

On the First Anniversary of Ukraine's Maidan Coup: Obama's War-Policies Show a Pattern

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, February 22, 2015

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

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

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

[Editor's Note: Documentation on each of the key points in this news report and analysis can be seen by merely clicking on the link where the given point is asserted. This is being especially noted because many of the facts reported here have not been covered generally in the Western press, and much of what is reported here could surprise some readers anywhere, and thus the documentation is linked-to. Our editors have checked the links and have found all of the allegations to be backed by solid sources. The reader is thus provided the same access to these sources that we do, so as to check what's being alleged in this article.]

U.S. President Barack Obama has repeatedly employed a tactic of attacking Russia by using fundamentalist and other conservative extremists in a given Russia-allied nation, so as to turn that Russia-allied nation away from Russia, and toward America, and then of trying to crush these very same right-wing extremists who have been so effective in defeating (or at least weakening) the pro-Russian leader in that Russia-allied country. This tactic leaves civil war and enormous bloodshed in the given formerly (or still) Russia-allied nation.

One example of this anti-Russian tactic, of relying upon far-right extremists and then of trying to defeat them (in order for Obama to maintain the secular fig-leaf that he is seeking to advance 'freedom', rather than to weaken both Russia and Islamic extremists), has been Russia's ally Syria, where [Obama joined with fundamentalist-Muslim extremists](#), by bombing the armed forces of Syria's Russia-allied leader, Bashar al-Assad, but then Obama turned to bombing also fundamentalist-Muslim extremists, including the ones, such as [al-Nusra](#), whom his Administration [had actually helped to supply the sarin](#) which [was used in the infamous gas attack that Obama said was perpetrated by Assad's forces](#). Theodore Postal of MIT studied the detailed evidence regarding [the sarin gas attack that the Administration was citing as its basis for justifying a U.S. invasion of Syria](#), and he said that, though insufficient evidence was available on the basis of which to determine precisely who was to blame for that gas attack, ["The administration narrative was not even close to reality. Our intelligence cannot possibly be correct."](#)

In order for the gas-delivery rocket to have come from Government held territory (instead of from territory controlled by the anti-Government rebels), it would have needed to fly at least 3.6 miles, but the actual rocket that was determined to have delivered the sarin was incapable of flying more than 2 or 3 miles at the very most. One thing that was clear from all of the evidence was that the Obama Administration were lying. Another was that they were eager to replace the pro-Russian dictator of Syria with an anti-Russian dictator. Obama (unlike the discredited George W. Bush regarding his similar lies about Saddam Hussein and Iraq) was not saying that his objective was to build a democratic state in Syria. Instead of

democracy, Obama was talking about ending Syria's alliance with Russia. He was presenting this as a strategic issue, against Russia — which it is: to replace Assad so that [natural gas from Qatar can be pipelined through Syria to Turkey to Greece and Europe](#), and thereby to reduce Russia's now-dominant position as being the chief supplier of gas to the EU.

Another example of this anti-Russian tactic — and an example which displays it outside the Middle East and the Islamic world — is currently occurring in Russia's neighboring country of Ukraine, which is Russia's main pipeline transit route supplying Russia's gas to Europe. Furthermore, it's on Russia's very doorstep, and thus a prime location for a nuclear missile base from which to hit Moscow within only ten minutes from an American President's button-push. (Ukraine could be, to Russia, even worse than Cuba was to the United States in 1962's Cuban Missile Crisis.) Finally, Ukraine has a religiously anti-Russian nationalist and Roman Catholic population around Lviv and western Ukraine, which can already serve effectively as religiously fanatical enemies of Russia. Ukraine is thus an ideal anti-Russian play. As will be documented here, the rabidly anti-Russian Obama has been taking advantage of it.

(NOTE: Throughout the following, the term "nazi" will refer to any racist fascist, whereas the capital-N term "Nazi" refers only to a member of the first political party which had that ideology, Hitler's Nazi Party. The distinction between the ideology, versus the first political Party that was based upon racist fascism, is important here, because a "nazi" may be obsessive for any type of racism, not necessarily obsessive against Jews as Hitler's Nazi Party was. Ukraine's nazis tend to be obsessive haters of ethnic Russians, even more than they hate ethnic Jews, but they still are ideologically nazis.)

A [successful coup by Obama in February of last year used the local rabidly racist anti-ethnic-Russian fundamentalist-Christian fascists there, the local nazis whose heroes during World War II had been Ukrainians who were allied with Hitler](#), and now these nazis successfully, with the help of the CIA and U.S. State Department, overthrew (and even Ukraine's current President Petro Poroshenko [admitted this at the time](#)) the Russia-friendly democratically elected Ukrainian President, Viktor Yanukovich, and they installed there a regime that, with American and European money, is [bombing the region of Ukraine](#), Donbass, which [had voted 90% for Yanukovich](#), who was the very same man whom Obama and his [nazis](#) had overthrown. Unless those pro-Russian voters, in Donbass in Ukraine's southeast, [can be either killed or expelled \(they're fleeing mainly to Russia\)](#), the danger exists (which would be fatal to the Ukrainian part of Obama's anti-Russian global war), that Obama's rabidly anti-Russian Ukrainian surrogate regime will be elected out of office and become replaced by yet another Russia-friendly democratic Government, which would then cause to have been a failed policy the [overthrow](#) of [Yanukovich](#). So: Obama is already heavily invested in the success of that [ethnic-cleansing](#) campaign, to rid Donbass of its residents. However, just as had happened with Obama's support of Islamic jihadists in Syria, Obama is now turning also against Ukraine's nazis, because [they are so obsessed with destroying Russia and killing or expelling all pro-Russian Ukrainians](#), so that Obama's broader anti-Russian objective, of [turning Ukraine into a member-nation of NATO so as to position U.S. nuclear missiles there targeting against Russia next door, is becoming seriously jeopardized](#).

The reason why [Obama's anti-Russian goal](#) is becoming threatened is that increasingly the Ukrainian nazis are turning against the post-coup Ukrainian President, Petro Poroshenko, who is taking his marching-orders from the U.S. White House.

