

Operation Barbarossa 2.0: US Military Occupation of Eastern Europe Intensifies, America Threatens to Attack Russia

Operation Barbarossa 2

By [Christopher Black](#)

Global Research, February 18, 2016

[New Easter Outlook](#) 17 February 2016

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

On February 1 the New York Times ran a front page story by two of their journalists confirming the intentions of the United States to increase its occupation of and military presence in Europe particularly the east. Under the title "U.S. Fortifying Europe's East to Deter Putin" the story sets out just one in a continuing series of acts of aggression against Russia. At the same time as the Americans announced this action they pretended to negotiate with Russia in Geneva about a solution to the American and allied aggression against Syria.

Of course, the story begins with the lie in the headline of a need to "deter Putin." It then continues with the standard set of lies and propaganda about world events that we always get from the government of that country. No one outside the United States can read these things without laughing or crying, but of course they are intended to justify the criminal actions of the American government and ruling elite to the people who have to pay for the criminal wars they conduct, that is, to justify the unjustifiable, to the citizens of the United States.

There is no need to enter once again into the real history of events in Ukraine, Syria, Europe, Asia, Africa and all the places in the world where American and European meddling have wreaked havoc and loosed Chaos with the dogs of war. The history is well known by those who are interested. But there is a need to comprehend the meaning of what the United States is doing by announcing that it will increase its military budget for eastern Europe by 400%, from a current budget of \$789 million to \$3.4 billion in 2017. Since the Russians are not the threat in the region, but the United States and NATO are, the placement of military hardware to support a full armoured combat brigade in the region, and right on top of Russia's borders can have only one other purpose, aggression.



Once can even argue that the pattern of moving equipment and forces continually nearer to Russia's border, the continuous military exercises and their increasing control of the governments of the east European states in lockstep with this military build up, looks far too much like Nazi Germany's build of forces prior to Operation Barbarossa, the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941. History never repeats itself exactly, we have learned that much. But the overall pattern is very similar and the objectives and motivations remain the same.

The story also quoted American officials as stating that the equipment could be used in Syria, another threat to Russia. But the main threat is against Russia itself. Indeed the writers stated,

“Still, there is no doubt the primary target of the funding is Russia.”

The Times admits that the 1997 agreement known as the NATO-Russia Founding Act stipulates that neither side can place forces along their respective borders and admits that the deployment of American and NATO troops along Russia’s borders is a clear violation of the agreement. But, being the weasels that they are, they always state that wrong is right and so they simply deny they are in violation of the agreement or excuse it based on “Russia’s incursion” into Crimea. This makes no sense of course since the United States took over Ukraine as its protectorate in the coup in 2014. Its forces have been there ever since and it has been in violation of the agreement from the day it was signed as NATO occupied, one by one, the countries formerly protected from NATO by the Soviet Union. The agreement means nothing to them. They just shrug their shoulders if it is mentioned and chew their gum.

Since the build-up of American forces in Europe is explicitly directed at Russia and since a few months ago an American general stated that they expected Russia to engage in “hybrid warfare” in the Baltic states and regard this as a “certainty” for which NATO has to prepare, an objective observer must ask whether the US itself intends to stage a series of provocations in the Baltic and blame them on Russia.

The Americans, British and Turks have created a series of provocations in the past weeks, accusing Russia of killing civilians in Syria, of violating Turkish, therefore NATO airspace, of murdering Russians abroad on the personal orders of President Putin, and as with other leaders they have attacked and murdered in the past, now accuse President Putin of corruption, a charge they levelled at President Milosevic when he was attacked and then finally arrested in Serbia.

This writer had the opportunity of meeting with Serbian officials who were in charge of the case against Milosevic at that time and I asked them if the corruption charges were true. They told me that they were completely false but that the Americans pushed them to charge Milosevic in order to undermine support for him in Serbia and as an excuse to hold him until they could kidnap him and take him in chains to their NATO tribunal in The Hague. They further told me that the Americans had threatened to bomb them again if they refused to cooperate.

The accusations made against President Putin are in line with this strategy of setting him up to be labelled in the west as a criminal with whom negotiations are impossible and therefore, setting the stage for sowing confusion amongst the Russian people about their own leaders, and undermining support for their government. But this is only one purpose and since the Russian people are very aware of how the game works, it is unlikely that this campaign of defamation against President Putin will have any success inside Russia. So, the primary objective is to demonise him in the eyes of the western public in order to justify further aggression against Russia and since these stories receive saturation coverage in the west, the NATO propagandists are succeeding.

It took nearly ten years for Operation Barbarossa to be set up and put into effect, from the

time that Hitler was made Chancellor of Germany and began to discuss with the British and French his intentions of attacking the Soviet Union. The British and French were very content for the Nazis to do that and there is no doubt that the primary objective of Hitler was always the crushing of Russia. That the attack failed is one of the reasons the NATO leaders snubbed the Moscow Victory Parade last summer since they now identify themselves with the objectives of the defeated Nazi regime.

Some doubt that the NATO powers will actually attack Russia and risk a world war and point out that the forces being placed in eastern Europe are too weak to mount any attack. But they miss the point, which is that the build up is steady, and it is increasing, along with the propaganda and increased economic warfare. The Americans are really repositioning resources, stores, equipment and headquarters and logistics bases that can be rapidly used to build up NATO forces at the right moment. The question is when that moment will be.

Unless the European powers can escape the American pressure and become independent states once again and unless a new regime dedicated to peace arises in the United States, neither of which look likely for the foreseeable future, it rests with us, the citizens of the world to get off our chairs and get on the streets and demand that these preparations for world war be stopped. For, unless that happens, the march to war by the Americans and their NATO lieutenants appears to be inexorable.

Christopher Black is an international criminal lawyer based in Toronto, he is a member of the Law Society of Upper Canada and he is known for a number of high-profile cases involving human rights and war crimes, especially for the online magazine ["New Eastern Outlook"](#).

The original source of this article is [New Easter Outlook](#)
Copyright © [Christopher Black](#), [New Easter Outlook](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Christopher Black](#)

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