

Sweden Joins NATO's Emerging War Against Russia

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, July 05, 2016

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Sweden, which historically has been a 'neutral' country between the U.S. and Russia, is joining the NATO buildup against Russia, allowing NATO to place nuclear weapons in Sweden for an attack against Russia, and, like NATO (of which Sweden isn't a member) lying about it to their people, and to the world.

The alleged reason for joining the operation is that ["Russian aggression against Ukraine breaches international law and challenges the European security order"](#), according to Sweden's 'defence' minister Peter Hultqvist. He denied nuclear weapons would be part of it.

He also said, "I have sometimes wondered if there has been deliberate disinformation" by opponents of the proposal. (Let him call *this report* such 'disinformation', because I'm going to link here to solid sources that expose his and 'The West's' other [vicious lies leading straight to World War III.](#))

This is being done by Sweden in the leadup to the NATO Summit on July 8-9 against Russia, and in the context of America's installation on Russia's borders of weaponry to disable Russia's capacity to retaliate against a Western blitz-invasion from NATO. The [first successful test of that BMD or "Ballistic Missile Defense" system](#) occurred on 19 May 2016 and constituted a breakthrough in the ability of the United States and its allies to conquer Russia; the test had [occurred in Hawaii](#). Just seven days earlier than that test, the first installation of the system had occurred, which took place [in Romania on May 12th](#). So, U.S. rulers have started to install the ultimate mass-killing system, for the ultimate conquest; it's the system to block an enemy from defending itself from an invasion. Russia is increasingly surrounded by an expanding NATO, and that expansion up to Russia's borders is supposed to be accepted by Russia as if it's not a very aggressive move against Russia. And Sweden's rulers have decided to be on the winning side of World War III.

[The news report on Sweden's joining this mega-disgusting operation against Russia was published on May 26th, in EU Observer](#), and added this: "Sweden is also likely to join Nato's strategic communications centre, Stratcom, in an effort to strengthen the country's counter propaganda efforts."

NATO has already been prominently promoting the lie that Russia invaded Ukraine and stole Crimea from Ukraine — which is the *basic* lie upon which NATO is preparing to invade Russia. Swedish officials are already using that baldfaced lie in order to fool the Swedish public to accept their country's becoming a staging area for NATO's buildup to invade Russia (even though Sweden *isn't in NATO*) as a measure supposedly to 'defend' Sweden and NATO countries from being invaded *by* Russia. Get that! Since they can't find any realistic excuse for preparing to invade Russia, the lie that Russia 'seized' Crimea suffices.

Here are the facts about this, the West's Big Lie:

The most important of all parts of U.S. President Barack Obama's foreign-policy plan to take over Russia was the one that enabled him to slap economic sanctions against Russia and that enables NATO to treat Russia as an ['aggressive'](#) enemy: this is the matter regarding Ukraine and its former peninsula, Crimea, which Russia accepted back into the Russian Federation after Obama's [coup](#) seizing Ukraine had [terrified the Crimean people](#).

Certainly, Obama's [extremely bloody coup in Ukraine](#) isn't known to most Americans nor to others in The West: the official line, promoted both by the U.S. aristocracy's government, and by the U.S. aristocracy's media, and by the media of its associated aristocracies, is that a ['democratic revolution'](#) overthrew the democratically elected President of that country, Viktor Yanukovich, in February 2014. The official line is that this 'revolution' arose spontaneously after Yanukovich, on 20 November 2013, had rejected the EU's offer for Ukraine to join the EU. *Not* part of the official line is that the U.S. Embassy was already starting by no later than [1 March 2013](#) to organize the overthrow that occurred in February 2014. Also not part of the official line is that the EU's membership offer to Ukraine came with [a \\$160 billion price tag](#), and so was entirely unaffordable.

Yanukovich had no real choice but to turn it down. After all, The West needed an excuse to explain the 'Maidan democracy demonstrations' that provided a pretext for the overthrow. If one is starting on 1 March 2013 to organize a [fascist coup](#) that's to occur a year later, then one won't want to provide the victim (Yanukovich and the Ukrainian people) an offer that will be *accepted* by him. One will need the offer to be *rejected*, in order to have a 'justification' to overthrow the victim. Such a 'justification' was that he was corrupt, but they didn't mention that *all* post-Soviet Ukrainian leaders have *been* corrupt. Another was that Yanukovich had turned down the proposal from ['the democratic West.'](#) All of it was lies.

