

Is Biden Being Blackmailed to Send US Combat Troops to Ukraine?

By Mike Whitney

Global Research, January 15, 2023

Region: Europe, USA

Theme: <u>Intelligence</u>

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.

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.

Billionaire elites are using their power over the media, the political class and public opinion to coerce Joe Biden into sending US troops to Ukraine to prevent a Russian victory. Idiot conservatives think the media is actually doing their job for once by accurately reporting Biden's alleged transgressions. But, the fact is, the media is simply showing that it can switch sides at any time in order to pursue the elitist agenda.

No one should be surprised that Joe Biden's 'classified documents problem' has emerged at the same time a key city in Ukraine (Soledar) has been liberated by Russian troops.

All of the recent reports from the frontlines indicate that the Russian army is steadily seizing more territory in the eastern part of the country while inflicting heavy casualties on the over-matched Ukrainian forces.

In short, the Ukrainian army is being beaten badly forcing US war planners to rethink their approach. What the US needs to do to prevail in its proxy-war with Russia, is to enlist a coalition of nations (US, Poland, Romania, and UK) that are willing to commit combat troops to the conflict with the tacit understanding that NATO will not directly participate in any ground war with Russia.

Biden previously rejected the idea of sending troops to Ukraine acknowledging that it would be tantamount to launching a Third World War.

But as the 'classified documents' scandal gains momentum, the malleable president will likely fall-in-line and do whatever the hawkish foreign policy establishment demands of him.

In short, the documents flap is being used by behind-the-scenes powerbrokers who are blackmailing the president to pursue their own narrow interests. They

have Brandon over-a-barrel.



Most readers will recall that Hunter Biden's laptop contains an abundance of information related to the Biden family's vast influence peddling operation. All of this information was deliberately suppressed in the mainstream media in order to pave the way for Biden's victory in the 2020 presidential election. So why—we wonder—has this new scandal become headline news while the laptop story was completely buried?

And why are the most hawkish neocons in the senate, like Lindsey Graham, calling for a "special counsel" when they made no such effort to reveal the sordid details of the laptop? This is from an article at Zero Hedge:

Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), a senior member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on Wednesday called for Attorney General Merrick Garland to appoint a special counsel to investigate the handling of classified documents by President Biden while he served as vice president...

"I think if you believe a special counsel is necessary to assure the public about the handling of classified documents by Donald Trump, you should apply a special counsel to the mishandling of classified documents by President Biden when he was vice president," Graham said during an interview with Martha MacCallum on Fox News...

"Garland, if you're listening, if you thought it was necessary to appoint a special counsel regarding President Trump, then you need to do the exact same thing regarding President Biden when it comes to handling classified information," Graham said." ("Sen. Graham Demands Special Counsel Probe As Biden Breaks Silence Over Classified Docs", Zero Hedge)

So, now Lindsey Graham is a champion of truth and transparency?

Don't make me laugh.

I assure you, if Biden announced the deployment of US combat troops to Ukraine tomorrow, Graham would withdraw his request for a special counsel immediately. **This is about**

Ukraine, not classified documents or potentially unlawful presidential behavior. And—whatever you think of Biden—he doesn't want to be the president who starts WW3. Unfortunately, the elites who control the media, the politicians and most of the nation's wealth—are determined to widen the conflict which is why the narrative in the media has dramatically changed in the last week. Take a look at this short clip from an article at CNN that—until now—had been promoting the "Ukraine is winning" meme nonstop for the last 11 months.

"The situation is critical. Difficult. We are holding on to the last," said the soldier said.

The soldier is from the 46th air mobile brigade, which is leading Ukraine's fight to hold onto Soledar in the face of a massive assault from Russian troops and Wagner mercenaries.... The soldier said that he believed Ukraine's military leaders would eventually abandon the fight for Soledar and questioned why they hadn't done this yet.

"Everyone understands that the city will be abandoned. Everyone understands this," he said. "I just want to understand what the point [in fighting house to house] is. Why die, if we are going to leave it anyway today or tomorrow?"..."No one will tell you how many dead and wounded there are. Because no one knows for sure. Not a single person," he said. "Not at the headquarters. Not anywhere. Positions are being taken and re-taken constantly. What was our house today, becomes Wagner's the next day."

