

The Trump-Putin Peace, Trade and Friendship Talks

By [Brian Cloughley](#)

Global Research, July 03, 2018

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 2 July 2018

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

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

News that a meeting has been arranged between Presidents Trump and Putin on 16 July was greeted with displeasure in many sectors of the western world, and especially by the military-industrial complex, the cabal of war-profiteering US and European oligarchs whose interests lie solely in maintaining their lucrative arms manufacturing empires. Trade is most important to them — but peace and friendship come way down their page of priorities, because it is enmity and distrust that lead to lucrative sales of weapons.

UK newspapers reacted predictably to the news, with the right wing Daily Mail [stating](#)

“Fears are mounting that Donald Trump wants a ‘peace deal’ with Vladimir Putin that could fatally undermine NATO. Ministers are becoming increasingly alarmed that the US president could offer the Russian president deep concessions such as withdrawing forces from Europe.”

The Times of London [recorded that](#)

“One [UK government] minister told the Times: ‘What we’re nervous of is some kind of Putin-Trump ‘peace deal’ suddenly being announced. We could see Trump and Putin saying, Why do we have all this military hardware in Europe? and agreeing to jointly remove that. ‘It’s hard to be against peace, but would it be real peace?’”

Yes, it would be real peace, because what Russia wants is amicable relations and trade. Trade with the US and the EU and China and every country that wants to trade — including, most importantly, the Baltic States that have been encouraged by the Pentagon-Brussels NATO High Command to imagine that Russia is poised to invade them.

The US defence secretary, **General James Mattis**, [told](#) Estonia’s minister of defence that “Russia is trying to change international borders by force” and at meetings in May with Lithuania’s president and Baltic defence ministers “[reassured US allies](#) in the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia of American solidarity with them and of US determination to defend Baltic and other NATO territory against any aggression.”

Of all the absurd concoctions swinging round the Western propaganda world at the moment, the notion that Russia wants to invade Estonia, Latvia or Lithuania is probably the least believable and most laughable. The Russian government fully realises that such action would inevitably result in wider conflict; and that there could be escalation to a shattering nuclear war. Even if it didn’t result in global catastrophe, the occupation of any one of these countries by Russian forces would be cripplingly costly in every way and simply doesn’t

make sense.

In the context of the impending US-Russia presidential talks, not a single Western media outlet mentioned that, as detailed in the [2018 World Report](#) of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI),

“In 2017 the USA spent more on its military [\$610 billion] than the next seven highest-spending countries combined... at \$66.3 billion, Russia’s military spending in 2017 was 20 per cent lower than in 2016.”

It would be awkward and indeed embarrassing for the Western media to give prominence to SIPRI’s [indisputable statement](#) that in 2016 “NATO’s collective military expenditure rose to \$881 billion” while “European NATO members spent \$254 billion in 2016 — over 3 times more than Russia.”

Russia is reducing its expenditure on defence while the US-NATO military alliance, as [noted by Radio Free Europe](#), agreed on 7 June to “reinforce NATO’s presence in a potential European crisis with the deployment of 30 troop battalions, 30 squadrons of aircraft, and 30 warships within 30 days — the so-called ‘Four 30s’ plan.” This, said the Secretary General of the US-NATO military alliance, **Jens Stoltenberg**, presumably with a straight face, is not “about setting up or deploying new forces — it is about boosting the readiness of existing forces across each and every ally.”

Then the BBC [reported](#) that Stoltenberg had put the best face he could on the unwelcome news of reduced tension and possible friendship. He said that

“dialogue is a sign of strength... We don’t want a new Cold War, we don’t want to isolate Russia, we want to strive for a better relationship with Russia.”

This is the man who [declared](#) in March 2018 that the US-NATO military grouping is increasing its numbers of confrontational deployments. He is proud of the fact that at the end of 2017 there were more than 23,000 troops involved in NATO operations, an increase of over 5,000 since 2014. This is a most peculiar way of striving for a “better relationship” with Russia, whose borders and shores are constantly menaced by NATO’s attack and electronic warfare aircraft, missile-equipped ships and tank-heavy troop manoeuvres.

In June, immediately before the start of the World Cup football tournament in Russia the US-NATO alliance (plus Israel) [conducted a two-week military exercise](#) in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland. 18,000 troops took part in the manoeuvres which, [according to the Pentagon’s HQ in Europe](#), were “not a provocation of Russia.” At the very time that citizens of countless countries were preparing to travel to Russia to enjoy a major sporting jamboree, the Pentagon-Brussels pressure group did its best to confront the country whose defence budget is one third of Europe’s and a tenth of America’s and whose [President declared](#) that his overwhelming priority is reduction of poverty and “the well-being of the people and the prosperity of Russian families.”

It is deeply ironical that while the US-NATO military fandangos were in full swing in the Baltic States, it was [reported that](#)

“Russia on Wednesday [6 June] successfully launched its Soyuz MS-09 spacecraft carrying three crew members to the International Space Station (ISS)...”

The spacecraft carried three astronauts: **Serena Aunon-Chancellor** of the US, Germany’s **Alexander Gerst** and Russia’s **Sergei Prokopyev**.

The spacecraft zoomed away in international harmony two days before US **Senator Ben Sasse** [grouched that](#)

“Putin is not our friend and he is not the president’s buddy. He is a thug using Soviet-style aggression to wage a shadow war against America, and our leaders should act like it.”

With that sort of attitude, widespread in the Congress, it’s going to be difficult to realise Trump’s [desire to](#) “get along with Russia” which he observes would be “good for the world, it’s good for us, it’s good for everybody.”



Source: Strategic Culture Foundation

Trump is the most erratic president the US has ever known. He ricochets from malevolent tweeting to spiteful speeches, and is now distrusted by almost every foreign leader of stature. It is difficult to disagree with the [opinion](#) of Iran’s foreign minister that he is “impulsive and illogical” **but** — and it is a very big ‘but’ — at the moment he presents the best chance for rapprochement and amity with Russia. The fact that Washington’s warmongers so violently oppose his forthcoming talks with President Putin is evidence enough that he is on the right track. Let’s hope that President Putin can keep him on the rails that lead to peace, trade and friendship.

*

Brian Cloughley is a British and Australian armies’ veteran, former deputy head of the UN military mission in Kashmir and Australian defense attaché in Pakistan.

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)
Copyright © [Brian Cloughley](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2018

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Brian Cloughley](#)

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