Ukraine is the key in Obama's plan for four reasons: it's the main transit-route pipelining Russia's gas into Europe; it's also a large country bordering Russia, and thus ideal for placement of American nuclear missiles against Russia; it has (at that time it was on a lease expiring in 2042) Russia's premier naval base in Sebastopol Crimea, which, for the U.S. to take, would directly weaken Russia's defenses; and, most importantly of all, the entire case for sanctions against Russia, and for NATO to be massing troops and weapons on and near Russia's borders to 'defend' NATO (now to include Sweden) against Russia, consists of Russia's 'aggression' exhibited in its 'seizing' Crimea, and in its helping the residents in the breakaway Donbass far eastern region of Ukraine, Donbass ([where the residents had voted 90% for Yanukovich](#)) to defend themselves against [the repeated invasions and bombings coming from the Ukrainian government](#). Crimea is especially important here, because, though [Russia refused to accept Donbass into the Russian Federation](#) (and so America's accusations that the massive bloodshed in Donbass was another 'aggression' by Russia was *ridiculously* false) Russia *did* accept Crimea.

However, the people in Crimea had [voted 75% for Yanukovich](#) and had also wanted to become again a part of Russia, ever since the Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev in 1954 arbitrarily transferred Crimea from Russia to Ukraine. And therefore Russia — not finding acceptable Obama's soon-to-be seizure of their naval base — supplied protection for Crimeans to be able to hold a peaceful [plebiscite on 16 March 2014](#) in order to exercise their right of self-determination on whether to accept rule by the [bloody](#) new Ukrainian [coup](#)-regime, or instead to accept Russia's offer to regain membership (and protection) in the Russian Federation.

97% chose the latter, and [Western-sponsored polls in Crimea both before and after the plebiscite showed similarly astronomically high support for rejoining with Russia](#). But that made no difference in Western countries, because their media never reported these realities but only the official line — [as Obama put it](#): “The days in which conquest of land somehow was a formula for great nation status is [sic] over.” Although he was there describing actually himself (in his ultimate plan to conquer Russia), he was pretending that it described instead Russia’s President, Vladimir Putin, who was merely protecting Crimeans, and, in the process, protecting all Russians (by retaining its key naval base), from an enemy (Obama) whose gift for deceiving the public might have no equal in all of human history.

And that ‘seizure of Crimea’ is actually the pretext upon the basis of which Obama’s NATO alliance is now [mobilizing to invade Russia](#).

[Here](#) is how Sweden’s ‘defense’ minister, in his 25 May 2016 Stockholm speech, described his reasons for Sweden to join the Western forces surrounding Russia:

The upcoming NATO Summit will take place in a security environment that continues to be challenging. And these challenges affect us all.

First of all, the security order that was established in Europe after the Cold War is challenged by Russia. The illegal annexation of Crimea is the first example in more than 70 years where one European state has occupied territory belonging to another state using military force. If we allow the annexation to become a status quo we make ourselves guilty of destroying one of the very pillars of the European security order as we know it. We see no signs that Russia has changed its position or have softened that.

Moreover, there are no indications that Russia is planning to leave the Donbass region. Instead, Russia is building up its proxy army there, with 25,000 soldiers and more tanks than any EU Member State has. The intensity of the conflict in eastern Ukraine can be increased or decreased depending on what best serves the interests of the Kremlin at any given moment.

He alleged that all violations of the Minsk agreement (the agreement regarding the war in Donbass) were from the Donbass side, and none at all from the Ukrainian side — the side that [has actually been attacking Donbass](#) — but the evidence clearly contradicts that lie. The residents of Donbass fire back when fired upon. What are they supposed to do? Then he listed Sweden’s military increases, and he said: “We do this from a platform of non-alignment.” He’s as much a liar as Obama is.

The U.S. doesn’t actually need additional military bases in countries such as Sweden. The U.S. already has [around 800 military bases in foreign countries](#), according to researcher David Vine in his 2015 book, *Base Nation*. But when tightening the noose, every little bit of extra pull helps. And after the coup in Ukraine, America’s aristocracy has been giving an extra yank at every opportunity. And they (actually U.S. taxpayers) pay well for it. Hultqvist will get his. It’s a nice business.

Back in 1990 the precondition (and Western promise) on the basis of which the Soviet and then Russian leader Mikhail Gorbachev dissolved in 1991 both the Soviet Union and its NATO-mirror the Warsaw Pact, was the promise by the representatives of U.S. President George Herbert Walker Bush, that if that happened, then NATO would [not expand “one inch eastward”](#) — which also turned out to have been a lie.

And the same news-suppression that causes Western publics (such as in Sweden, where this article was even offered as an exclusive to *Dagens Nyheter*, and was turned down by them) not to know these facts, will now probably cause this news-report to be likewise rejected by virtually all Western 'news' media, *to all of whom it has been submitted* (after its having been declined there). The ones that don't publish it are sharing in the blame for causing WW III. The few that do publish it will not be to blame for WW III. They all make their choices. (And, if any of them have any allegation to make against this news-report, then any who have honor will publish that allegation, so that the crucially needed *public debate* can begin, before WW III itself does. The utter lack of that public debate is what's especially damning against The West.)

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, 2016

[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