

Putin's Enormous Blunder

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, April 03, 2023

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

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

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 [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Putin's biggest-ever blunder has been his failure to have offered to Finland a guarantee of peaceful relations, and of favored-nation status on trade (including on energy-prices of oil and gas, which, prior to the 2022 U.S.-imposed sanctions against Russia, European countries had, for decades, been buying at lower prices from Russia than from any other country, even without any favored-nation status), if Finland will not join NATO.

If Finland's Government would have turned down such an offer, then what excuses could they provide to their voters, for having said no to it? **(And, if the offer had been made privately and then privately rejected, Putin would then have made the offer publicly, and might have been able to get the Finnish public to support it, and then the Finnish Government to support it.)** If Finland would have accepted such an offer, then how much benefit would that provide to the Russian people?

Regarding the latter matter: the main reason why Russia invaded Ukraine on 24 February 2022 was that on 7 January 2022, both the U.S. Government and its NATO anti-Russian military alliance not only rejected Russia's 17 December 2021 proposal for there to be peaceful relations between Russia and The West, but neither the U.S. Government nor NATO were even willing to negotiate with Russia regarding any one of the specific clauses in Russia's thoughtful and lengthy — very serious — proposal.

Central to Russia's concerns in having offered the proposal was the 1962-Cuban-Missile-Crisis-in-Reverse issue that America is threatening Russia that America might place its nuclear missiles in Ukraine only 300 miles (or five minutes of missile-flying-time) away from blitz-nuclear bombing The Kremlin. Five minutes would be far too short a time for Russia to be able to identify the U.S. launch, and then to launch its retaliatory nuclear arsenal against the U.S. and its allied countries. Russia's central command would be beheaded before Russia could have any chance to respond.

Whereas in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, Khrushchev and JFK negotiated, and thus averted World War Three, America and its NATO anti-Russian military alliance, on 7 January 2022,

refused to negotiate at all. Russia then had no alternative remaining, other than to take military action to achieve by military force, assurance that U.S. missiles *won't* be able to be placed a mere five minutes away from Moscow.

Finland is the second-closest anti-Russian country, and is 507 miles away from Moscow, which would be 7 minutes of missile-flying time away. Consequently, America's gaining Finland as a NATO member will be almost as life-threatening to Russia as if America had gained Ukraine into NATO.

Is Russia, then, now left without hope? Not quite. Here is a possible way in which Russia might — just *possibly* — be able to attain some protection (other than MERELY by military means) against what is now unquestionably a U.S. Government that is determined ultimately to conquer Russia:

Russia would now make, to any U.S.-allied country, the type of deal that it inexplicably had failed to offer to Finland. A possibility exists — though perhaps only a slim one — that one or more existing NATO-member countries might say yes to such a deal. **(The offer should be made only privately to each U.S.-allied country; and, then, if any such country privately says no, Russia should then offer the deal publicly to that country. Public opinion in that country might then force that Government — whose prior rejection of the deal would *not* be publicly known — publicly to say yes to it. Thus, there would then be two chances to obtain an agreement, instead of only one, and this would greatly increase the chances of success.)**

Right now, the high fuel prices in Europe are a huge factor in favor of such an agreement being able to be reached. Those high fuel-prices are due to the cut-off (on account of the U.S.-and-allied sanctions against Russia, and the destruction of the Nord Stream pipelines) of Europe's by-far-cheapest fuels-supplier, Russia. Thus, there is a strong incentive for each and every existing NATO-member country to negotiate with Russia about this matter. It would be a clear win-win deal for both sides. Obviously, the U.S. Government, and its NATO, would be strongly opposed to allowing any NATO-member country to say yes, but would they be able to prevent it from happening? Who knows?

What is irrefutable is that Putin shouldn't have waited this long to start thinking about this. Better late than never, but will he ever? He has publicly stated that he favors win-win arrangements. So, here's his chance to propose it. Why not *try* (first, privately; then — if necessary — publicly)? Why hasn't he tried? There might still be a chance to get this done.

*

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 [The Duran](#).

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse's new book, [AMERICA'S EMPIRE OF EVIL: Hitler's Posthumous Victory, and Why the Social Sciences Need to Change](#), is about how America took over the world after World War II in order to enslave it to U.S.-and-allied billionaires. Their cartels extract the world's wealth by control of not only their 'news' media but the social 'sciences' — duping the public. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image: Letters of application to NATO from Finland and Sweden, presented to Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg on May 18. (NATO)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

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