Whereas back at the time of the coup, Obama had wanted the committed [Russia-hater Yulia](#)

[Tymoshenko](#) to win the presidential election that was to be held in Ukraine on May 25th, she was too closely allied with Ukraine's overt nazis, for her to have been able to win even in the largely nazi-accepting northwest of Ukraine, which was the region that was voting in the post-coup Ukrainian Presidential election. ([Turnout was light to nil in the southeast.](#)) But, now, Poroshenko isn't sufficiently anti-Russian to satisfy the nazis who had brought this 'pro-European' (actually Russia-hating) Government to power, but Poroshenko is not getting enough money from the U.S. and Europe for him to be able to come even close to finishing the extermination-job that he [has been doing for Obama](#).

Actually, that job began earlier than Poroshenko's election, under Tymoshenko's ally Premier [Arseniy Yatsenyuk](#), whom the U.S. State Department's Victoria Nuland [had selected on 4 February 2014](#) to run the coup-Government that became [installed 22 days later](#). But Poroshenko has been continuing it, as being [\(northeast\) Ukraine's](#) 'democratically' elected Ukrainian President (*claiming* to represent *all* of Ukraine, even [the area that he's bombing, which had voted 90% for Yanukovych](#) — the President whom Poroshenko had actually helped to overthrow). Poroshenko claims to represent the people who weren't able to participate in the election and whom he is now bombing. Obama supports that position. The EU leaders have gone along with it (at least up till February 12th of 2015 and the second Minsk agreement). But Ukraine's nazis are increasingly demanding even more (and so [they refuse to go along with that agreement](#)).

One-after-another of Ukraine's leading nazis (meaning racist fascists), even [the top Jewish one](#) (Ihor Kolomoysky, who enjoys [personal ties to the White House](#)), has rejected President Poroshenko's authority, or [even threatened him and has demanded that he focus more on completing the extermination-campaign that was started by Yatsenyuk](#); and [they](#) are also [organizing a campaign against Poroshenko in the parliament \(or "Rada"\)](#); but now the U.S. White House is instead [protecting Poroshenko from its nazi former allies](#), and not protecting their original stooge, Yatsenyuk.

On Tuesday, 6 January 2015, Russia's Tass news agency bannered, ["Right Sector units Refuse to Obey Orders of Ukrainian Defense Ministry,"](#) and reported that, "Units of the radical organization Right Sector have refused to obey orders of the Ukrainian Defense Ministry, presidential adviser Yury Biryukov said on TV Channel 5 on Tuesday." Right Sector was the main armed force that had carried out the coup, and they now said that they constituted an "autonomous unit that subordinates to nobody," so that they would follow only their own leader, [Dmitriy Yarosh](#), not President Poroshenko's orders.

Yarosh had led the coup, and he was now a member of the Rada — he was one of the three parliamentarians who were aiming to bring down President Poroshenko. This wasn't really new from him: on September 18th, he had [said](#), "Unless Poroshenko comes to his senses, we'll have a new president and commander-in-chief in Ukraine. ... If anyone doubts that it's possible, he can write to Yanukovich. He can verify that impossible things can be made happen." Yarosh was indirectly also warning Obama there, in effect: I gave you Ukraine, and I can take it over myself if I need to.

On 10 January 2015, the Fort Russ blog headlined ["Ukrainian Armed Forces Are Bombing the Right Sector,"](#) and reported that Right Sector troops in battle were now being killed by Ukrainian Government forces, and were no longer being killed only by separatists. Then, on January 21st, UNIAN headlined, ["Yarosh Wounded in Grad Attack,"](#) and reported that "Ukrainian MP and leader of the Right Sector organization Dmytro Yarosh has been injured by shrapnel from a Grad rocket strike." Also on January 21st, Harrison Koehli bannered

at [sott.net](#), "[Kiev Lies to Its Own Troops, Sends Them to Be Slaughtered.](#)" and he documented (with recent videos) that Ukraine's Colonel Oleg Mikats, Commander of Ukraine's 93rd Brigade, had been captured by the pro-Russian separatists during a battle at the Donetsk Airport. However, Koehli failed to note that Mikats was also [one of Right Sector's leaders](#), and that not only Mikats but also Yarosh himself had been in that battle, and that Yarosh's "[hand is damaged seriously](#)" from a "[close exploding shell](#)" and so Yarosh was evacuated to a military hospital.

The Ukrainian site Unian headlined, "[Yarosh Wounded in Grad Attack.](#)" and said he "has been slightly wounded from shrapnel" and was up and about. "He is fighting on." No mention was made of Mikats. As "J. Hawk" [commented](#) at Fort Russ, on January 20th, "Mikats' capture suggests he, a rising star in the Right Sector, tried to prove his organization would succeed where the regular military had failed. Imagine the hero's welcome he'd have gotten in Kiev had he succeeded in retaking the Donetsk Airport." And the fact that Yarosh himself was also there, suggests even more strongly, that Yarosh was here aiming to achieve a military victory that Poroshenko's forces could not, which would embarrass Poroshenko by showing Ukrainians that only by means of the Right Sector's taking charge of the Government could the war against the 'Terrorists' — the 'Anti Terrorist Operation,' or ATO — be won. Perhaps one of the reasons why Mikats had been captured was that Poroshenko's line of command had intentionally left the Right Sector forces "to be slaughtered," so as to prevent Yarosh from overthrowing Poroshenko. The U.S.-installed operatives were now warring against one-another, and not only against Ukraine's pro-Russians.

