

Washington's Whoppers on the War in Ukraine

Militant defenders of Ukraine might be surprised by the country's anti-democratic tendencies.

By [Ted Galen Carpenter](#)

Global Research, October 28, 2022

[The American Conservative](#) 24 October
2022

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

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

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

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the **Translate Website** button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*U.S. leaders have amassed a long track record of deception about Washington's international objectives and the nature of U.S. foreign clients. Modest or even minor threats and disruptions became supposed existential threats to America's security, as well as threats to regional or world order, in Washington's overwrought propaganda narratives. In addition, multiple administrations routinely whitewashed the record of authoritarian foreign clients. Thus, autocrats such as Nicaragua's **Anastasio Somoza Debayle**, Egypt's **Hosni Mubarak**, and ugly extremists, such as Syria's Sunni Jihadists, all became honorary members of the "Free World."*

Both components are present in Washington's current campaign of disinformation with respect to the Ukraine war. Two deceptive arguments in U.S. propaganda are so egregious that they stand out as gigantic whoppers. **The first whopper is that:**

Russia's war against Ukraine was entirely unprovoked; nothing Ukraine, the United States, or NATO did, this story goes, threatened Russia or contributed in the slightest to the current bloody tragedy.

The second whopper is that

Ukraine is a liberal democratic country whose mere existence as a model in Russia's neighborhood terrifies **Vladimir Putin** and his inner circle of authoritarian oligarchs.

In his initial statement from the White House, **President Biden stated flatly that Russia's invasion was "[unprovoked and unjustified](#)."**

The following day, he described the attack as a "brutal assault on the people of Ukraine [without provocation](#), without justification, without necessity."

The “unprovoked” mantra soon became a staple of the narrative put out by the administration and its allies in the news media and the foreign policy blob.

Criticisms of Russia’s military action as brutal and over-the-top are entirely justified. The argument that it was utterly unprovoked, however, is misleading at best and an outright falsehood at worst.

Respected analysts had [warned for more than a quarter century](#) that expanding NATO eastward to Russia’s border would turn out badly, no matter who ruled in Moscow, since the move was inherently menacing and intruded on important Russian interests.

Yet, multiple U.S. administrations casually spurned those recommendations for caution. Indeed, Bush, Obama, Trump, and Biden administration policymakers continued to push for Ukraine’s inclusion in NATO, despite the Kremlin’s repeated and steadily escalating warnings that such a step would cross a [red line](#) and trigger a crisis.

Critics who dare contend that such Western actions constituted unwise provocations and were a major factor in the breakdown of East-West relations have been subjected to [a barrage of vilification](#), led by the Biden administration. The favorite allegation is that they are echoing “Putin’s talking points.” The historical record, however, contains abundant evidence against such a simplistic smear.

Somewhat more sophisticated proponents of the thesis that the United States and NATO did nothing to provoke Russia, argue that there [was no realistic prospect](#) that Ukraine could join the Alliance for many years, if ever, so Putin had no reason to worry. Those arguments conveniently dodge the point that Moscow did not merely object to Ukraine getting a NATO membership card; more fundamentally, Russian leaders objected to Ukraine becoming a NATO military asset, whether formal membership was a feature or not.

It is an important distinction, because Western weaponry poured into the country, U.S. personnel [trained Ukrainian military and intelligence forces](#), and U.S. forces conducted joint war games (military exercises) with Ukrainian military units, as did forces from other NATO countries. There is even credible evidence that U.S. and Ukrainian intelligence operatives conducted [joint cyberattacks on Russian targets](#). To contend that such actions did not constitute a major provocation is profoundly dishonest.

So much for the first whopper.

Now on to whopper two. A coordinated barrage of propaganda from the administration and its ideological allies insists that Ukraine is a bastion of freedom and democracy now under assault by a brutal authoritarian neighbor.

Former CIA station chief Dan Hoffman [contended](#) that “What scares Vladimir Putin at the heart of this conflict is democracy.” He added that “Putin couldn’t stomach a democracy on his border with a Russian-speaking population and commercial links to Europe.”

At best, that argument is only half right. Russia is the aggressor in the current war, and there is no doubt that Russia is a nasty, authoritarian state. Democracy in that country has been dying a slow death for two decades at Putin’s hands.

However, the notion that Ukraine is a democracy—much less a liberal democracy—is belied

by extensive facts. Even during the early years after the 2014 “Maidan Revolution,” there were numerous [worrisome features to Kyiv’s conduct](#). The new government under **President Petro Poroshenko** implemented onerous censorship measures, harassed and even jailed regime critics, shelled civilians in the secessionist Donetsk and Luhansk regions, and continued the systematic corruption that had plagued Ukraine since it became independent in 1991. Those trends have persisted under current **President Volodymyr Zelensky**.

By the standards of corruption and political freedom alone, Ukraine was not a liberal democracy even before the war with Russia began. The annual report on corruption put out by Transparency International, published in early 2022, should have been extremely sobering to Ukraine’s defenders. Transparency evaluated 180 countries, and on a 1 to 180 scale, with 1 being the country with the least corruption. [Ukraine ranked 122](#), just 14 points better than notoriously corrupt Russia.

In its 2022 annual report on political freedoms, Freedom House rated Ukraine [just “partly free,”](#) a status similar to that given to countries ruled by such sketchy regimes as Rodrigo Duterte’s in the Philippines. Even that was a generous rating at the time, and according to multiple accounts, developments across the board have shown serious deterioration since the war began. Zelensky has [outlawed opposition political parties](#), closed nearly all opposition news outlets, and imprisoned numerous critics and even officials in his own administration, accusing them of being [pro-Russian traitors](#). There are even [credible reports](#) of torture being used in political prisons and of pro-regime death squads operating with impunity throughout the country.

Zelensky and his colleagues have no tolerance for critics, domestic or foreign. The willingness to target and attempt to intimidate foreign critics became abundantly clear this summer when his government’s Center for Countering Disinformation (partly funded by U.S. taxpayers, no less) [published a “blacklist”](#) of such opponents. Numerous prominent Americans were on that list, including University of Chicago Professor (and the dean of foreign policy realists), John Mearsheimer, Fox News host Tucker Carlson, former congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard, and Cato Institute Senior Fellow Doug Bandow. The ominous, threatening nature of the blacklist became even clearer in late September, when the CCD issued a revised roster (including addresses) of the top 35 targets in early October. That narrower, high-priority list denounced those critics as [“disinformation terrorists” and “war criminals.”](#) Such conduct definitely is not consistent with the [behavior of a liberal democracy](#). Yet official Washington and its media echo chamber persist in trying to market that whopper.

Washington’s pervasive, dishonest propaganda campaign is certain to continue, aided and abetted by a [shamelessly pro-war news media](#). The more pertinent question is whether the American people will wake up and realize that they’ve been deceived yet again about a dubious U.S. overseas intervention on behalf of an even more dubious foreign client.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Ted Galen Carpenter, a senior fellow in defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato

Institute and a contributing editor at the American Conservative, is the author of 13 books and more than 1,100 articles on international affairs. His latest book is Unreliable Watchdog: The News Media and U.S. Foreign Policy (2022).

Featured image is from The Libertarian Institute

The original source of this article is [The American Conservative](#)
Copyright © [Ted Galen Carpenter](#), [The American Conservative](#), 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Ted Galen Carpenter](#)

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