

G7 Boldly Displays Its Lies Regarding Anti-Russia Economic Sanctions

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, June 03, 2016

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

The official statement from the G7 group, of leading industrialized countries, publicly exposes the entire G7 group, by basing on provable and even blatant lies, the group's support for continuation of Barack Obama's anti-Russia sanctions.

In its statement at the conclusion of the meeting of the G7 countries on May 27th, the G7 nations — the U.S. (who dictate to the others), plus the six others (who always do what they're told): Germany, Japan, Italy, France, Canada, and UK — said [in their joint statement](#) (which I shall accompany here by links to relevant sources, plus comments and questions from myself, for the purpose of clarification):

We stand united in our conviction that [the conflict in Ukraine](#) can only be solved by diplomatic means and in full respect for international law, especially the legal obligation to respect Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence [even though they don't similarly deny the rights of Catalonians to separate from Spain, nor of Scotts to separate from UK, if that's what the people there want]. We reiterate our condemnation of the [illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula by Russia](#) [as those links show, the illegality was actually Obama's [coup in Kiev](#), not what either the Crimeans or Russia did] and reaffirm our policy of its non-recognition and sanctions against those involved [those being sanctions solely against Russia, [for having accepted the request of 97% of Crimeans to become Russian citizens, and for protecting Crimeans from being invaded by the Ukrainian army and air force](#)].

We are concerned by continued violence along the line of contact in violation of the ceasefire [in the far-eastern Donbass portion of Ukraine]; we urge all sides to take concrete steps that will lead to [the complete ceasefire required under the Minsk agreements](#). We also urge all sides to fulfill their commitments without delay with a view to holding local elections in certain areas of the Donetsk and Luhansk regions [the two regions that together make up Donbass, the part of Ukraine that had [voted 90% for the Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich](#), whom [Obama overthrew in February 2014](#)] as soon as possible [in accordance with the Minsk agreements](#). We emphasize our strongest support for [full](#) implementation of the Minsk agreements and the work of the Normandy format and the Trilateral Contact Group. We expect Russia [but not the Ukrainian government] to live up to its commitments and use its influence over the separatists to meet their commitments in full. [This passage acknowledges that Russia has only 'influence' over the separatists, not control over them, and yet only Russia is being demanded here to meet its alleged 'commitments', which would be precisely what, if Russia doesn't control the separatists, and if Russia exercises no 'influence' at all on the other side, the Ukrainian government?] We stress the OSCE's key role in helping to deescalate the crisis, and we call upon all sides, particularly the

separatists [why 'particularly' the separatists — is this supposed to be an unbiased neutral statement, which it clearly is not?], to provide the organization's monitors full and unfettered access throughout the conflict zone.

We recall that the duration of sanctions is clearly linked to Russia's complete implementation of the Minsk agreements [yet again, the G7's statement is clearly and singularly hostile against Russia, and supportive of the [coup-imposed](#) Ukrainian government] and respect for Ukraine's sovereignty [but what about the right of self-determination of peoples, which even the West recognizes in the cases of Scotland's right to separate from UK, and Catalonia's right to separate from Spain — but NOT in Donbass's and Crimea's right to separate from Ukraine, though [Donbass had voted 90% for Yanukovich, and Crimea had voted 75% for him](#), and the post-coup Ukrainian regime was rabidly hostile to them and calling the residents there 'terrorists' for rejecting Ukraine's coup-government as their government?]. Sanctions can be rolled back when Russia meets these commitments [what 'commitments', that are only by one side of the dispute — and not even by one of the two sides in the dispute, neither by the Ukrainian government, nor by the separatists?]. However, we also stand ready to take further restrictive measures [here the warmongering G7 are actually threatening to increase sanctions against Russia, though their case for even having those sanctions is based entirely upon [lies](#)] in order to increase cost on Russia should its actions so require [according to what standard, and judged by whom — them?]. We recognize the importance of maintaining dialogue with Russia [but if this assertion weren't a lie, then would their entire statement here be so incredibly one-sided and false as it so obviously is?] in order to ensure it abides by the commitments it [yet again referring only to Russia] has made as well as international law and to reach a comprehensive, sustainable and peaceful solution to the crisis.

