participant waiting for its annihilation as they sacrifice their lives and their nations in a war against Russia not for Europe, but for the American Empire.

The original source of this article is [Silent Crow News](#)

Copyright © [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#), [Silent Crow News](#), 2016

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

## About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)