

The Origin of the ‘New Cold War’

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, March 16, 2015

[Oriental Review](#) 15 March 2015

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

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

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

*This will be history, replacing myth. So: if at the start it might seem unbelievable, I request the reader — please click onto the sources; and, as you read them, you will (if you have been getting your ‘news’ from the popular mainstream and ‘alternative’ ‘news’ sources) experience the replacement of myth by actual history. **The world in our time will come directly alive via the most-reliable sources that exist; and it clearly contradicts, it disproves, the widespread myth that has been projected from the ‘news.’***

To start with: the ‘new Cold War,’ against Russia, is something of a misnomer, because it differs from the original version, against the U.S.S.R., in that it’s already a hot war, which started in Ukraine as being the key proxy-state for the American Government’s chief foreign-policy aim, of defeating Russia; and it’s a war that is very bloody, and widely lied-about in both the U.S. and Europe, but that is discussed in Russia as if it were somehow the result of mere errors by Western powers, when in fact all of the Western leaders knew from the get-go that this was intended to be a lynching of Russia by Uncle Sam, and when the EU have been going along with this aim because the U.S. aristocracy supposedly have the interests of European aristocrats in mind and not only their own: it’s ‘the Western Alliance,’ after all.

But it’s not ‘the Western Alliance,’ really. It’s instead a gangland war by aristocrats on the global stage, and it’s threatening to become the hottest war that ever was.

Regarding the knowledge by top EU officials that this conflict is based on a set-up job and not a development of democracy in Ukraine, the essential documentation is [this](#). **It’s an annotated transcript I did of the 26 February 2014 conversation between two top EU officials when one of them, Catherine Ashton, the EU’s Foreign Affairs chief, heard by phone from her investigator in Kiev, Urmaz Paet, that he had discovered that even Petro Poroshenko, who supported the public demonstrations against Ukraine’s President Viktor Yanukovich, knew that the snipers whose slaughter of people doing the demonstrating there came not from Yanukovich’s side but from “someone from the new coalition” — in other words: from the ‘pro-Western’ side, the side that favored the EU and United States against Russia, and not from the side that favored the Yanukovich Government.** (To clarify here: It was “the Yanukovich Government,” and not ‘the Yanukovich regime,’ because it had been fairly and freely elected by all regions of the entire Ukrainian public in 2010 and because Yanukovich’s term was not yet up; Yanukovich was still Ukraine’s democratic President, still the legal Government in the most fundamental democratic sense; and its overthrow by “someone from the new coalition” was [blatantly illegal](#). So, it wasn’t ‘the Yanukovich regime,’ which many people in the West call it. And ‘the West’ didn’t install democracy in Ukraine; they ended it, by this [coup](#).)

Furthermore, in the other key documentary source on this overthrow, which is the phone-conversation between U.S. President Barack Obama's two chief operatives who arranged the overthrow, a conversation that occurred 18 days before the overthrow, Victoria Nuland instructed Geoffrey Pyatt to have Arseniy Yatsenyuk appointed to lead the junta-regime that would become installed when the coup was completed. **Everyone should hear that conversation; it is massively important, in a historical sense, especially because it proves that this was a coup and not anything of a democratic nature — it proves that Western governments and press have been lying through their rotten teeth about this being some sort of victory for 'democracy,' when in fact it was the exact opposite of that.**

Anyone who hears those two phone-conversations will know that the press has been lying rabidly about this entire matter. The brazenness with which Western 'news' people and think-tank operatives and government officials lie about this is shocking, because **it proves that democracy in the West is all but ended**, already. This is even worse than the lies leading up to our invasion of Iraq in 2003, because this can lead to a nuclear war between the superpowers. There can be no democracy when the public is so pervasively lied-to by the thugs who are in the positions of power and influence, and who do things like that, but this is the situation.

The documentation on the matter is by now well beyond conclusive. For example, recently came to light [a Ukrainian parliamentarian speaking the day before wikipedia says that the "Maidan" demonstrations against Yanukovych even started](#), in which speech he described in detail the U.S. Embassy's already months-long operation for a coup. And a reader-comment there, from a terrific researcher "ian56," pointed out and linked to loads of terrific background to that parliamentarian's speech, such as [this note](#) from America's Embassy in Kiev back on 1 March 2013, and [this detailed backgrounder from Steve Weissman](#) providing an even fuller picture of the conspiracy. **The U.S. Government was carrying out an international criminal conspiracy to destroy a fragile but functioning democracy**, yet keeps lying about it, and pretends it was all done in order to "build democratic skills and institutions" there. They just keep playing the public for suckers. They rape the public's mind.