On January 29th, Ukraine's Political Navigator website bannered, "[Yarosh Prepares a 'Parallel General Staff'.](#)" and reported that Yarosh had said that "after a while, it will be implemented" — a "General Staff" of "volunteers" — to compete against and (he expected) outperform Poroshenko's military team. Yarosh was now just waiting for Poroshenko's regime to collapse, so that Yarosh's own people would grab power. And then what? He would dictate terms, to Obama, and also to Ukraine's creditors? Really? On 30 January, Fort Russ headlined, "['Yatsenyuk and Turchinov started the war!' — Poroshenko Bloc Deputy.](#)" and reported that in the Rada, a Poroshenko ally was stating that Yatsenyuk, and his chosen colleague who was briefly Ukraine's appointed President until Poroshenko, Aleksander Turchinov, were to blame for the war; Poroshenko wasn't. Rats were scurrying from this sinking ship. The next day, at the same website, the headline was, "[Ukraine After Poroshenko — Analysis by Aleksandr Rodzhers.](#)" and the analysis said that another violent Maidan would soon happen, and that U.S. "SecState Kerry personally flew to IMF to persuade them to stop Kiev credits under the pretext of 'absence of reforms.'" Of course, this would collapse the war-effort; so, Obama had now clearly abandoned the nazis; but the author amazingly assumed the exact opposite: "Poroshenko is being flushed," the Yatsenyuk bloc wasn't. More reliably, however, Rodzhers recounted: "Kolomoysky-controlled battalions are still raiding business[es] but even more nakedly than before, completely ignoring the central authorities, both Poroshenko and Yatsenyuk. All representatives of central authorities have been pushed out of Dnepropetrovsk and Zaporozhye, this process is also evident in Odessa and some other cities."

Kolomoysky was [a former White House favorite](#); he now went his own way, to grab whatever the new chaos was making available to be grabbed. Then, on 1 February 2015, Fort Russ bannered, "[We call on all commanders to rise up and start overthrowing the government.](#)" and reported that on that day, "a Volunteer Soldier National Assembly was

held, with 500 militants who had fought in the Donbass. ‘We call on all commanders to rise up and start overthrowing the government. The battalion brotherhood is starting a national tribunal’, they chanted. ... Their demands to the Verkhovna Rada included the impeachment of the President and the removal of legal immunity afforded to Rada members and judges.” Some wanted not just Poroshenko impeached, but also Yatsenyuk. On February 2nd, Oleg Tsarev, a leader of the anti-coup government in Donbass, [whose life had been threatened by Kolomoysky](#), headlined [“Dnepropetrovsk Concentration Camp,”](#) and he reported that Kolomoysky was now a total dictator in the region (Dnepropetrovsk) over which Kolomoysky had been appointed governor. Four days later, Tsarev bannered [“Stealing Is Not Work,”](#) and he reported that Tsarev’s own family business, which unfortunately happened to be located in that district, had been forcefully stolen by Kolomoysky. This was the libertarian ideal: real anarchy. Only armed people held power — government was as “small” as possible. The gangsters *were* the ‘government,’ because there was none other. This was pure libertarianism: only natural law existed, because no man-made law existed to oppose and restrain it.

So: U.S. President Obama was having a difficult time getting his extremist right-wing clients to accept anything less than their total victory — such as [Yatsenyuk had famously demanded](#). Obama’s totalitarian team were cracking at the seams. The ‘moderates,’ led by [Poroshenko](#), seemed willing to accept a negotiated settlement with the separatists, but the extremists, led by [Yarosh](#), accepted nothing other than the destruction of the separatists, and of all of Russia.

The Muslim extremists are likewise demanding total victory against Assad in Syria. [The Muslim extremists are Sunis allied with the Bush family’s \(and U.S. oil companies’\) friends the Saudi dynasty](#), but Assad is Shiite allied with Shiite Iran and their backer Russia. The chief difference between Muslim extremists and Christian extremists (and also Jewish extremists, Hindu extremists, etc.) is their respective religious affiliations. Otherwise, they’re all basically the same. In Ukraine, the traditionally dominant religion, especially in the pro-nazi far-west of Ukraine, has been the Ukrainian Catholic Church. [“It is led by His Beatitude Sviatoslav \(Shevchuk\), Major Archbishop of Kyiv-Galicia. His election was confirmed by Pope Benedict XVI on 25 March 2011.”](#) Because of Ukraine’s civil war, mutual accusations have flown back and forth between Shevchuk and Patriarch Kirill, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church, which is headquartered in Moscow. On 28 May 2014, Russia’s Interfax headlined, [“Patriarch Kirill accuses Ukrainian Greek-Catholics of Russophobia.”](#) Catholic News Service responded on August 22nd, by [reporting](#) that Shevchuk “issued a rebuttal to Russian Orthodox Patriarch Kirill of Moscow’s claims that that the Ukrainian Catholic Church and its priests were fomenting hatred and violence against believers who belong to the Orthodox Church affiliated with Moscow.” In this and other statements, Shevchuk blamed Russia.

That report continued: “Muslim Tartars are most at risk, he said, but Ukrainian Catholics, Latin-rite Catholics, Jewish communities and members of the independent Orthodox Church have ‘been menaced.’ All those communities, Archbishop Shevchuk said, ‘are further endangered by the rhetoric of the Orthodox leadership in Russia, which is becoming increasingly similar to the propaganda of Russian political authorities and leadership.’” Another name for the Ukrainian Catholic Church is the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church; and, unlike the Russian Orthodox Church, this “Greek” Catholic Church recognizes the supreme authority of Rome’s Pope.

When the Soviet Union ended, the head in Ukraine of the Russian Orthodox Church there, Patriarch Filaret, made clear his hatred of Russia, by his breaking away from the Russian Orthodox Church, though he still didn't recognize the Pope in Rome, since to do so would have made his followers an extension of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, and Filaret turned out to be more of a Ukrainian nationalist than he was any sort of Roman Catholic. Thus, he founded, in 1992, [what became Ukraine's largest denomination, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church — Kyiv Patriarchate](#). The #2 religious denomination in Ukraine now is the Church he broke away from: the Ukrainian Orthodox Church — Moscow Patriarchate. The #3 is the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (which had been the main Church during Hitler's era, and which remains the leading Ukrainian Church in the most-nazi part of the country: the far west, around Lviv). Consequently, [most of Ukraine's nationalists are now members of Filaret's Church, if they are affiliated with any](#). However, even those worshippers are idolizing as their political model, Stepan Bandar and the first generation of organized Ukrainian nazis during Hitler's time, including Yaroslav Stetsko (who was briefly serving under the Nazis as their appointed Prime Minister of Ukraine), almost all of whom were devout members of what is today the #3 church in Ukraine: the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. On 6 September 2014, Reuters bannered, ["Putin is under Satan's influence: leader of Kiev Orthodox Church,"](#) and reported that Filaret had said "there has appeared a new Cain" and he is Putin, who "has fallen under the action of Satan." This statement by Filaret, of course, supported the nazi Government's position. On 23 January 2015, the pro-nationalist (or 'pro-Western') *Kyiv Post* bannered, "Ukrainians shun Moscow Patriarchate as Russia's war intensifies in Donbas," and reported:

