

US House Votes 348-48 To Arm Ukraine, Russia Warns Lethal Aid Will “Explode The Whole Situation”

By [Zero Hedge](#)

Global Research, March 26, 2015

Zero Hedge

Region: [USA](#)

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

Yesterday, in a vote that largely slid under the radar, the House of Representatives passed a resolution urging Obama to send lethal aid to Ukraine, providing offensive, not just “defensive” weapons to the Ukraine army – the same insolvent, hyperinflating Ukraine which, with a Caa3/CC credit rating, last week [started preparations](#) to issue sovereign debt with a US guarantee, in essence making it a part of the United States (something the US previously did as a favor to Egypt before the Muslim Brotherhood puppet regime was swept from power by the local army).

The resolution passed with broad bipartisan support by a count of 348 to 48.

[According to DW](#), the measure urges Obama to provide Ukraine with “lethal defensive weapon systems” that would better enable Ukraine to defend its territory from “the unprovoked and continuing aggression of the Russian Federation.”

“Policy like this should not be partisan,” said House Democrat Eliot Engel, the lead sponsor of the resolution. “That is why we are rising today as Democrats and Republicans, really as Americans, to say enough is enough in Ukraine.”

Engel, a New York Democrat, has decided that he knows better than Europe what is the best option for Ukraine’s people – a Europe, and especially Germany, which has repeatedly said it rejects a push to give western arms to the Ukraine army, and warned that Russia under President Vladimir Putin has become **“a clear threat to half century of American commitment to an investment in a Europe that is whole, free and at peace. A Europe where borders are not changed by force.”**

This war has left thousands of dead, tens of thousands wounded, a million displaced, and has begun to threaten the post-Cold War stability of Europe,” Engel said.

Odd, perhaps the US state department should have thought of that in a little over a year ago when Victoria Nuland was plotting how to most effectively put her puppet government in charge of Kiev and how to overthrow the lawfully elected president in a US-sponsored coup.

Then again, one glance at the Rep. Engel’s [career donors](#) provides some explanation for his tenacity to start another armed conflict and to escalate what he himself defines as a cold war into a warm one.



So what will Obama do? As a reminder, the president has been far more eager to sit this one out, and giving Europe the upper hand when it comes to the decision if and when to escalate the proxy civil war in Ukraine. To be sure, the vote puts even more pressure on the Obama administration, which has repeatedly said it was considering providing lethal aid to Ukraine; it just never dared to actually pull the trigger. Several months ago, the Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman General Martin Dempsey said we would “absolutely consider” providing lethal aid, sentiments that were echoed by Defense Secretary Ashton Carter, who said that he was also “inclined” in that direction.

Obama’s options may be even more limited after NATO’s top military commander General Philip Breedlove said Sunday that the West should “consider all our tools” to assist Ukraine, including sending defensive weapons to areas held by pro-Russian rebels.

For now the president is delaying because according to the State Department, the White House is waiting to see whether the second Minsk ceasefire will hold before deciding whether to deliver lethal assistance.

Ironically, the biggest stumbling block ahead of an outright overture to World War III, may be Hillary Clinton herself. The former SecState, currently embroiled in an e-mail communication scandal, was recently revealed to have been a recipient of some [very generous foreign donations into the Clinton foundation](#): donations where Ukraine was at the very top!



Considering last week’s news of a just as dangerous cold war being waged between Obama’s right hand (wo)man, Valerie Jarrett, and the Clintons, it is perhaps just as likely that Obama, whose foreign policy team is absolutely abysmal and whose offshore “achievements” can best be described as a disaster, is not eager to get involved in Ukraine not so much to avert the cold war with Russia to turn hot, but to make Hillary’s life difficult as she launches her challenge to Obama’s favorite populist Elizabeth Warren.

Then again, when it comes to calling the foreign shots, the US president is merely a figurehead, and the real decision-maker has always been the US military-industrial complex. So while Obama may stall sending weapons, he will ultimately get a tap on the shoulder from the gentle folks shown on the table below, who will soon demand something in [exchange for their millions in lobby funding](#).



The prepackaged spin is already ready: “sending weapons to the Kiev government would not mean involvement in a new war for America”, claimed the abovementioned Eliot Engel who sponsored the document. “The people of Ukraine are not looking for American troops,” Engel said. **“They are just looking for the weapons.”**

Beautiful. And if weapons the Ukraine wants, the US MIC will be delighted to provide them.

So the only question is how Russia will responds to this escalation: according to RT,

“Washington’s decision to supply Ukraine with ammunition and weapons would **“explode the whole situation” in eastern Ukraine and Russia would be forced to respond “appropriately,”** Russia’s Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov said at the end of February.

“It would be a major blow to the Minsk agreements and would explode the whole situation,” TASS quoted Ryabkov as saying.

In other words, bullish for stocks – just think of the central-bank monetary paratroops that World War III would unleash.

The original source of this article is Zero Hedge
Copyright © [Zero Hedge](#), Zero Hedge, 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Zero Hedge](#)

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