

What Liberals Get Wrong About Obama and Ukraine's War

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, February 06, 2015

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

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

Liberals won't acknowledge that they've "been had" by Barack Obama when they believed his liberal rhetoric; they won't acknowledge it, even after Obama has proven by his actions that he is actually extremely conservative (a [total agent of Wall Street](#); and, thus, [inequality has been rising under his rule](#)); Obama is conservative despite his liberal rhetoric, which is [designed to deceive them](#); and he has — which is the worst thing of all — intentionally caused an extremely bloody ethnic cleansing in Ukraine, a war there against those of Ukraine's citizens who think that Russia is a better country than the United States: an ethnic cleansing to cement-in, as permanent, a rabidly anti-Russian Government in Ukraine, by getting rid of the people there who had voted for the man Obama overthrew. This is, historically, the first time in history that any American President has sponsored an ethnic cleansing: it's an attempt to exterminate a civilian population. That's how bad Obama actually is.

Liberals won't acknowledge either [the violent coup in Ukraine](#), or the [brutal ethnic-cleansing campaign](#) to cement its result: an [anti-Russian Government on Russia's doorstep](#) — a [very real threat to Russia's national security, and a very aggressive American policy against Russians](#).

The founder of Stratfor, the "private CIA" firm, says that the overthrow of Viktor Yanukovich in Ukraine in February 2014 was ["the most blatant coup in history."](#) The President of the Czech Republic contrasts that coup versus Czechoslovakia's authentically democratic 1968 "Velvet Revolution," and he says that ["only poorly informed people"](#) don't know that the governmental overthrow in Ukraine in 2014 was a coup. America's liberals, then, *are indeed* poorly informed, and they are so partly because they don't *want* to know the truth about Obama; America's conservatives, by contrast, simply hate Obama, merely because he's a black Democratic politician (and any President who has been so good to Wall Street would be loved by them if he were a white Republican); they don't mind (and they actually support) that Obama hates Russia and institutes an ethnic cleansing campaign in his aggressive war against Russia. Whereas conservatives don't mind Obama's ethnic-cleansing campaign to get rid of pro-Russians in Ukraine, liberals don't want to know about it. The result is actually conservatives reigning in both Parties, not just in one: we now have one-party government, in all but name.

Typical on the liberal side is Professor Steven F. Cohen, a supposed Russia-expert, who sometimes writes articles for his wife's liberal magazine (which she, Katrina vanden Heuvel, owns), *The Nation*, and plays dumb about Obama's anti-Russian coup in Ukraine, and he even says, on Amy Goodman's [February 3rd "Democracy Now!"](#): "Many people have argued that the United States organized a coup in February to overthrow the president of Ukraine

and bring to power of this new pro-American, pro-Western government. I do not know if that's true."

The founder of Stratfor is correct: it's not only true, it is *blatantly* true. In fact: this was *the best-documented coup in all of human history*; and some of the documentation of it is simply stunning. For example: [Here is Obama's selected and hired U.S. State Department official, who is responsible for policy in Europe, Victoria Nuland, telling the U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey Pyatt, on 4 February 2014](#), whom to get appointed to be the leader of the Ukrainian Government to replace Ukraine's democratically elected President — and it was "Yats" Yatsenyuk, who, 22 days later, *did, in fact, become appointed to rule in Ukraine* as the new Prime Minister when the coup occurred, to rule that country not as being its President, because that would be unseemly (to replace the President directly); but, instead, Yatsenyuk himself chose the rabidly anti-Russian fundamentalist Baptist preacher Oleksandr Turchynov to fill that post until the voters in the extremely conservative and anti-Russian northwestern half of Ukraine would select a 'democratic' President, from among a field of pre-selected extremely right-wing anti-Russian candidates on May 25th. (The voters in Ukraine's *non-fascist* southeastern half were so turned off (if they hadn't already seceded from this rabidly right-wing Ukrainian Government), so that [the electoral turnout in that half of the country was small to nil](#). The current Ukrainian Government does not represent those people, but still wants to control their land and all the resources that lie under it (such as gas).

This was an extremely violent coup that Professor Steven Cohen says he doesn't know about (that he doesn't know about even though it was captured in hundreds of shocking videos, which he apparently hasn't seen or else doesn't want to understand — [here are some of the best of those](#)).

Cohen should look at what Obama is doing in the former Ukraine, right now:

<http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2015/02/ukraine-war-feb-4th-updates-prezrak-ghost-battalion-commander-alexey-mosgovoy-future-ukraines-war.html>

Is he blind, or does he simply refuse to see?

Will he blame the slaughter on Obama's underlings, whom Obama hired? They're doing the jobs Obama hired them to do. This is Obama's Administration — no one else's. They ran his coup, appointed the new Government, and oversee [the ethnic cleansing this Government does](#) after being installed.