"Many Ukrainians have switched denominations, moving away from the Moscow Patriarchate that is very close to the authoritarian President Vladimir Putin. In a survey conducted by the Razumkov Center think tank in April 2014 [see p. 31 of [this](#)], 22.4 percent of Ukrainians then considered themselves parishioners of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate — up from 18.3 percent just a year earlier. At the same time, the number of parishioners claiming allegiance to the Moscow Patriarchate dropped in 2013-2014 from 19.6 percent to 17.4 percent of population."

It explained the decline of the pro-Russian Church, and the growth of the new anti-Russian one, this way: "Unlike the Kyiv Patriarchate Orthodox Church that openly supports the Ukrainian army and volunteers fighting in the east with public statements and generous donations, the Moscow Patriarchate prefers to distance itself from the situation, upsetting some parishioners." All of Ukraine's major 'news' media are controlled by oligarchs (Ukrainian or Western), and/or by Western governments, and their propaganda had apparently succeeded in turning Ukraine's population sharply to the right. This has greatly benefited nazi churches, at the expense of churches that aren't. However, the racism of these churches is specifically anti-Russian, even more than anti-Jew. That specifically anti-Russian focus goes back to Hitler's time, and even before.

Religion is thus being used by the respective national aristocracies in order to intensify the willingness of their respective troops to fight, kill, and die, as the various aristocracies wage wars to establish their international dominance-submission relationships. The same is true between Shia and Sunni in Islam, and between Jew and Muslim in Israel. The clergy, for any religion, keep their respective followers in line, to fight the battles of their respective aristocratic sponsors — the people who control the money. The result is 'ethnic' or 'religious' wars, which are actually inter-aristocratic wars. The respective publics fight and die, each in

service to its respective national aristocracy, but the aristocrats themselves are often unseen and unheard behind the scenes; only their money talks. This has been the situation throughout history.

Both of Ukraine's traditional two racist-facist, or nazi, political parties — both the former "Social Nationalist Party" that the CIA persuaded to rename themselves the "Freedom" or "Svoboda" Party, and the separate "Right Sector" or "Pravy Sektor" Party — derive from, and venerate, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists or OUN, which was led and co-founded by two Hitler-supporters, Stepan Bandera and Yaroslav Stetsko, both of whom had been raised in fundamentalist Ukrainian Greek Catholic families, not far from Lviv in western Ukraine, and had fathers who were priests in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, which strongly supported Adolf Hitler and his Nazis. That Church's head during World War II was [Josyf Slipyj](#), who was also a Cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church, which was Hitler's Church, and which Roman Church chose to honor Hitler with a solemn memorial mass in Germany, upon his suicide (though suicide is prohibited by that Church), at a time when the Nazi atrocities were already well known to the Pope. Hitler's racist writings were never placed on the Church's banned list.

The [Roman Church furthermore helped thousands](#) of Nazis [escape to Argentina and elsewhere](#). It hid and protected and fed many of them in a network of churches and seminaries, overseen by the Vatican, while finding places for them abroad. [Money-laundering for them to dispose of looted Jewish property was handled by the Vatican Bank](#), and the Vatican has refused to make its key records available to courts when sued. [Even the eventual Pope Paul VI was involved in it](#). These weren't Jews and Gypsies or other victims of the Holocaust who were being helped by Rome; it was their murderers and thieves who were. It's no particular religion; it's all religion — "us" versus "them" — as if any authentic ethics can be based upon personal partisanship. The basis of any organized religion is loyalty, not ethics of any sort, at all — neither nationalistic nor religious — it is no ethics, but only fake ethics; it is a type of mere psychopathy that pretends to be ethics, that pretends to be something it's not. Supremacism is 'justified' by it ("Our believers have the inside track on heaven"); and that's its real purpose. So, in the current era: the Sunni Islamic supremacism by the Saudi Wahhabi clerics has its counterpart in the Western Christian supremacism of both of Ukraine's two nazi Parties, both of which are anti-Moscow, pro-Rome.

This "Western" orientation turns out to include Obama, and virtually the entire American aristocracy that he represents. Furthermore, the Jewish supremacism of the Ukrainian regime's billionaire Governor in the Dnipropetrovsk region, Ihor Kolomoyski, is likewise expressed by his Jewish nationalism or zionism, and by his major financial support to far-right Israeli causes. (He furthermore maintains both Ukrainian and Israeli citizenships.) But, basically, the Ukrainian conflict is another outcome of Rome's war against Moscow. Rome also supports far-right Israelis, because far-right Israelis hate Moscow, just as does the Vatican.

When Slipyj died in 1984, one of the attendees at his funeral was Stetsko; and, then, ["The body of the Cardinal was buried in the Basilica of Santa Sofia in Rome."](#) Russian communism having not yet been abandoned by Russia, U.S. President Ronald Reagan issued an anti-"Soviet" eulogy on that occasion, commemorating ["Cardinal Slipyj's commitment to God and the freedom of men."](#) But, at root, this wasn't really an anti-Soviet ritual; it was an anti-Moscow one, as has been made especially clear by subsequent history — the continuance of NATO after communism ended. What had once been (at least nominally) an ideological

conflict (communism v. capitalism), has since turned out to have been actually a 'racist' one, which is really (at the very deepest level) a conflict between contending national aristocracies; and NATO is the military arm of all national aristocracies that accept the supremacy of America's aristocracy. The euphemism for this is "the West."

