

# US Now Wants to Shift the Burden of Ukraine Onto Its European Colonies. Allies or “Veiled Enemies”?

By [Uriel Araujo](#)

Global Research, September 20, 2024

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

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

*About Ukraine's use of long-range missiles, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg now [says](#): “I welcome these developments and these decisions but it's for individual allies to make the final decisions.” He means Europe. With US-led NATO, a pattern has clearly been emerging – one about shifting the burden (and blame) to Europe.*

Some context is needed. I've written a number of times on how the Euro-American partnership and friendship consists of a rather strange alliance to the point of resembling a veiled enmity. Just consider this:

Washington does not refrain from [openly employing terrorist operations](#) against a major European power such as Germany, with no consequences – I am of course talking about the blowing up of Nord Stream, as [promised](#) by Joe Biden himself, a huge act of sabotage which, [according to](#) Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Seymour Hersh, was Washington's doing.

The US wages a “[subsidy war](#)” against Europe's [industry](#) via the Inflation Reduction Act, while advancing its own [energy interests](#) to the detriment of the continent.

Even though this [betrayal of Europe](#) is in line with Washington's historical [record](#) pertaining to partners, considering all the above, one can argue it is not far-fetched at all to describe the relationship between the United States and its transatlantic European “allies” as bearing a colonial character.

Hal Brands (Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies) describes the role played by an American “benign hegemon” by imagining the European continent “without Washington's embrace” and then reverting to an “anarchic and illiberal past”. He describes such a scenario [thusly](#):

“Which is the real Europe? The mostly peaceful, democratic, and united continent of the past few decades? Or the fragmented, volatile, and conflict-ridden Europe that existed for centuries before that? If Donald Trump wins... we may soon find out... A post-American Europe... might even revert, eventually, to the darker, more anarchic, more illiberal patterns of its past... Many people—Americans especially—have forgotten how hopeless the continent once seemed.... Europe was the land of “eternal wars” and endless troubles... [a] cursed continent.... U.S. military protection broke the doom loop of violence by safeguarding Western Europe from Moscow—and from its own self-destructive instincts.... Americans are the “best Europeans,” West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer remarked in 1949... [The] transformation began with the forced democratization of West Germany under the Allied occupation. It involved using

Marshall Plan aid to revitalize and stabilize fragile democracies...This was a uniquely U.S. solution to Europe's problems... U.S. intervention helped turn a "dark continent"... into a post-historical paradise at the heart of an expanding liberal order"

It does sound almost like a defense of the American man's burden, doesn't it? It goes way beyond Pax American. Those European barbarians simply can't get their act together and will naturally revert to their old illiberal ways, it seems.

It would be rather tempting to compare Brands' rhetoric with European colonialist discourses on Eastern or New World peoples (I've commented on Hal Brands's apocalyptic reasoning [elsewhere](#)). I believe that the point that I am trying to make by quoting Brand's exercise of [exceptionalism](#) is quite self-evident. While some Western Europeans picture their civilization as a "[garden](#)" (and the rest of the world as a "jungle"), many figures within the American regime's Establishment and Intelligentsia perceive Europe instead as a "dark continent".

Again, this is not merely an exercise of rhetoric. Once one starts to understand the American hegemony over Europe as colonial in character, in a literal way, one can thus make much more sense of today's world. For example, with regards to US actions pertaining to Georgia and Ukraine, we know that key European leaders such as former Chancellor of Germany [Angela Merkel](#) and former French President Nicolas Sarkozy [warned against it for several reasons](#) – but ultimately then US President George W. Bush had his way, and American interest prevailed, as often happens.

The Atlantic Alliance 2008 Bucharest Summit Declaration then [stated](#) that "NATO welcomes Ukraine's and Georgia's Euro-Atlantic aspirations for membership in NATO. We agreed today that these countries will become members of NATO" (23). The outcome back then was the 2008 Russo-Georgian conflict – one can argue 2014 and [2022](#) are also part of the outcomes of an ongoing trend, namely NATO expansion. And yet, paradoxically, strategic Russo-European energy cooperation kept going, [as recently as 2021](#).

How can Europeans allow such a [disaster](#)? Why won't they stand against the Americans? The answer can be quite simple. As John Mearsheimer, the renowned University of Chicago political scientist, put it, in quite blunt terms: "the United States runs NATO and the Europeans do what we tell them" (see video [here](#), at around 1h59min).

Make no mistake – there shall be no real American "withdrawal" from Europe. All talk about European "[strategic autonomy](#)" aside, what is happening now is that Washington is skillfully shifting the Ukrainian crisis' burden onto the shoulders of the European bloc (which will have an impact on European welfare and standard of living), while still benefiting from it – by having [ever-more dependent](#) European NATO members [purchasing American weaponry](#) to comply with NATO standards (alas, even [Trump's rhetoric](#) is really about it).

It has become clear by now that the political, economic, and moral costs pertaining to the Ukrainian effort are becoming too high – not to mention the risk of uncontrolled escalation potentially leading to nuclear war. It is thus time to further "proxify" the American [proxy attrition war](#) against Russia (as Former US ambassador to Finland, Earle Mack described it), by turning Europe itself into a full-fledged American proxy. It is not just about "[pivoting to the Pacific](#)".

Realizing that the European bloc today is a de facto American colony is part of the

theoretical effort to come up with an accurate description of the current state of affairs. Reflecting on what to do about it, upon realizing this, would be the next logical step, especially from a European perspective. Such reflection is a kind of forbidden discourse in Europe today, and it has become a monopoly of the [Populist camp](#) and the so-called “far-right”. It doesn’t need to be this way. It is about time to decolonize Europe.

\*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Get Your Free Copy of “Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War”!](#)

*This article was originally published on [InfoBrics](#).*

*Uriel Araujo, PhD, is an anthropology researcher with a focus on international and ethnic conflicts. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Uriel Araujo](#), Global Research, 2024

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Uriel Araujo](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)