We commend and support the steps Ukraine is taking [can anyone but a full-fledged idiot fail to recognize how biased in favor of the Ukrainian government and against the Russian government — how totally one-sided — this statement is?] to implement comprehensive structural, governance and economic reforms and encourage Ukraine to continue and accelerate the process. We urge Ukraine to maintain and enhance the momentum in its fight against corruption and its judicial reform, including the Prosecutor General's office. We are fully committed to providing long-term support to this end [does that mean anything more than providing yet more taxpayer-backed loans to get the bankrupt Ukrainian government even deeper into debt and austerity than it already is and to sell off in insider-rigged 'auctions' virtually the entire Ukrainian government?]. We also commend the work of the Ukraine support group of G7 Ambassadors in Kyiv.

Three **underlying suppositions** of that statement are:

- 1: All of the violations of the Minsk agreements were by Russia.
- 2: Russia controls what the independence forces in the separatist Donbass region of the former Ukraine do, and is therefore responsible for everything that those forces do, including any Minsk-violation they might commit.
- 3 (a corollary of 1&2): The Ukrainian government never violates the Minsk agreements, or else must suffer no sanctions for having done so: only Russia can be blamed for any failure to comply with the Minsk agreements.

All 3 are blatantly false.

1: Many of the violations were by the Ukrainian government, and most if not all the rest were by Donbass separatist forces firing back at forces attacking from the Ukrainian government. Self-defense against attacks from the other side doesn't violate any agreement, and it certainly isn't a violation of the Minsk agreements. (The residents of Luhansk and Donetsk had never agreed to be sitting ducks for [Ukrainian soldiers and airmen intent upon killing them.](#))

2: Russia doesn't control what the separatist forces do, but does provide essential assistance to those forces — and there is a big difference between providing such assistance, and having control over those forces.

3: Here are some direct and indisputable violations of the Minsk agreements, *by the Ukrainian government* (totally ignored by the G7's statement, just cited here):

Measure 4 of the agreement — which was signed on 12 February 2015 — states that,

“Without delays, but no later than 30 days from the date of signing of this document [i.e., by no later than 13 March 2015], a resolution has to be approved by the Verkhovna Rada [parliament] of Ukraine, indicating the territory which falls under the special regime in accordance with the law ‘On temporary Order of Local Self-Governance in Particular Districts of Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts,’ based in the line set up by the Minsk Memorandum as of 19 September 2014.”

It wasn't only a required action, but also an action required to have been taken by no later than a specific date, and it *was not done*. Instead, on 12 March 2015, Radio Free Europe headlined [“A Bipartisan Cause In Washington: Arming Ukraine Against Russia”](#) and reported that, “consensus appears to be snowballing among Democratic and Republican lawmakers in the U.S. capital on at least one issue: arming Ukraine. One exception, however, is the figure who matters most: President Barack Obama.” No reason was given for his hesitation on this, but by this time it was clear that Ukraine would be in stark violation already of the Minsk II accord — barely a mere month after its passage. The U.S. Congress can ignore international legalities and be unconcerned about the public appearance abroad (that America doesn't really care about international legalities), but the U.S. President needs to keep up the legalistic front so as not to embarrass too much the leaders of America's client-states such as Germany and France (which had *initiated* the Minsk agreements: after all, Obama's agent who orchestrated the coup had said at the time, [“F-k the EU!”](#); but there's a limit to the public humiliation that even the most cooperative of the White House's stooges can reasonably be expected to tolerate).