When Germany's Nazis took over Ukraine in 1941, they had appointed Stetsko as Ukraine's Prime Minister, and he said at the time, "[Jews help Moscow to keep Ukraine in captivity; that is why I hold that Jews should be annihilated and the German method of destruction of Jewry is necessary.](#)" Furthermore, according to [wikipedia](#), "On 30 June 1941, Stetsko declared in Lviv the formation of a Ukrainian state which 'will closely cooperate with the National-Socialist Greater Germany, under the leadership of its leader Adolf Hitler which is forming a new order in Europe and the world.' ... Gestapo and Abwehr officials protected Bandera followers." This is what those followers [did](#):

The base for Bandera and Stetsko was (and remains) Lviv. Even before the Janowska Concentration Camp was built in Lviv, late in 1941, the "Banderites" as they were called, rounded up and slaughtered the local area's Jews. According to [wikipedia](#): "Encouraged by the German army, local Ukrainian nationalists murdered about 5,500 Jews during the second Lviv pogrom in early July 1941. On July 25-27, 1941, a second pogrom took place, known as the 'Petliura Days', named for Symon Petliura [a political hero to both Bandera and Stetsko]. For three straight days, Ukrainian militants went on a murderous rampage through the Jewish districts of Lwów. Groups of Jews were herded out to the Jewish cemetery and to the prison on Łąckiego street where they were shot. More than 2,000 Jews were killed and thousands more were injured." The Ukrainian leader at the time, Stetsko, had already endorsed these actions; and now they were being done.

However, unlike in Germany where the chief bigotry was against Jews, Stetsko's and Bandera's actual chief bigotry was against Russians. For Hitler, killing Jews took a higher priority than killing Russians. However, Stetsko as Ukraine's new leader cooperated — and eagerly — with Hitler's Holocaust against Jews. It just wasn't his main objective: destroying Russia (and killing all Ukrainians who supported Russia) was Stetsko's top goal. In this respect, he was unlike Hitler: his priority of bigotries was different. But he cooperated with and followed Hitler's lead at that time. Hitler briefly imprisoned both him and Bandera anyway, because they insisted upon ultimate independence for Ukraine, which Hitler wouldn't allow for any country, and especially not for a '[Slavic](#)' one. Hitler's contempt for Slavs was nowhere nearly as intense as was his contempt for Jews, but it was still contempt. He viewed Jews as snakes, descended from the snake in Genesis 3, and so to be killed for constituting the ongoing source of "original sin," which he felt must be eradicated; but he viewed Slavs as mere "Untermenschen" or "sub-humans," and so to be enslaved as constituting human beasts-of-burden, their land to be taken from them by "Aryans" (who are pure-blooded Christians, as he viewed it). As regards Muslims and Japanese, etc., Hitler didn't even think at all about them, except as potential allies. His total concern was Christian history, Christian culture. Other cultures, he just didn't care about.

[The CIA's file on Stetsko](#) noted on p. 139 that Stetsko was "Chairman of the Central Committee of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations," and on its p. 72 the CIA's file noted the specific type of racism of this organization, its *anti-Russian* bigotry:

"ABN hates all things Russian — not Bolshevik but Russian. It proclaims 'We are fighting for the complete annihilation and partition of the Russian empire.'
... The whole course of Russian history is portrayed as ... the nature of 'that

people.' ... 'The Russian people,' ABN Correspondence says,' has never been able to evolve what the West considers to be an order of society worthy of human beings.' The refrain continues: 'There is only one inveterate enemy of humanity in this world: Moscow.' ... It does not matter for ABN what type of government is established in Russia, for 'Russians are all the same.'"

Consequently, the CIA — an agency of America's aristocracy that seeks global supremacy for them — worked very closely with Stetsko, against Russia (not really against communism, which was just the aristocracy's ideological cover-story).

So, in regards to foreign policy: just as Obama is allied with Islamic extremists, he is allied also with Christian extremists, and with Jewish extremists — all in order to conquer Russia, which is his real goal.

But, now, Obama's nazis in Ukraine, who brought Obama to power there via the coup, are trying to assert independence from him, by toppling Poroshenko and replacing him with a leader who is to the right of even the conservative voters who constitute the overwhelming majority in northwestern Ukraine. Obama knows that that's an impractical idea. But perhaps Obama had simply not been aware that extremist right-wingers despise anyone who would negotiate with people whom they passionately hate and despise and want to see dead; and, that, therefore, Obama's support to religious extremists might produce consequences that would get out of his control. It's happening right now in Ukraine, just as it did in Syria.

On 22 May 2014, Agence France Presse headlined from Lviv, ["In Ukraine's Nationalist Bastion, Locals Want Revenge Against Rebels,"](#) and Vassyl Trukhan reported an encounter with a resident there, who "protested that the government was just 'too soft'. 'We must kill the separatists and bring the traitors to justice so that order is restored and we stop the spread of this gangrene.'" As Ukraine's military failure to eliminate this "gangrene" becomes clearer, the public support for another violent overthrow of Government grows — but, this time, it will be indigenous, not imposed.

The only way that people like Hitler or bin Laden can be satisfied is for their enemies to be utterly destroyed. Is Obama like that? He will need to decide whether he is or not. But, for now, he's supporting Poroshenko in Ukraine, and the moderate Islamists in Syria. He had started with Tymoshenko and al-Nusra, but he's now essentially at war against both of them — he is turning against the extremists in both countries. But, he still needs those extremists, in order to achieve his objective of destroying Russia.

Obama will thus now have to choose between, on the one hand, [destroying Russia](#), or, on the other, negotiating with Russia a face-saving way out of Obama's primary foreign-policy aim: that of [crushing Russia](#).

Both in Syria, and in Ukraine, Obama's real target is [regime-change in Russia — replacing Vladimir Putin with someone who will accept Russia's being a client-state of the American Empire](#); that is, a nation whose aristocracy subordinates itself to America's aristocracy. Obama's initial hope in Ukraine had been that Putin would send Russia's armed forces into Donbass to rescue its pro-Russian population, which would then give Obama an open door toward turning northwestern Ukraine into a U.S. military base 'to defend Ukraine against Russian aggression.' Putin didn't do that. The aid that he has supplied to Donbass has been far short of an overt war against Ukraine.

