

Things Will Get Worse Until the U.S. Stops Lying About Crimea

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, February 08, 2017

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 7 February
2017

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Unless the U.S. government's lies about Crimea — the 'Russia seized Crimea' narratives — become acknowledged to be lies, war between the U.S. and Russia can only continue to become increasingly likely, because the world is sliding toward World War III based upon these lies, and will therefore inevitably continue that slide until these lies are publicly repudiated by the U.S. government, which is their sole source. The liar on this is clearly the U.S. and not Russia: the U.S. is the entire source for the alleged cause for war between the U.S. and Russia.

The preparations for war between the U.S. and Russia continue naturally apace until the United States publicly acknowledges that Russia had not 'seized' Crimea — acknowledges that the cause for all of these war-preparations by the U.S. and its NATO and other allies against Russia is fake, a U.S. lie, and that Russia is purely America's victim in this entire matter and acting in a 100% defensive way against America's aggressions in this matter.

Anyone who is closed-minded to the possibility that the U.S. is lying and that Russia is telling the truth about the relationship between the two countries, would therefore be simply wasting time to read here, because the solid documentation that will be provided here will prove that that's not only a possibility; it is the fact, and those widespread false beliefs will, indeed, be disproven here. Proving that, is the purpose of this article. Therefore, a warning is needed beforehand, for any reader who is closed-minded about that possibility — any such person would be wasting time to read this article. Here it is:

(WARNING: The following article asserts many things that are propagandized almost universally in The West to be false, and in each such instance the documentation of the assertion's being true is provided in a link, so that any reader who doesn't already know its truth can easily come to know that he/she had previously been deceived about that particular matter — the reader can come to know this just by clicking onto the link. This article depends upon its links, which are rooted in the most-reliable evidence on the given topic — far more reliable than any of the 'evidence' that's cited by defenders of The West's position, lies on these matters. The links are provided so that a reader can easily connect to the actual evidence, and decide on one's own, whom the liars are, and are not. It all depends upon the evidence. Any reader who doesn't want to know the evidence, would be just wasting time to read here.)

PRESENTATION OF THE CASE

Obama-Trump economic sanctions against Russia are based upon the lies that are to be

exposed as lies, in the links here. So too are [the NATO movements of U.S. troops and missiles right up to Russia's very borders — ready to invade Russia](#) — based especially upon the lie of 'Russian aggression in Crimea'. All of the thrust for WW III is based upon U.S. President Barack Obama's vicious lie against Russia: his saying that the transfer of Crimea from Ukraine to Russia was not (which it actually was) an example of the U.N.-and-U.S. universally recognized right of self-determination of peoples (such as the U.S. recognizes to apply both in Catalonia and in Scotland, but not in Crimea) but was instead an [alleged 'conquest' of Crimea by Russia](#). (As that link there documents, Obama's allegation that it was 'Putin's conquest' of Crimea is false, and he knew it to be false; he was well informed that the people of Crimea overwhelmingly wanted their land to be restored to Russia, and to be protected by Russia, so as not to be invaded by the Ukrainian government's troops and weapons, after [a bloody U.S. coup](#) by Obama had — less than a month earlier — overthrown the [democratically elected](#) President of Ukraine, [for whom 75% of Crimeans had voted](#). Obama's [own agents](#) were behind that coup; they were doing his bidding. The aggressor here is entirely the U.S., not Russia, despite [Obama's lies](#).)

[All U.S.-government-sponsored and other Western polling of Crimeans, both prior to the 16 March 2014 plebiscite in Crimea, and after it, showed that far more Crimeans wanted Crimea to be again a part of Russia](#) as it had been until the Soviet dictator in 1954 arbitrarily transferred Crimea from Russia to Ukraine. U.S. President Barack Obama was actually insisting that Nikita Khrushchev's diktat on this matter must stand permanently — that the people of Crimea should never be able to choose their own government, but *must become ruled by Obama's coup-installed regime in Ukraine, no matter about [that new government's intense hostility toward those people](#)*. And Obama instituted the economic sanctions against Russia *on this basis* — U.S. as the aggressor, *calling Russia the 'aggressor'*, Obama's *lying basis for 'the new Cold War'*. It's a serious lie — no mere 'fib'.