Is Cohen going to excuse Obama's total lack of expressed outrage against the [barbarisms](#) that the Government he placed into power has perpetrated? Of course not: these things have been done on Obama's behalf. That's why Obama perpetrated the coup: this is the purpose of it: to install a rabidly anti-Russian Government on Russia's doorstep, in Ukraine, ready and eager to place nuclear missiles within a ten-minute flight to Moscow — checkmate. In order to do this, Obama needs to get rid of the people in the area of Ukraine whose 90% votes for the former neutral Ukrainian President, Viktor Yanukovich, had made Yanukovich President. If those voters aren't eliminated, then the current, Russia-hating Ukrainian Government, will be elected out of office in a subsequent election. That's the reason why the area of the former Ukraine that is now undergoing [firebombing, clusterbombing](#), and other [exterminationist](#) measures, which is [the area that's shown in dark purple on the far-eastern side of this map](#), is exactly the same area that had voted 90% for

the person, Yanukovych, whom Obama overthrew (and the EU was [shocked to find out that it had, indeed, been a coup](#)). The purpose of this ethnic cleansing is to assure that, in the future, pro-Russian voters in Ukraine, most especially the 90%-voters-for-Yanukovych (the residents in this area), won't ever again be in Ukraine to vote on candidates for the national Government. Obama wants the U.S. Government to control all of Ukraine, including the land where those people have lived their lives, but he doesn't want those people on it. He wants them either [dead](#), or [gone to Russia](#), so that they won't be able to participate in future Ukrainian elections and reverse the strategic impact of Obama's 2014 Ukrainian coup.

[Evading Obama's culpability in both the coup and the subsequent ethnic-cleansing in Ukraine is nothing new for Cohen](#), and any 'news' media that participate in spreading or else ignoring such evasions are not to be trusted by any intelligent reader or viewer or hearer. Spreading of such liberal pap is placing against the conservative poison of Fox 'News' etc., not an opponent but a nullity. It might be liberal, if liberalism is simply the verbal repudiation of conservatism, but it's not an *alternative* to conservatism; it is definitely *not* progressivism; it is just an *absence of ideology*, being put up against the very real — and this nation's dominant — ideology, which is conservatism, or "the right."

No nation whose political discourse ranges between conservatism and nothingness can be anything else than extremist conservative, or fascist (essentially pure conservatism), which seems to be what now exists in the United States.

In the case of Barack Obama, who is the first American President to install an outright racist-fascist (in this instance, a rabidly anti-Russian) government — in other words a *nazi* government — anywhere in the world, and who is also the first American President to sponsor an ethnic cleansing anywhere in the world, what we actually have in the U.S. right now is a nazi President and a nazi Congress to support his nazism. Obama is not out to exterminate the Jews as Hitler was; he is out to exterminate, or else to achieve U.S. domination over, the Russian people.

If America does not repudiate that, then America has transmogrified into what America was waging war against in World War II. It's spitting onto the graves of America's WW II heroes.

'News' media that tolerate (as liberals do), or else encourage (as conservatives do), nazi control over the U.S., are not news media for a democratic nation. They are 'news' media for a fascist one. That's what we've now got.

There should be millions of people marching on Washington to stop this U.S.-initiated and -backed genocide of Ukraine's pro-Russian population. Where are the 'peace' marchers? Maybe they think that people such as Steven Cohen are the ones to follow.

Is that the best America now has?

This American anti-Russian nazism could lead to a [nuclear WW III](#).

PS: This is a response to the earliest group of reader-comments to [this article as posted at Fort Russ](#), because those comments fall into two categories, both of which I find disturbing:

1) There are several comments that are plainly anti-Semitic, and which therefore belong in the league along with the ethnicity that was the obsession of Germany's form of nazism, that of the original Nazi Party. Such readers apparently have nothing better to respond to the American aristocracy's and their Ukrainian agents' anti-Russian nazism than to side with

Hitler's form of nazism, and that's neither an intelligent nor a germane way to respond to any form of racist fascism; I find all racist fascisms to be deplorable.

2) There are also several comments that defend Professor Cohen's claimed ignorance on whether there was a coup in Ukraine, and that assert that because Cohen is a liberal and is the highest-profile one who is allowed onto the major 'news' media to discuss this matter, he should not be held to account for understating the vileness of the reality here. I do not respect any such blurring of Obama's horrendous guilt in this extremely important historical matter: Obama caused the coup, and Russia had to respond to it, which was a basic defensive necessity for that country, not at all optional, neither as regards Russia's accepting the obvious desire of the vast majority of Crimeans to rejoin Russia, nor as regards Russia's assisting the tragic victims in Donbass to protect their lives against the Obama-nazi assault from Kiev. If one (such as Cohen) alleges that there is question as to whether Obama perpetrated a coup in the violent overthrow of Yanukovych, then one is alleging that Russia might have been the instigator of the conflict here, when Russia responded to it with protection of the Crimeans and protection of the Donbassers. What Cohen is doing is to assert that he doesn't have any idea which side was the aggressor here. If there was no coup, then Obama was not the aggressor. Is that really a serious possibility? I would not be devoting most of my time since at least last May 2nd to reporting on the return of the nazi threat, if there was any reason whatsoever to doubt Obama's guilt as the aggressor in the Ukrainian war. To me, what Obama is doing here is to spit on the graves of all Americans who died in World War II. Tolerance of nazism, such as by saying "I don't know which side is the aggressor here, and which side is responding to that aggression" is despicable. One might as well say that maybe Germany's Nazis were defending Germany's Christians from the deprivations by all Jews inside and outside Germany. Steven F. Cohen's expressed position compromises truth just as much.

*Investigative historian **Eric Zuesse** is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).*

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

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