"In Soledar, no one counts the dead," he added." "The situation is critical. Difficult. We are holding on to the last," said the soldier said." (<u>"Situation in eastern Ukrainian Town is Critical"</u>, CNN)

Can you see the difference in the coverage? No more stories about the 'plucky' Ukrainians beating back the ghoulish Russian Orcs. No. Instead, it's the cold bitter truth: **Ukraine is losing and losing hard.** But how do we explain this sudden 'narrative shift'?

And why has the Washington Post provided a platform for two dyed-in-the-wool warhawks from the George W Bush administration to make an impassioned plea for emergency military support to stave off Russia's winter offensive. Here's former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates making a desperate, last-ditch appeal for immediate assistance to prevent the collapse of the Ukrainian forces in the Donbas:

"When it comes to the war in Ukraine, about the only thing that's certain right now is that the fighting and destruction will continue....although Ukraine's response to the invasion has been heroic and its military has performed brilliantly, the country's economy is in a shambles, millions of its people have fled, its infrastructure is being destroyed, and much of its mineral wealth, industrial capacity and considerable agricultural land are under Russian control.

Ukraine's military capability and economy are now dependent almost entirely on lifelines from the West — primarily, the United States. .. Under current circumstances, any negotiated cease-fire would leave Russian forces in a strong position to resume their invasion whenever they are ready. That is unacceptable.

The only way to avoid such a scenario is for the United States and its allies to urgently provide Ukraine with a dramatic increase in military supplies and capability—sufficient to deter a renewed Russian offensive and to enable Ukraine to push back Russian forces in the east and south....

NATO members also should provide the Ukrainians with longer-range missiles, advanced drones, significant ammunition stocks (including artillery shells), more reconnaissance and surveillance capability, and other equipment. **These capabilities are needed in weeks, not months...**.The way to avoid confrontation with Russia in the future is to help Ukraine push back the invader now." ("Time Is Not On Ukraine's Side", Condoleezza Rice and Robert Gates, WVNews)

Normally, elder members of the political establishment are more restrained in their pronouncements, but not here. **This is pure, unabashed desperation. Rice and Gates declare in no uncertain terms that Ukraine is in dire straits,** their economy and infrastructure is in a shambles, millions have fled the country and most of the nation's natural wealth is under Russian control.

It's a disaster; and it's a disaster that Gates and Rice want to address by pumping more weapons into a failed state that has zero prospects of winning the war. Does that make sense?

As we speak, the Ukrainian frontlines are crumbling just as the illusion that wars are determined by the proficiency of one's propaganda services, is crumbling. What's left is the looming prospect that the Russians are essentially on the verge of prevailing in this war's bloodiest and most consequential conflagration, Bakhmut, the eastern transportation hub that will likely be the turning point in the broader campaign. When Bakhmut falls, the Ukrainians will be forced to retreat to their third and forth lines of defense pushing the war closer and closer towards the Dnieper and then onwards to Kiev. The checkered flag is gradually coming into sight. But don't take my word for it; here it is from the horse's mouth. This is an excerpt from an interview with **General Valery Zaluzhny, who is the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine:**

"Russian mobilisation has worked," says General Zaluzhny.... "The enemy shouldn't be discounted. They are not weak...and they have very great potential in terms of manpower." ... Mobilisation has also allowed Russia to rotate its forces on and off the front lines more frequently, he says, allowing them to rest and recuperate. "In this regard, they have an advantage."

Therefore, everything really depends on the amount of supplies, and this determines the success of the battle in many cases." General Zaluzhny, who is raising a new army corps, reels off a wishlist. "I know that I can beat this enemy," he says. "But I need resources. I need 300 tanks, 600-700 IFVs [infantry fighting vehicles], 500 Howitzers." The incremental arsenal he is seeking is bigger than the total armoured forces of most European armies....

In private, however, Ukrainian and Western officials admit there may be other outcomes. "We can and should take a lot more territory," General Zaluzhny insists. But he obliquely acknowledges the possibility that Russian advances might prove stronger than expected, or Ukrainian ones weaker...

"It seems to me we are on the edge," warns General Zaluzhny... "I have no doubt they will have another go at Kyiv." children start freezing," he says. "What kind of mood will the fighters be in? Without water, light and heat, can we talk about preparing reserves to keep fighting?" ("Volodymyr Zelensky and his generals explain why the war hangs in the balance", The Economist)

Does that sound like a general that is confident in his prospects for success or a military leader who is fatalistically resigned to defeat?

