

Destabilizing Russia, A Nuclear Power: Is the U.S. Trying to Implement “Regime Change” in Russia?

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, August 30, 2014

[Washington's Blog](#)

America Has Undertaken Regime Change In Many Countries Before

In 1957, the U.S. and British governments [planned regime change in Syria](#) ... because it was drifting too close to the Soviet Union.

20 years ago, influential U.S. government officials decided to effect regime change [throughout the Middle East and North Africa](#). The countries targeted were “[old Soviet regimes](#)”.

The U.S. has, of course, already carried out regime change in [Guatemala](#), [Iran](#), [Iraq](#), [Afghanistan](#), [Libya](#), [Chile](#), [Haiti](#) and [many other countries](#). The U.S. was also instrumental in the recent regime change in [Ukraine](#).

Soviet leader Gorbachev allowed the Soviet Union broken up only after the U.S. and NATO [promised they would not encircle Russia militarily](#). Ever since 1991, they have broken their promise and [encircled Russia](#).

Is the U.S. Now Trying to Implement Regime Change In *Russia*?

New Republic [writes](#):

There are now voices in Moscow saying that these sanctions are an attempt to force regime change in Russia.

Richard Becker – of the American anti-war group Answer Coalition – [says](#):

Their (US and NATO) clear aim is to surround Russia, to weaken Russia in the long run [and] to bring about **regime change** in Russia...

DNA India [argues](#):

Washington’s obvious plan is to get troublesome Putin out of the way. The expectation is that once Russians feel the crunch they will turn against the president.

Regime change has become the latest buzzword against rulers the West dislikes. It was Iraq’s Saddam Hussain at one time, Libya’s Muammar Gaddafi

at another time and now it is Russia's Putin. The Russian leader may not be an easy prey.

Former Indian ambassador M.K.Bhadrakumar [theorizes](#) that it is Russia's sheltering of Edward Snowden which is the motivation for the U.S. push for regime change in Russia:

The US is undoubtedly in a punishing mood. What accounts for it? Can't be Syria. Can't be Iran, Iraq or Afghanistan. Can't be the Arctic, can't be BRICS.

Yes, it has to be the unprecedented **humiliation and damage caused to the US' global standing and foreign and security policies by the Edward Snowden affair, which Washington believes was masterminded from the Kremlin.** It's payback time for the CIA.

Former Associated Press and Newsweek reporter Robert Parry [wrote](#) in April:

Now that the demonization of Russia's President Vladimir Putin is in full swing, one has to wonder when the neocons will unveil their plan for "regime change" in Moscow, despite the risks that overthrowing Putin and turning Russia into a super-sized version of Ukraine might entail for the survival of the planet.

There is a "little-old-lady-who-swallowed-the-fly" quality to neocon thinking. When one of their schemes goes bad, they simply move to a bigger, more dangerous scheme.



If the Palestinians and Lebanon's Hezbollah persist in annoying you and troubling Israel, you target their sponsors with "regime change" - in Iraq, Syria and Iran. If your "regime change" in Iraq goes badly, you escalate the subversion of Syria and the bankrupting of Iran. [See Consortiumnews.com's "[The Mysterious Why of the Iraq War.](#)"]

Just when you think you've cornered President Barack Obama into a massive bombing campaign against Syria - with a possible follow-on war against Iran - Putin steps in to give Obama a peaceful path out, getting Syria to surrender its chemical weapons and Iran to agree to constraints on its nuclear program.

So, this Obama-Putin collaboration has become your new threat. That means you take aim at Ukraine, knowing its sensitivity to Russia. [For details, see Consortiumnews.com's "[What Neocons Want from Ukraine Crisis.](#)"]

You support an uprising against elected President Viktor Yanukovich, even though neo-Nazi militias are needed to accomplish the actual coup. You get the

U.S. State Department to immediately recognize the coup regime although it disenfranchises many people of eastern and southern Ukraine, where Yanukovych had his political base.

When Putin steps in to protect the interests of those ethnic Russian populations and supports the secession of Crimea (endorsed by 96 percent of voters in a hastily called referendum), your target shifts again. Though you've succeeded in your plan to drive a wedge between Obama and Putin, Putin's resistance to your Ukraine plans makes him the next focus of "regime change."

And a former high-level CIA official [says](#) that Putin has to go, and the U.S. should assassinate him if he doesn't leave voluntarily.

But every country we've regime changed have [descended into chaos](#).

As Robert Parry warns, we might be very sorry if we succeed in forcing Putin out:

But what would it mean to destabilize Russia? Does anyone think that shattering the Russian political structure through a combination of economic sanctions and information warfare will result in a smooth transition to some better future? The Russians already have tried the West's "shock therapy" under drunken President Boris Yeltsin – and they saw the cruel ugliness of "free market" capitalism.

Putin's autocratic nationalism was a response to the near-starvation levels of poverty that many Russians were forced into as they watched well-connected capitalists plunder the nation's wealth and emerge as oligarchic billionaires. For all Putin's faults, it was his pushback against some of those oligarchs and his defense of Russian interests internationally that secured him a solid political base.

In other words, even if the neocons get the Obama administration – and maybe its successor – to ratchet up tensions with Russia enough to generate sufficient political friction to drive Putin from office, the likely result would be a dangerously unstable Russia possessing a vast arsenal of nuclear weapons. Putin loyalists are not likely to readily accept a replay of the Yeltsin years.

But the neocons apparently think the risks are well worth it. After all, the end result might finally let them kill off that pesky fly, Israel's near-in threat from the Palestinians and Hezbollah. But we might remember what happened to the little old lady in the ditty, when she swallowed the horse, she was dead, of course.

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)

Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's
Blog](#)

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