

What Does America Stand to Gain by Surrounding Russia with Missiles? Ukraine and Taiwan: Spark Plugs for WW3?

By [Matthew Ehret-Kump](#)

Global Research, January 09, 2022

[Matthew Ehret's Insights](#) 8 January 2022

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch_crg](#).

In the wake of the December 31 phone call between Presidents Biden and Putin, two very different perceptions of reality were brought into conflict which we can only pray will be resolved in the coming days and weeks of meetings between both sides.

Where one side sees itself committed to supporting Ukraine’s independent right to join NATO in order to help empower the trans Atlantic rules based order, the other side sees an encroaching military encirclement of its vast territory under a military doctrine dubbed “full spectrum dominance”. This latter doctrine, born in the bowels of Brzezinski’s “Flexible Response” doctrine of 1980, assumes that it is possible to deliver a nuclear first strike on Russia (and China) with only minor “acceptable” rates of collateral damage suffered as a consequence.

Former US Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul correctly identified President Putin’s fears of NATO’s ongoing encroachment [in a December 21 tweet](#), but was McFaul correct to dismiss these concerns as the crazy ravings of a paranoid Russian dictator with no bearing in reality? Or is there something to Putin’s fears?

Considering the rapid growth of NATO from 16 to 29 nations in 24 years, and the obsessive drive which post-Maidan Kiev governments have made to enter into the military pact, Putin’s fears shouldn’t be dismissed too quickly.

When you also consider:

- 1) the vast array of military games that have taken place on the Black Sea in recent years,
- 2) the expansion of the anti-ballistic missile shield which weapons experts have proven can be turned into offensive systems with relative ease,
- 3) America’s abrogation of several trust building treaties since 2002,

4) the vast increase of arms sales to Ukraine over the past year, and

5) the promotion of first-use nuclear bombs by leading western officials in the last few weeks of 2021, it is clear that Russia's fears are not unfounded as McFaul or other hawks encircling Biden would have it seem.

Considering McFaul is a renowned "[color revolution expert](#)" who was caught [trying to arrange](#) a failed "white revolution" in Russia in 2011, it must be assumed that his perspective is more than a little polluted.

Even China has felt the burn of full spectrum dominance and western regime change operations in recent years, with a massive armada of military bases, troop buildup, war games and anti-ballistic missiles like THAAD deployed in South Korea where 20 thousand American troops are stationed and ready for battle. These troops are joined by 50 thousand soldiers in Japan, while talks of creating a Pacific NATO (aka: QUAD) has occupied the conversations of military officials in Washington, Japan, India and Australia since 2020.

Ukraine and Taiwan: Spark Plugs for WW3?

As much as Biden, McFaul, Carter or Nuland might scream and shout that "Crimea will always belong to Ukraine", the fact is that a democratic plebiscite did occur in 2014 which resulted in a majority vote to return the peninsula to Russia. Whether you like it or not, that happened.

As much as war hawks might also scream that the island of Taiwan is an independent nation deserving of US military support, according to the United Nations, and Taiwan's own constitution, the island is still legally a part of China. That's just a basic fact of life that no amount of media spin can change.

Should we treat the words of leading NATOcrats like Jens Stoltenberg seriously when [he threatens](#) to move US nukes in Germany closer to Russia's border? Should we dismiss the claims made by former Defense Secretary Ash Carter that the USA [should support a color revolution in Russia](#)? Should we ignore the words of Senator Roger Wicker when he called for a nuclear first strike on Russia [on December 8](#)?

Whether or not American citizens take such words seriously, the fact is that Vladimir Putin and his military advisors certainly do.

USA Should Agree to Putin's Demands

Taking the above facts into consideration, Putin's demands for written agreements on freezing the growth of NATO's eastward expansion should strike any American patriot as eminently reasonable.

After all, who does NATO's growth actually benefit? Does it benefit the Ukrainian people if US missiles are installed in Kiev, which would only see the nation suffer the risk of a Russian retaliatory attack? And who on earth will gain if the world is pushed to nuclear war?

So why not make the oral promises of 1990 between James Baker, Bush Sr. and Gorbachev ([that NATO would not expand one inch eastward](#)) legally binding now once and for all?

If Putin requests that war games halt on Russia's border (which he will reciprocate in turn)

and requests that no short or medium range missiles be placed on Ukrainian soil (which he will reciprocate in turn) while re-empowering the Russia-NATO council, then what harm does this do to the USA's interests? Moscow is, after all, only 300 miles away from Ukraine's border, so this sort of security guarantee is perfectly rational.

Just to put it into perspective, I doubt a single American would feel secure if either Russia or China carried out military war games in the Gulf of Mexico while placing Russian-controlled missiles in Ottawa. And how secure would Americans feel if Moscow's intelligence agencies were openly supporting rabidly anti-American Mexicans who wished to become a part of a Shanghai Cooperation Organization of the Americas?

So rather than risk lighting the world on nuclear fire in a bid for global hegemony, why not simply agree to Putin's red lines, while also toning down the sabre-rattling in the Pacific while we're at it?

Doing these simple things will involve returning to the tried-and-true methods of diplomatic engagement and acting like the UN Charter actually matters in international affairs. It will also involve treating other nations like partners with common interests, instead of assuming that everyone not under our hegemony are enemies vying for dominance in a world of diminishing returns.

It may be a lot to ask the NATOcrats running rampant in Washington, but I guarantee you that the majority of Americans from all sides of the political aisle will be overjoyed to avoid a nuclear holocaust.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

This article was first published in [today's print and online edition of the Washington Times' Cross Talk](#) with Dr. Edward Lozansky.

[Matthew Ehret](#) is the Editor-in-Chief of [the Canadian Patriot Review](#), and Senior Fellow at the American University in Moscow. He is author of the ['Untold History of Canada' book series](#) and [Clash of the Two Americas](#) (which you can purchase by clicking those links or the book covers below). In 2019 he co-founded the Montreal-based [Rising Tide Foundation](#).

He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from OneWorld

The original source of this article is [Matthew Ehret's Insights](#)
Copyright © [Matthew Ehret-Kump](#), [Matthew Ehret's Insights](#), 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Matthew Ehret-Kump](#)

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