Obama's fallback position has perhaps been for Russian nationalists to win the support of Russia's own population if Putin lets the people in Donbass be exterminated and he thus becomes replaced via a Russian civil war, which would provide a U.S. pretext to invade Russia, and to establish "order" there. But that too isn't happening. On the contrary: this past December 18th, the AP headlined ["Poll: 81 percent back Putin even as ruble falls."](#) This AP poll confirmed previous polls, such as Gallup's having bannered on July 18th, ["Russian Approval of Putin Soars to Highest Level in Years: Ratings of U.S., European Union leadership sink to record lows, in single digits."](#)

If Obama cannot find a solution to this problem, then the possibility of a nuclear war, [which would destroy the entire planet](#), is very real, and then the outcome of [Obama's anti-Russia war](#) will end up depending upon whether or not Obama can accept what would inevitably be [a very embarrassing public defeat for him](#), and for [his aristocratic backers — America's aristocracy](#) (including not just his backers but the ones who had stood with Mitt Romney when he asserted that Russia ["is without question our No. 1 geopolitical foe"](#)) — a defeat which would prove to the world that the nation that Obama leads, which he has repeatedly called by the supremacist nationalist phrase, ["the one indispensable nation,"](#) isn't so unique, after all. By his calling his country that, he is implicitly asserting that *every other nation* is "dispensable." Hitler, too, felt that way about his nation, Germany ("Deutschland über alles" was his phrase for it). But Hitler didn't possess nuclear weapons; Obama does, and Obama might soon have to either give up his extreme nationalism, or else use these weapons to enforce it.

Such a defeat would be a huge come-down for Obama's ego. So, maybe he will stick with his plan, even if it means destroying the world. But, no one today can yet say which is more important to him: Is it destroying Russia? Or is it instead *avoiding* a nuclear war?

Within a few years, we (or at least the survivors) will know which of these two priorities was the higher for him.

The people whom Obama represents are standing firm with the nazis. [Obama's chief political donor, George Soros](#), is, in fact, [frantically campaigning throughout the world for taxpayers in both the U.S. and EU to finance at least a \\$20 billion step-up in aid to Ukraine so that they can complete the job that he has personally invested very heavily in.](#) (Of course, some of Obama's main financial backers don't have any involvement in Ukraine, and don't care what happens there. None who do care, however, has in any way been supporting the anti-nazi position and helping the Donbass residents.)

The U.S. House and Senate are both virtually unanimous, [by more than 98%](#), supporting more money from U.S. taxpayers in order to achieve a successful final solution to rid Donbass of its existing residents so that NATO missiles can be placed there. [Republicans have traditionally hated Russians \(not only communism\)](#), and congressional Democrats have recently been bought-off by aristocrats such as Soros (who, perhaps, has hated Russians all his life; though, until the fall of communism there, he had veiled this hatred by criticizing communism instead — and, now that the ideological veil is finally off, [the nazi shows](#); and, consequently, on a popular Ukrainian TV station, which was financed by the U.S. Government, the Dutch Government, and Soros's International Renaissance Foundation, a journalist even [spoke openly about the necessity to exterminate at least 1.5 million residents of Donbass](#)). So, the [slaughter](#) of Donbass residents [goes on](#). And Ukraine is now trying also to [starve them to death](#). So, Soros now is [pleading for \\$50 billion from taxpayers in U.S. and EU](#), in order to finish the job.

Killing and starving millions of people is costly, but Soros has a plan to do it, with taxpayers' money — 'loans', which will go to the very end of Ukraine's creditors' line for payback from a bankrupt country, and therefore can't even begin to be paid, ever: never start to pay, [no matter how hard Ukrainian citizens might work in order to pay their taxes and so their country's debts](#). These 'loans' will instead be donations, not really loans, from Western taxpayers. But the money won't go to the citizens of Ukraine; all of it is to go instead to the war-effort, to the anti-Russian killing-campaign. On January 9th, Ukraine's Prime Minister, Arseniy Yatsenyuk, [reassured the IMF, EU, and other investors of all funds](#) that are being loaned to Ukraine, that Ukraine is doing everything possible to fulfill on its financial obligations to all investors: "I would also like to note that the money that we get in the framework of international financial assistance, does not go to finance the state budget deficit, it does not go to the payment of pensions, it does not go to the payment of wages. All of this is happening in the first place, solely to perform our external obligations." On 1 May 2014, the IMF (whose money comes from taxpayers in U.S. and the EU, not from the aristocrats whose investments the IMF protects and whom the IMF actually serves) had stated that Ukraine's first obligation, [without which the IMF would lend no more money, is to win the war against Donbass](#). Yatsenyuk, thus, is here reassuring the IMF, and other investors in Ukraine, that their money will not go to pay for anything but winning this war.

The IMF, and other lenders, require Ukraine to win this war, because, if the Ukrainian Government doesn't win, then [the natural gas](#) and other assets that are in the ground in that region will not become available to be sold (privatized) by the Ukrainian Government in order to pay-off those investors; instead, the residents there (the people whom the Ukrainian Government is now trying to [eliminate](#)) will control those assets, as being assets of a separate state — one which has not borrowed from these investors. The IMF wants the assets that are in the ground, [not the people who are living on it](#). That is why it demands victory ([elimination](#) of the [people](#) in [Donbass](#)) — or else Ukraine will promptly go [bankrupt](#). (And, perhaps, so too will some of those [investors](#).)

Ukrainian citizens will be bled dry to live in [perhaps the most corrupt country on Earth](#). As Ukraine's nazis proudly say: ["Ukraine above all! Russians on knives!!"](#)

In order to support the nazis, Obama even had his U.N. representative [vote with only two other countries — Ukraine and Canada — against a resolution condemning racist fascism \(nazism\)](#). Ukraine wasn't so much as mentioned in the resolution (though Ukraine is the world's only country now that has an outright nazi government), but these three countries stood out alone from all the rest, and voted against the thoroughly reasonable (especially in light of the recent worldwide increase in racism) resolution, anyway. The remaining fig-leaf of American decency is thus now gone. Ukraine refused to endorse the resolution; and, so, the U.S. representative said that the U.S. stands with Ukraine. Canada then joined in, supporting the U.S., even despite all the rest of the world. Like Obama's agent controlling the coup, Victoria Nuland, had said, just weeks before the coup: ["F—k the EU!"](#) She had, we now know, meant it: If the EU feels queasy about installing a nazi government in Ukraine, then to hell with them — we're the ones in control, and they'll do what we say!