In other words: the renewal of the Cold War (and an increasingly hot war by the U.S. against Russia's ally Syria, and elsewhere) this time against Russia (no longer against the Soviet Union and its communism and its Warsaw Pact military alliance, none of which even existed after 1991) is based upon Barack Obama's refusal to allow democracy for the people of Crimea. The build-up toward WW III is that simple — a vicious U.S. lie, directed against Russia.

And that's *not the only* instance where the U.S. government blocks democracy in order to conquer Russia by grabbing Russian-allied nations (first Ukraine, and then, increasingly, Syria). [Twice in one day](#), U.N. Secretary General Ban ki-Moon said that Obama's demand that Syria's current President, the Russia-friendly Bashar al-Assad, must be *prevented* from being even on the ballot in Syria's next election for President, is *unacceptable*, and that (as Ban said) «The future of Assad must be determined *by the Syrian people*».

Why is the West allowed to dictate to Crimeans, and to Syrians, that they cannot choose their own government?

This is the new, *anti-democratic*, United States government. This is the reality.

Lawrence J. Korb, who was U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense during 1981-1985, quit the Cold War against Russia when the Soviet Union and its communism and Warsaw Pact all ended in 1991, and he wrote on 26 February 2016, headlining [«Don't Fall for Obama's \\$3 Billion Arms Buildup at Russia's Door»](#). He was on the correct side about this, against the

Obama-initiated thrust toward WW III, but he understated the evilness, by saying:

There is no Russian resurgence. Washington is playing on your Cold War fears to get you to pay for something the U.S. does not need and can't afford. In one of the key justifications for the new \$600 billion defense spending request, the Department of Defense has fallen back on a tried-and-true Cold War boogeyman: the threat of Russian aggression against allies in Europe. While there is no ignoring the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the Russo-Georgian war in 2008, to interpret these events as some kind of Russian 'resurgence' is to grossly inflate the danger Russia poses to NATO and the United States.

Neither in Ukraine nor in Georgia was the U.S. guiltless — to the exact contrary: the U.S. had sparked both of those conflicts on Russia's borders. And Russia is not grabbing territory on America's borders; the U.S. is grabbing territory on Russia's. (Is Russia trying to overturn and replace U.S.-allied governments on America's borders — Mexico and Canada? Of course not. But the U.S. tries to do it to Russia — and then blames Russia for what are actually appropriate responses to such U.S. aggressions.) Korb went on to say:

Though Crimea has been a historic lynchpin of Russian grand strategy for centuries, its open use of military force and political manipulation there in the midst of the Ukrainian Revolution drew an immediate response in the form of sanctions from the West. Russia is paying a massive economic and diplomatic cost for its aggression against Ukraine.

He ignored there that it was no 'Revolution'; it was instead a U.S. coup in Ukraine, which overthrew the democratically elected government there and installed an [illegal](#) one, which was composed of [fascists](#), who went on to do [fascist things](#).

These euphemisms — the lies calling a coup a 'Revolution', and pretending that the breakaway of Crimea from Ukraine wasn't a direct consequence of that bloody and illegal U.S. coup on Russia's border — are what the buildup toward WW III is built upon; and, so, it must end now, or else civilization will.

Furthermore, Korb's implicit assumption there, that post-Soviet (post-Empire) Russia, is no different from the USSR, but all just the same «Russian grand strategy for centuries», is no conclusion that he supports with any evidence, but is instead his purely unsupported assumption, which would severely weaken his case if it were true. It happens to be a false assumption. A person doesn't become influential in governing circles in The West without buying into certain historical and cultural falsehoods; and Korb would not be cited at all here if he had not been such an influential person.

Similarly, his reference there to Russia's 'aggression against Ukraine' is also a falsehood, which fits into the narrative that 'Russia seized Crimea', but repeating such lies is the price of admission into, or retention in, such governing circles. Whether the inclusion of such falsehoods is consciously intended or not, it increases the chances that an article in The West will be published. It's part of the cultural mythology (such as produces almost all wars).

And, similarly, [the rest of America's Establishment trumpet such dangerous lies](#) to the world. That too must stop, but since the U.S. press are mere stenographers for the U.S.

government, the only way that it will stop, is if the U.S. government's lies stop first.