And this is also why [the ethnic-cleansing operation to get rid of the residents in the region of Ukraine that had voted 90% for Yanukovych](#) is kept silent by those thugs. If the residents in that area ("[Donbass](#)") were to survive and vote in future Ukrainian national elections, then the existing coup-regime in Ukraine would be bounced out of office; that's why Obama wants these people eliminated.

And even the coup itself was violent and very bloody — the slaughtering didn't start with the mass-extermination program (called by the American side the 'Anti Terrorist Operation' or 'ATO') in Donbass.

So: what is the source of this already-hot war?

Strategically, I have earlier dealt with that in several articles, especially [here](#) and [here](#); but, basically, President Obama (at least publicly) agrees with [this viewpoint](#) which his friend presented to Congress — the view that Russia must be defeated — he supports it because

the U.S. aristocracy want to control the whole world. (Some of Obama's own words on that will be following here shortly.) That's it in a nutshell: Obama represents the U.S. aristocracy, not the U.S. public. And so do [almost all members of the U.S. Congress](#). Like I said before: democracy has ended in the United States — this is a dictatorship. (I have a book coming out soon which will explain how and why that happened; its title will be Feudalism, Fascism, Libertarianism, and Economics.)

However, **historically, the origin of this war can be seen in the following sources:**

The great investigative historian and journalist George Eliason, an American who lives in Donbass, the former Ukraine's war-zone, has written extensively about the background of this conflict, especially in two articles, one being ["The Nazis Even Hitler Was Afraid Of,"](#) and the other being ["Why Bandera Have the Largest Geo-Political Voice in EU."](#) **Especially the latter one is essential reading for anyone who wants to understand the war's background.**

However, an important thing that's left out of the second of those two articles is that even as early as the 1960s, both in the British Parliament and in the U.S. Congress, conservatives were pushing this very same basic idea, which now is being pushed so hard by Obama, and by today's Republican Party (as well as by Hillary Clinton and other leaders of the Clintonite, or anti-FDR, post-Reagan, Democratic Party), that **what 'the West' was fighting against during the Cold War wasn't just communism, but was, even more importantly, Russia itself, as being something that's intrinsically dangerous, irrespective of communism.**

[Here](#), then, is a speech by a Republican in the U.S. House, on 18 February 1969, saying that our enemy is Russia, not at all Marxism.

And [here](#) is a speech by a Conservative in the British House of Commons, on 31 July 1961, saying the same thing, though more briefly.

Both speeches cite an alleged article by Karl Marx in which Marx allegedly said that "Russia's policy is unchangeable. Russia's methods, tactics and maneuvers may change but the lodestar of Russian policy—world domination—is a fixed star."

This alleged Marx-article was cited by both men, admiring Marx (the founder of communism, which both men allegedly opposed) as the Republican said: **"Karl Marx's reports are an excellent survey of Russia's policy during fifty years before the Crimean War and of the traditional political maxims of the Russian Empire which go back a long way in history. It is a historically valid political expose which does credit to his sharp, analytical powers and to his gift or interpretation."** (Those 'sharp, analytical powers' led to a labor-theory-of-value and other false assumptions that collapsed communist economies.)

Their saying this, during a time when the U.S. public thought that what we were against in the Cold War was the ideology communism, and not an ethnicity of Russians (or of anyone else), should be understood within the context of Eliason's ["Why Bandera Have the Largest Geo-Political Voice in EU."](#) Eliason explained it there.

Essentially, what the conservatives are saying is that the only final solution to 'the Russian problem' is to exterminate them. They don't come right out and say it, but that's their

underlying position. (As I just noted, they were even willing to cite Marx to support it.)

The CIA nurtured this bigotry, for decades. Here is a lengthy BBC documentary on it. And [here](#) is a short, and more up-to-date Russian TV documentary on it. **Of course, the U.S. Government and the American-aristocracy-controlled media don't produce such documentaries; this type of information is severely suppressed in the U.S.**

This CIA operation is the view that has now taken over in Washington and controls the U.S. Government. (Eliason has pretty well explained that, too.)