What Zaluzhny is saying is that he needs an entirely new army to even compete with the Russians. ("I need resources. I need 300 tanks, 600-700 IFVs, 500 Howitzers.") And, even if his requests are met, the Ukrainian people will be left "freezing" in the dark "without water, light or heat." This is why—according to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)—8 million Ukrainians have already fled into Europe while another 3 million have escaped to Russia. (Tass)

Washington's war on Russia has transformed the country into an uninhabitable wasteland supported entirely by foreign charity in exchange for a resolute commitment to the globalist agenda. In truth, "I Stand with Ukraine" means 'I support the summary obliteration of a thriving civilization so that Washington can achieve its pernicious ambitions'. That's what it really means.

We're not criticizing Zaluzhny who is just doing his job. We're criticizing the US warhawks and neocons who provoked this war but never anticipated the catastrophe they were creating. They never expected that there'd come a day when Ukraine's highest-ranking Officer would demand an entirely new army in order to beat the Russians.

They never expected that the most comprehensive economic sanctions ever levied on a country would backfire and only hurt our closest allies in Europe. They never expected that those same sanctions would serve to enrich Russia and strengthen its ties with countries that are strategic rivals of the United States.

They never expected that China and India would thumb their noses at US sanctions and take full advantage of Russia's cheap gas and oil to grow their economies leaving Europe to languish in a permanent slump brought on by their irrational attachment to the United States. They never expected any of these things which leads us to conclude that the Ukraine gambit is probably the most poorly-planned foreign policy debacle of all-time leading to the greatest strategic disaster in American history.

For people who have followed events in Ukraine closely, much of what I'm saying will seem obvious. For those who believe the media's reports, well, we think they are going to be very surprised by upcoming events. The outcome of combined-arms ground wars is not decided by the fiction writers at the New York Times. The war in Ukraine is going to end in favor of the side that is the most powerful; that much is certain. Take a look at this brief summary by combat veteran U.S. Lt. Col. Alex Vershinin who worked as a modeling and simulations officer in NATO and U.S. Army concept development and experimentation:

Wars of attrition are won through careful husbandry of one's own resources while destroying the enemy's. Russia entered the war with vast materiel superiority and a greater industrial base to sustain and replace losses. They have carefully preserved their resources, withdrawing every time the tactical

situation turned against them. Ukraine started the war with a smaller resource pool and relied on the Western coalition to sustain its war effort. This dependency pressured Ukraine into a series of tactically successful offensives, which consumed strategic resources that Ukraine will struggle to replace in full, in my view. The real question isn't whether Ukraine can regain all its territory, but whether it can inflict sufficient losses on Russian mobilized reservists to undermine Russia's domestic unity, forcing it to the negotiation table on Ukrainian terms, or will Russian' attrition strategy work to annex an even larger portion of Ukraine." ("What's Ahead in the War in Ukraine", Alex Vershini, Russia Matters)

The question of whether Russia made mistakes in the beginning of their military operation helps to shape our understanding of what is happening now. Think about it. **Putin called up an additional 300,000 reservists in September. That is an admission that he miscalculated how many combat troops he needed to fulfill the mission. But now he has corrected that mistake.** Why else would he call up 300,000 reservists and put the war on hold until they had joined their units and were ready for offensive operations?

The point we're trying to make is simple: Putin has now assembled the army he needs to finish the job through military force. In simple terms, he's ready to roll. In fact, his army is already making significant headway in the east where a key city was liberated on Tuesday. (Soledar) We expect that these regional victories will continue throughout the winter and into the spring. We do not think that the provision of tanks, armored vehicles, javelins, Patriots or other weapons-systems will make a significant difference in the outcome of the war.

The only way Washington can prevent a humiliating defeat in Ukraine is by leading a coalition of countries that are willing to commit combat troops and airpower to fight the Russian army. In other words, we are fast approaching the 'moment of truth' that many had anticipated from the very beginning; a direct clash between the United States and Russia.

This is the war the fanatical neocons want and, this is why, they are using the 'classified documents' to coerce Biden's support. It's blackmail.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons 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>The Unz Review</u>.

Michael Whitney is a renowned geopolitical and social analyst based in Washington State. He initiated his career as an independent citizen-journalist in 2002 with a commitment to honest journalism, social justice and World peace.

He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG).

All images in this article are from TUR

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Mike Whitney

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