The crucial March 13th date came and went, without being mentioned in Western 'news' media. (And please note here that the 27 May 2016 G7 statement says “We also urge all sides to fulfill their commitments without delay,” but simply ignores that Ukraine didn't only “delay,” Ukraine still refuses to comply.) Then, four days later, at the Fort Russ website on March 17th, appeared the headline [“Back to war? Ukrainian parliament rejects the Minsk agreement”](#), and reported that, “A month after the Minsk agreement the masks are off. New weapons are coming, American instructors are in Ukraine, the IMF credit is approved. Time to get back to killing the kids of Donbass. Where are the sanctions on Kiev?” That information was unpublishable in the West's 'news' media — their 'journalistic' standards exclude such 'Russian propaganda' as this. Truth doesn't set these standards; power does, and the G7 (and their aristocracies' 'news' media) have the power.

The Minsk II agreement set up a 13-stage process; and each stage beyond stage three, every stage from #4 on through #13, is in abeyance, *because the Ukrainian government refuses to implement its side of them*. As a consequence of Ukraine's refusals, the G7 group are demanding intensification of the anti-Russia sanctions, on the basis of blaming Russia for *all violations of the Minsk accords*. Blaming Russia for all of them is the *official 'truth'*, and the 'news' media comply with it. (Similarly, in 2002 and 2003, the 'news' media, in order to assist the U.S. government to eliminate *another* Russian-allied leader, Saddam Hussein, had complied with [the official 'truth' about 'Saddam's WMD'](#) — that those nuclear-weapons equipments and materials still existed, and that they threatened the West, though [the IAEA actually said that they had destroyed all of Saddam's nuclear-weapons-related capabilities and materials in 1998](#), and the press simply hid this crucial information from the public, and allowed George W. Bush to state without challenge, citing ["the IAEA, that they were six months away from developing a weapon"](#) — an [entirely fabricated charge against Saddam](#). Geoffrey Perret [wrote](#) (p. 349): "After inspections resumed in November 2002, the IAEA concluded that there were no nuclear weapons and no program to build them. That was why the Niger yellowcake story had to be cooked up." So: Iraq was invaded on 19 March 2003, on entirely fabricated 'evidence', which an honest press would have exposed, instead of stenographically 'reported'. And now, we're [heading into World War III](#), this way.)

Another item in Minsk II that has a deadline is #11: "Constitutional reform in Ukraine, with a new constitution to come into effect by the end of 2015, the key element of which is decentralisation (taking into account peculiarities of particular districts of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts, agreed with representatives of these districts)." That deadline, too, came and went, and is still being ignored by the G7 and 'the West'; and the reason it hasn't been complied with, *not even after the deadline passed*, has likewise been that Ukraine *refuses to comply with it* (which is the reason why the West's 'news' media ignore it).

The extension or even intensification of sanctions, and the NATO buildup on Russia's borders, are [steps along the road to WW III](#), but Western 'news' media have been so effective at their function (propaganda), so that their respective publics are unconcerned about the risks of nuclear annihilation resulting, and about the increasing closeness of whatever event will spark such a global nuclear war, because those publics *don't even know the most important things that are happening* in their '[democratic](#)' countries.

Here's a video at Fort Russ on 1 June 2016, showing ["Texas visits frontline DPR positions"](#). But such evidence is irrelevant to the G7 leaders ([Obama](#), [Merkel](#), [Hollande](#), [Abe](#), [Cameron](#), [Renzi](#), [Trudeau](#)): they've got [an entire world to destroy](#), and they're too busy doing it, to care about evidence that shows them to be all [liars](#). (Not a *single one* of them said, to the G7's proposed statement: NO — I will not sign this!!!)

Is the path to nuclear annihilation being created by an elite of hypocritical liars and a mass of their deceived suckers? Can anything destroy this path, and so block those liars from destroying the world? Will any major news medium in the West finally separate itself from the chorus of liars and start to report the terrifying truth of these matters — while there is still time left to avert [global calamity](#)?

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](#).

[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