Donald Trump, now as America's new President, continues Obama's lies. He was different back on 1 August 2016 when Politico headlined [«Trump: Taking back Crimea would trigger World War III»](#), and they showed video of him campaigning in Columbus Ohio saying ([at 57:50-59:00 in this video](#)) that as President he would drop the Crimea matter, because «I mean, do you want to go back? Do you want to have World War Three to get it back?»

So, he was elected on the basis of his conveying to voters that as President he would simply end Obama's anti-Russia sanctions and NATO threats, not continue those punishments and invasion-dangers against Russians unless and until the Russian government forces Crimeans to become ruled again by Ukraine's government (now even worse than before — Obama's government). But once ensconced into office, Trump promptly changed his tune, in his actual follow-through, as the now-President: His agent at the U.N., America's U.N. [id at the U.N. on February 2nd](#):

I must condemn the aggressive actions of Russia... The United States stands with the people of Ukraine, who have suffered for nearly three years under Russian occupation and military intervention. Until Russia and the separatists it supports respect Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, this crisis will continue. ... The United States continues to condemn and call for an immediate end to the Russian occupation of Crimea. Crimea is a part of Ukraine. Our Crimea-related sanctions will remain in place until Russia returns control over the peninsula to Ukraine.

In other words: Trump's answer to «Do you want to have World War Three to get it back?» is: Yes. He actually does. (Unless he quickly renounces what she said.)

Trump's commitment there to continue Obama's vicious lies against Russia, instead of acknowledging that they were and are lies (which acknowledgment must be done if WW III is to be avoided), is extraordinarily dangerous. It is a *commitment* to WW III, because Russia is in the right here, and will never knuckle under to America's attempts to coerce Russia to do something shameful, just because the U.S. government demands it.

A matter of fundamental principle is involved here, and the U.S. government is on the evil side of it — even under the new President, who had promised otherwise. That's a fact, just as much as such a statement as that «Genocide is evil» is a statement of fact, not merely an assertion of 'opinion'. The U.S. government is on the evil side of the most important matter imaginable — potentially, WW III. (That's what it will be unless Trump reverses himself yet again, this time with finality, *by publicly acknowledging that Obama's allegations that Russia stole Crimea were lies*. That Obama's whole basis for 'the new Cold War' was actually bogus. That the real aggressor in [the entire matter](#) was America.)

Anyone who seeks further background on the historical roots of this evil, is invited here to see the following three terrific documentaries that present the essential origins of it:

Those three documentaries provide the fundamental, the most crucial, history behind Obama's escalation toward war against Russia. However, one of the essential elements of that historical background is absent from those documentaries, and it's filled in by [this](#)

[article](#), which covers the post-1991 history — the portion of the operation that [Obama was working so hard to culminate](#). (Another aspect that's missing from the three documentaries is the connection to 'terrorism' or jihadism, and that's covered in the links to [this](#) — and especially to [this](#), which latter focuses on the royal Saudis' funding of Al Qaeda.)

The basic excuse for this evil is — as the fake-compassionate (and fake-democratic, and fake anti-invasion) Obama [phrased it](#) — «There's no formula in which this ends up being good for Russia. The annexation of Crimea is a cost, not a benefit, to Russia. The days in which conquest of land somehow was a formula for great nation status is over». He had imposed these costs upon Russia, and then he possessed the nerve there to blame Russia for doing what it needed to do, and was ethically required to do, to respond to Obama's aggression against Russia (by way of Obama's prior [seizure of Ukraine](#)).

If Donald Trump continues Obama's course on this, instead of publicly acknowledges that it was founded upon the lies that Crimea's becoming again a part of Russia constituted 'conquest of land', then we're [still heading toward World War III](#), and doing it on the basis of American lies.

The only way to put a stop to it — other than putting a stop to civilization if not to perhaps all animate life on Earth — is for the U.S. government to acknowledge Obama's lies about Crimea and Russia, as having been Obama's lies. It means separation from the prior Administration, on the most important issue of all; and this will require Trump to say publicly that Obama was lying about Ukraine and Crimea and Russia.

Trump thus faces a [stark choice](#) here. Either he will declare that Obama was lying about these matters, or else there will be war between the U.S. and Russia. It's his choice.

He's no longer just a lying and prevaricating candidate, like he was before. He is now the actual President. If he continues imposing the policy of his predecessor, it will be the end of us all. It's his choice to make; none of his advisors can make it for him.

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2017

[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