This statement by her was actually in character, and it expressed one of the reasons why Obama had given her the power that she has, to exterminate people that America's aristocrats want to get rid of: she had previously been Vice President Dick Cheney's foreign-policy advisor, and then, during 2005-2008, she became the U.S. Ambassador to America's international military club against Russia, NATO. Her husband, Robert Kagan, had been John McCain's foreign-policy advisor during the 2008 Presidential campaign (and McCain has

been one of the leading American supporters of Ukraine's nazis); and, before that, Kagan had been one of the main proponents throughout 2002 and 2003 of George W. Bush's "regime change in Iraq" policy, and of its resulting 2003 invasion of Iraq, which Kagan prominently argued for. Victoria Nuland was one of Hillary Clinton's closest advisors, while Hillary was Secretary of State; and, on 5 July 2014, *The New York Times* noted that Robert Kagan had ["co-founded an influential bipartisan advisory group during Mrs. Clinton's time at the State Department."](#) So: Hillary Clinton can be expected to be similar to Barack Obama, John McCain, Dick Cheney, and Mitt Romney, all of whom favor a "muscular" foreign policy, to advance the interests of the American aristocracy, and so to crush Russia and *its* aristocrats.

Throughout history, aristocracies have been at war against each other, asserting their dominance over one-another; and, after the historically brief period when democracy had been fashionable, the world is returning to that aristocratic model, of Empire. The modern term for it is fascism; and the extreme, or racist, form of that, is nazism.

In addition to the aim of America's aristocracy to place quick-strike missiles in Ukraine aimed against Moscow, Washington also seeks to grab away Russia's role of being the main energy-supplier to Europe; and this means changing Russia's gas-pipeline through Ukraine to Europe, to become instead a pipeline carrying fracked gas from Ukraine's own Yuzivska gas field in Donbass, to Europe, thus replacing Russia as that gas supplier, so that this formerly Ukrainian gas will have been privatized to Western aristocrats in the fire-sale of formerly Ukrainian-Government-owned property, and the Russian-built pipeline will be benefiting Western aristocrats instead of Russian ones. A good summary of this plan was provided by local resident "Ayre," (Ms. Ayre Vende) titled ["Naked Goals of Ukrainian Genocide."](#) She said that Western aristocrats are "interested in the war to make Yuzivska gas field clear of local folks." The land will be destroyed anyway, so (purely as a business proposition) the people who live there might as well be killed or expelled by war — it'll remove an economic problem for Western investors, since the land will thus get cleared of its population in advance of the transaction. War will have cleared the land for these new owners.

Consequently, Western aristocrats benefit not only by increasing their military advantage, but by increasing their economic advantage as against Russia's. It's a double-whammy, for Western aristocrats. The economic losses will be experienced not only by Russia, but by taxpayers in the West, who will have paid for the bombs, etc. Meanwhile, all of the investment profits will go to the investors who will have bought up these privatized fire-sale Ukrainian assets. But this means that the war against the Donbassers must first be won. Obama needs the nazis for that, but he also needs to keep these nazis under his control. It's like a rodeo's bucking-bronco act, but it spills lots more blood and guts. And it transfers even more wealth to the 'right' aristocrats than they had previously controlled.

Push is finally coming to shove, for Obama's favorite foreign-policy tactic — the use of dedicated nazis to lead their regime-changes, so as to establish and maintain their international dominance. Now that Obama is learning this lesson, that things can get out of control this way, he will have to make up his mind who he is. In Syria and Iraq the supporters of global Islamic Caliphate, and in Ukraine the supporters of ["Ukraine above all!"](#) (like Hitler's "Deutschland über alles!"), are willing to destroy the world in order to achieve their goal of nationalistic dominance; so, Obama will ultimately need to decide whether he's really one of them himself — one of the nazis — or not.

We can't yet know. But does he? Perhaps that's the biggest unresolved mystery here. What are his priorities? Beyond all of the rhetoric, what is he, really? How does he feel about the enormous bloodshed he has caused — [bloodshed of entirely innocent civilians](#) who are trapped in the hatred by some, and the unconcern by others (such as himself)? Does the person who [ultimately caused](#) these [deaths](#), even care about it? His White House has [argued to the U.S. Supreme Court that political lying is essential to democracy](#). (The Court [unanimously agreed](#).) So: what's the real purpose of his lying? He does it on both [domestic](#) and foreign policy. Is he as [proud of himself](#) as he seems? What are his values, or does he have any?

The mystery is about Obama — it is not about his standard foreign-policy tactic, which is clear. Obama will soon have to make a choice, about what he really is.

PS: Two objections will be discussed here that are frequently raised regarding Russia's alleged blame in the Ukrainian matter:

First, the White House and its agents assert that Russia precipitated the conflict in Ukraine by its 'aggression' in 'seizing' Crimea away from Ukraine. These allegations ignore that [in 2010, Russia and Ukraine had signed a 25-year extension on the lease that Russia had had on Russia's Black-Sea-Fleet naval base at Sevastopol in Crimea](#) ever since [1783](#), when Crimea first became a part of Russia. [In 1954, the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev donated Crimea to Ukraine](#) without considering the wishes of the Crimean population, who strongly opposed that, and who overwhelmingly considered themselves to be Russians, not to be Ukrainians, anyway. One of Obama's objectives in taking over Ukraine in the 2014 coup was to cancel the remaining 21 years on Russia's lease. Crimeans and Russia both opposed doing that, and Crimeans held a plebiscite on March 16th about whether to rejoin Russia. With that as historical background, then:

(A) [The March 16th, 2014, referendum of the voters in Crimea](#), produced a 96% vote to secede. Some people, like the anti-democratic Russian nationalist "Girkin," [ridiculed it](#), because the Ukrainian Government's officials in Crimea at the time (who hadn't yet been changed by the new coup Government) opposed holding any such referendum. But of course they would have opposed it; they'd have gotten immediately fired by the new Government if they had said that this new Government wasn't now legally the Government in Ukraine. Girkin said: "The Ukrainian army units remained loyal to Kyiv as they were. Furthermore, most of the army remained that way. The only thing that made what we have accomplished in Crimea possible was the presence of Russian army." And that too is true, just not relevant: without the Russian army there (as part of the lease agreement for protecting Russia's naval base), Crimea would have gone the way of Donbass: civil war. The real question is instead: Did the majority of Crimeans favor or oppose rejoining Russia? The answer to that question is clear; it is:

(B) [Gallup polled 500 Crimeans during May 16-30 in 2013, and found](#) that only 15% considered themselves "Ukrainian." 24% considered themselves "Crimean." But 40% considered themselves "Russian." Even before [Obama's February 2014 coup which overthrew the Ukrainian President](#) whom [80% of Crimeans had voted for](#), the Crimean people overwhelmingly wanted to secede from Ukraine — and, especially now they did, right after the President for whom they had overwhelmingly voted, Viktor Yanukovich, had been overthrown in this [extremely bloody coup](#). Furthermore, [in April 2014, Gallup again polled Crimea](#), and they found that 71.3% of Crimeans viewed as "Mostly positive" the role of Russia there, and 4.0% viewed it as "Mostly negative"; by contrast, only 2.8% viewed the

role of the United States there as “Mostly positive,” and a whopping 76.2% viewed it as “Mostly negative.” During the intervening year, Crimeans’ favorability toward America had plunged down to 2.8%, from its year-earlier 6%. Clearly, what Obama had done in Ukraine (his violent coup in Kiev) had antagonized the Crimeans. And, as if that weren’t enough, the 2014 poll provided yet more evidence: “The 500 people that were sampled in Crimea were asked [and this is crucial] ‘Please tell me if you agree or disagree: The results of the referendum on Crimea’s status [whether to rejoin Russia] reflect the views of most people here.’ 82.8% said ‘Agree.’ 6.7% said ‘Disagree.’” In the hearts of the local residents, Crimea was still Russian territory, after an involuntary hiatus of 60 years; and, so, the Russian Government accepted them back again, into Russia — this was not ‘Russia’s seizure of Crimea.’ It was Russia’s protection of Crimeans, from the invasion of Ukraine by the United States in a bloody coup in Kiev.

Second, the White House and its agents blame Russia for the shooting-down of Malaysia’s MH17 airliner over Ukraine’s conflict-zone on 17 July 2014, and on that basis they won a crucial hike in the economic sanctions against Russia. However, even if it had been the case that the White House and its Ukrainian regime were correct in their allegations that this shoot-down resulted from an error by the separatists when they were mistaking that airliner for a Ukrainian bomber, of which they had already shot down several (in order to protect themselves and their families from being bombed), this still would not have been any reason for Obama and the EU to hike the economic sanctions against Russia, as they did. But it was *not* the case: [The Ukrainian Government shot down the airliner, and moreover intentionally — it was downed by gunfire and then missile-fire both from at least one Ukrainian fighter-plane](#). U.S. President Obama had failed to persuade the EU to hike those sanctions, and so this event was perpetrated precisely in order to get these sanctions hiked, which the event (and the propaganda about how it had happened) succeeded in achieving.

The bottom line in all of this is:

Whether or not Russia’s President Vladimir Putin should be removed from power is something that should be determined by the Russian people themselves, by means of uncorrupted democratic procedures that are not being manipulated either by Russia’s aristocracy or — and *especially* not — by the aristocracy of America or any other foreign country.

Obama’s desire for regime-change in Russia is by now obvious, just as was G.W. Bush’s desire for regime-change in Iraq. In either instance, one’s prejudices about the matter (and everything that had helped to produce those prejudices) should be rejected, in favor of the actual relevant facts, in the given case; and the relevant facts regarding the situations in both Syria and Ukraine are facts about Obama and his aggressions against Russia, vastly more than they are any facts about Putin and his aggressions against the United States, especially because there are actually *no* aggressions by Putin against the United States, though there might soon be such, if Obama keeps pressing for Putin’s removal, either by the tactics that are described here, or else by others. Bush succeeded in Iraq. He ended Saddam and the existing regime there. The results if Obama succeeds in Russia could turn out to be even worse — *far* worse than what resulted in Iraq. And the costs to the entire world would likely be incalculably higher.

The American Government has become extremely skilled at overthrowing foreign democratically elected — and sometimes not elected — governments. But clearly now, the government that urgently needs to be replaced is the one in the United States itself. This

has nothing to do with the U.S. Constitution — the Supreme Court has already destroyed that, and replaced it with rule-by-aristocracy, which America’s Founders had instead tried to end, rather than to establish. The American aristocracy itself is now the enormous threat to this planet. America is ruled by corruption, which is normal throughout the world; but absolute power corrupts absolutely, and America’s aristocracy is seeking (and close to obtaining) absolute power. Obama calls this aristocratically controlled America, “the one indispensable nation.” To him, all *other* nations are dispensable. It’s the same nationalistic ideology as Hitler’s “Deutschland über alles!” and nazi-Ukraine’s “Ukraine above all!” But it’s backed by nuclear weapons and the world’s largest military.

All other NATO nations must therefore quit the U.S. military alliance, NATO, which should have been disbanded when the Soviet Union did. And every nation should view the U.S. — the power that controls this country, which is America’s aristocracy — to be profoundly hostile; because, tragically, that’s what America has now become, to the welfare of all countries.

The American people are not to blame for this. The gangsters who control this nation are. They now threaten the entire world. They need to be cut off, by all other nations.

Any nation that considers itself to be “the one indispensable nation” needs to be dispensed with. Germany, Italy, and Japan, each declared themselves to be the one indispensable nation, before the world almost exhausted itself in defeating them.

Perhaps the solution this time around won’t need to be so violent. But continued inaction certainly will be. The choice is thus stark, and delay would be disastrous.

*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](#).*

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2015

[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](#).

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