Europe will need to go with either the U.S. or Russia, because the U.S. has now laid down the gauntlet, regarding Ukraine.

Barack Obama, [in his "National Security Strategy 2015" uses the word "aggression" 18 times, and 17 of them are referring to Russia.](#) **In point of fact, he concentrates even more on Russia as the enemy than on jihadist Islamists as the #1 enemy.** What Mitt Romney said in public (that "Russia is America's 'number one geopolitical foe,'" as [Fox Noise summarized it and Obama still publicly says he disagrees with](#), even though [his actions prove otherwise](#)) he believes in [practice](#), if not in private. (He knows that polls show Americans are far more concerned about jihadist Islam than about Russia; Obama is a [gifted](#) and proven [liar](#), and he does read the polls and modulate his rhetoric accordingly.)

He also has [said](#) this about the nation that he leads:

"The United States is and remains the one indispensable nation. [So: all other nations are 'dispensable.'] That has been true for the century passed [he misspelled 'past'] and it will be true for the century to come."

And he didn't mince words about what the enemies of 'the one indispensable nation' are:

"Russia's aggression toward former Soviet states unnerves capitals in Europe, while China's economic rise and military reach worries its neighbors. From Brazil to India, rising middle classes compete with us."

He was saying this, about "competition," to military men, whose "competitors" are dealt with by bombs instead of by lowered prices. Obama (perhaps he should be renamed "O'Bomba") knew what he was doing: identifying as 'enemies' the foreign aristocracies that seek to compete (economically, not militarily) against America's aristocracy. For Obama to have raised economic-competitive issues in his address at West Point was despicable, but it shows where his heart is at — it's with the American aristocracy, the only segment of the population whose incomes and wealth are rising during his Presidency (the first time that's happened in U.S. history after an economic crash: normally, economic inequality goes down after a crash).

And, now, Obama is committed to the view that Russia is seeking to control the world — even though he insists that only his nation, America, is 'the one indispensable nation.' Which nation, then, is actually seeking to control the world? Should any nation? (That's the basic difference he has with Russia's Vladimir Putin, who answers a resounding "no" to that

question.)

This is the origin of “the ‘new Cold War’,” which is really a new hot version of the old conservative war against Russia — a war conservatives have been hankering for, during decades, for it to become hot, and which it now [is](#).

The closer the EU gets to this war — meaning the hotter that it becomes — the more they seem to be finding it too hot for to handle. Maybe they’ll [abandon](#) Obama, the U.S. Congress, and the aristocracy that America’s Government represents. Maybe NATO will be left with just the U.S. and a few fanatical racist anti-Russian European nations (Ukraine, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Croatia). (And, [throw in Israel if Rupert Murdoch gets his way.](#)) But America’s Republicans, Britain’s Tories, and other conservative Western parties (and virtually all concerned [aristocrats](#)) in the West will fight tooth-and-nail to prevent that shrinkage or elimination of NATO from happening: they are, indeed, [demanding the conquest of Russia](#). That’s Obama’s basic position, too. **But if Germany, France, and a few other countries, abandon NATO — which should have been disbanded when communism and the U.S.S.R. ended — then the U.S. aristocracy might cease their demand, and maybe an all-out nuclear war can be avoided.** The very idea of surrounding Russia with NATO nations (already 12 former Warsaw Pact members) as ‘the West’ is doing, is so evil it constitutes, alone, reason to consider NATO in the post-Soviet era to be ipso-facto or automatically a criminal enterprise, an outrage against the world’s future — not an organization for international security (such as it pretends) but instead an enormous and criminal agency promoting global insecurity.

It’s things like this that led to World War I. But this would be WW III — and almost inevitably nuclear. And there is no justification for it, whatsoever.

The origin of the ‘new Cold War’ is a decades-long international criminal operation.

Anyone who doesn’t think that the United States is so corrupt should just dig a little deeper: things like [this](#) are now routine in America. Are we finally “competing” with Ukraine?

Obama is throwing stones from a glass house. He could destroy the whole thing. And Republicans are egging him on to do that.

*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 [Oriental Review](#)
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Oriental Review](#), 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*.

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