

Washington's MH17 End Game: Targetting Moscow as a "State Sponsor of Terrorism", Deployment of "Shadow NATO Forces" inside Ukraine

By [Andrew Korybko](#)

Global Research, July 28, 2014
[Oriental Review](#)

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

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

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

The Ukrainian Civil War took a violent and headline-grabbing international turn for the worst on 17 July following the downing of Flight MH17. Although it appears more and more likely that [it was the Ukrainian Army that shot it down and not the anti-Kiev Resistance](#), pro-Western media has been aggressively pushing the narrative that Russia, specifically President Putin, was involved and has been suppressing evidence to the contrary.

It has even gone as far as to infer that "Russian-backed separatists" carried out a "terrorist attack", further upping [the propaganda ante](#). The reason behind this massive information war is that the US wants to "isolate Russia" and expand NATO into Ukraine, something which it has largely been unable to successfully do up until this point. In fact, it appears as though the US is now readying to play its trump card - granting Ukraine major non-NATO ally status and declaring Russia as a "state sponsor of terrorism", both of which would in turn advance NATO interests and threateningly force the EU to choose whether its destiny lies with the Atlantic or the Continent.

"Operation: Isolation" before Flight MH17

Prior to the downing of MH17, US-led sanctions against Russia were unsuccessful in isolating Moscow. The EU [refused](#) to enact any meaningful sanctions that would endanger its \$330 billion yearly trade with Russia, thereby mitigating the US' economic bullying efforts. In fact, the verbal threat of sanctions was actually beneficial for Russia since it motivated the country to look outside of the West for future economic prospects. [A historic gas deal with China](#) was signed in May that was worth nearly half a trillion dollars, and in the same month, [the Eurasian Economic Union was officially formed](#). Then, right before 17 July, Putin attended the BRICS conference in Brazil where he met with leaders representing nearly half of the world's population, and they committed to creating [the alternative BRICS Development Bank](#). Clearly, Russia wasn't going to be isolated by the West. ❌

All the while this was happening, the US kept trying to find a backdoor way for incorporating Kiev's armed forces into NATO, and it found it through its local lackey, Poland. A [plan](#) was concocted by Ukraine to create a joint brigade between it, Lithuania, and Poland, with Poland being the key NATO partner involved (Lithuania on its own is almost insignificant in international and military affairs of any kind). The importance here is that Kiev has been institutionalizing the relationship it has with its new strategic partner, Poland, also [inviting its former overlord and mercenary-in-arms](#) into the east to assist with "[creating new jobs](#)"

(read: plundering) in Donbass. What is happening here is that even if the West was unsuccessful in isolating Russia, it could at the very least move as much of its influence eastward to the Russian frontier as it can in order to enact maximum pressure on Moscow.

The “Terrorist” Label and Shadow NATO

Almost immediately after it happened, the MH17 catastrophe was seized upon by Western political opportunists as valuable capital for their geostrategic game. As was mentioned in the first paragraph, pro-Western media outlets immediately laid the blame squarely at Putin’s feet, and this wasn’t coincidental. The objective in doing so has been to generate enough anti-Russian sentiment in Europe so as to justify mutually disadvantageous sanctions (more so for the socially and politically fractured EU, many of whose members are still in recession, than for the economically resolute Russia). The EU, and especially Germany, will only “shoot itself in the kneecaps” as either an emotional or forced response, as to do so under any normal circumstances would be absolutely unreasonable.

Thus, the “terrorist” label entered the discourse. 

It has now become popular for Western opinion makers to repeat the Kiev slur that the anti-coup Resistance are “[terrorists](#)”, emphasizing that they are “[Russian-backed](#)” and “[supported by Putin](#)”. It doesn’t matter that none of this is true – what is important is that it is repeated as loudly and as often as can be. The result is to acclimate the public into believing that Russia under Putin is a pariah state, much as Newsweek magazine tried to convince their audience with its [last hate piece](#). Poroshenko has taken things even further, [likening MH17 to Lockerbie and 9/11](#) and trying to get Donetsk and Lugansk’s governments [on the international terrorist list](#).

It is only a short leap of “logic” to see the connection between Russia and Putin as terrorist sponsors and the US’ designation of state-sponsor-of-terrorism status onto the country. Such a step would lead to immediate US sanctions and intense pressure on the EU to cut off its major non-energy trade contacts with Russia and fiendishly move towards diversifying away from Russian gas (to say nothing of killing the South Stream project). The US will only take this extreme step if it is sure that it has more influence over Europe than Russia does and that Europe can be convinced to sacrifice its economic well-being for ideological and political reasons (which is not that far-off of a possibility for such an indoctrinated leadership).

Just as before the tragedy, it must be noted that the US is still pursuing the goal of shadow NATO integration with Ukraine parallel to isolating Russia. It is [reported](#) that it may be on the cusp of granting Ukraine major non-NATO ally status and even [providing pinpoint precision intelligence](#) for attacking anti-Kiev SAM sites. This could rapidly creep into something much more, per the Libya model, especially since US military advisors [will be on the ground](#). Thus, in one fell swoop, by evoking the “terrorist” label, the US can ‘kill two birds with one stone’ – guilt/force the EU into “isolating Russia” (thereby isolating and harming itself as well) and swallow Ukraine into Shadow NATO.

Concluding Thoughts

The US has plainly demonstrated that it is salivating for a Cold War redux with Russia, and once more, Europe is caught in the middle. It is completely contrary to any of its interests

for it to participate in this needless and aggressive geopolitical struggle, but as the EU seems wont to do nowadays, it may easily get sucked into it out of misguided ideological and political reasons dictated by the US. In fact, it may have little choice: the US could unilaterally declare Russia as a state sponsor of terrorism and then force the EU, whose [largest export market is the US](#) and with whom it is negotiating the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (which European political elite naively believe will benefit them), into acquiescing to its military occupier's demands. This wouldn't "isolate" Russia, which has already made a strong push into the non-Western world since April, as much as it would isolate the EU, but ironically, this may even work in Washington's favor by crippling its friendly economic rival and keeping it under its thumb for at least another decade.

Moreover, Russia as a "state sponsor of terrorism" would create a clear dividing line between the West and Russia and could give a renewed hybrid purpose to NATO. Whereas in the Cold War it was an anti-Russian organization and then in the "Global War on Terror" it nominally became an anti-terrorist organization, it may soon carry the new hybrid mission of containing a "terrorist-supporting" Russia. This would also provide enhanced justification to European populations for the deployment of even more US and NATO personnel in Eastern Europe, as well as deeper and faster Shadow NATO integration for Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova, thereby laying the framework for a Western battering ram into Russia's Near Abroad. All of this would rightfully alarm Russia, which would then defensively ramp up its multivector cooperation with 'The Rest' and BRICS. This would be especially so for its prized strategic partner and fellow Western target, China, potentially creating an eventual de-facto alliance between the two giants out of shared security concerns and transforming the Eurasian strategic landscape.

Andrew Korybko is the American political correspondent of [Voice of Russia](#) who currently lives and studies in Moscow, exclusively for [ORIENTAL REVIEW](#).

The original source of this article is [Oriental Review](#)
Copyright © [Andrew Korybko](#), [Oriental Review](#), 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Korybko](#)

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

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