

# This Will Result in Certain War!

It's Official! Russia Central bank Announces Ruble Bound to Gold! 5000 Rubles per Gram!

If this report from Hal Turner is correct, and there is no reason to doubt it, the table stakes has gone off the charts. Sunday evening March 27, 2022, Hal Turner posted the following report.

The Central Bank of Russia has officially announced that, as of March 28, 2022, the Russian Ruble currency is BOUND to Gold. The rate is 5,000 Rubles per gram of gold bullion.

*(NOTE: This story has been corrected to report "TROY" ounces as opposed to dry ounces, and the values recomputed to reflect there are more grams per TROY ounce than in a dry ounce.)*

There are 32 grams in each TROY ounce. 32 grams times 5,000 rubles per Gram is 160,000 Rubles. Ya with me so far?

The conversion rate of Rubles to U.S. Dollars is 100 Rubles, 90 Kopecs, to each U.S. Dollar.

If Rubles are bound to Gold at 5000 Rubles per gram, and there are 32 grams per TROY ounce, meaning one ounce of gold would cost 160,000 Rubles, then converting that to U.S. Dollars means Gold is \$1600 per ounce when using Rubles, instead of \$1,928 per ounce using Dollars.

Russia just wiped out about thirty percent (30%) of the value of the U.S. Dollar, worldwide, when it comes to Gold Bullion.

Worse, because Russia will only sell its oil and gas in Rubles, and Rubles are now fixed at 5,000 Rubles per gram, anyone wishing to buy Oil or Gas will need to either pay in Rubles or pay in Gold, and they won't get the U.S. Dollar value for the gold they tender as payment!

People around the world will be literally THROWING their money at the Ruble and DUMPING Dollars and EUROS to do it.

What Russia just did is the financial equivalent of detonating a nuclear bomb.

FWIW, the last guy on this planet who tried to back a currency with Gold, was Muammar Quadaffi of Libya.

NATO went into Libya, bombed the sh+t out of it, until the people of Libya grabbed Quadaffi on the street, beat him bloody, and put a bullet in his head.

As of this hour, 10:39 PM EDT, I suspect Bankers all over the world are on the phones with each other and with heads of state, instructing them that what Russia has done will totally smash both the U.S. Dollar and the EURO, and those Bankers will be telling the heads of State that World War 3 must commence immediately.

Let me explain why.

Today, the Russian Central Bank pegged Rubles to Gold.

Last week, Russia declared they would only sell OIL and GAS in . . . Rubles.

This means Russian OIL and GAS are pegged to Gold with Rubles as the proxy for Gold.

EFFECT: Europe (that needs Russian Gas and Oil) will now have to buy Rubles from Putin using Gold, or pay for the Oil and Gas with Gold itself.

Currently, the FOREX Rate for Rubles to Dollars is about 100:1

BUT . . . with 5,000 Rubles now equaling one gram of Gold, and oil being priced directly in Gold, we are going to see a MASSIVE price disruption in FOREX markets, in terms of how much Gold a Dollar can still buy.

Foreign countries holding our Dollar Debt Notes in Reserve, will see an immediate, and far less use for them and will want to start dumping them in favor of something more stable; something which holds its value.

Basically, any currency pegged to Gold will fit the bill. it means countries like that -- like Japan -- will start dumping their Dollar Debt as fast as they can -- they are NOT going to go down with the ship! They will move into more stable currencies, like . . . the Ruble.

This will have a DE-flationary effect on the Ruble, making it more valuable over time.

This also means Putin can re-peg the Ruble any time he wants, to like 500, or 50, or 10. IT just keeps getting more valuable for him.

The instant result is that all those foreign countries dumping their Dollar Reserves will cause all those excess Dollars to start coming home, triggering worse hyper-inflation than we already have now in the USA.

Is it any wonder why Biden was on stage last week calling for Regime change in Russia? He is about to have masses of angry and literally starving Americans marching through the streets here at home demanding answers.

In Blessed Hope #97, I mentioned “Project Sandman” and how 100 countries are about to drop the Petro-dollar or U.S. Dollar as the reserve currency of the world for buying oil and gas. This is huge with ramifications that will ripple around the world and with certainty lead to World War 3, and the Ukraine war is the pretext to destroy Russia! The U.S. and NATO are likely to execute a “false flag” event within a matter of days. Putin has all but destroyed the International Banksters in a single swoop of the pen! They will not take this action sitting down. Nate Rothschild called it a few weeks ago when he said Putin must be destroyed if you want to keep the New World Order!

Few people today ask the most important question about the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. Many people want America to stay out of the fight, but even they don't ask the vital question. Why does the world face a crisis today? Why has a border dispute between Russia and Ukraine escalated to the point where people fear nuclear war?

The answer is simple. America, under the “leadership” of brain-dead Biden and the forces controlling him, has done this and, by doing so, brought the world to the brink of disaster. As always, the great Dr. Ron Paul gets it right: *“Three weeks into this terrible war, the U.S. is not pursuing talks with Russia. As Antiwar.com recently reported, instead of supporting negotiations between Ukraine and Russia that could lead to a ceasefire and an end to the bloodshed, the U.S. government is actually escalating the situation which can only increase the bloodshed.”*

*“The constant flow of U.S. and allied weapons into Ukraine and talk of supporting an extended insurgency does not seem designed to give Ukraine a victory on the battlefield but rather to hand Russia what Secretary of State Blinken called ‘a strategic defeat’.”*

*“It sounds an awful lot like the Biden Administration intends to fight Russia down to the last Ukrainian. The only solution for the U.S. is to get out. Let the Russians and Ukrainians reach an agreement. That means no NATO for Ukraine and no U.S. missiles on Russia's borders? So what! End the war then end NATO.”*

Let's look at an analogy that will help us understand Dr. Paul's point. For years, the Ukrainian government has attacked an area in the Donbas region that has seceded from Ukraine and formed an independent, pro-Russian, republic. Just before Putin moved against Ukraine, Ukrainians increased the scale and scope of their attack. Rick Rozoff describes what they did: *“Two-thirds of Ukrainian army servicemen have been amassed along the Donbas contact line, Eduard Basurin, spokesman for the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic (DPR) militia, said on Thursday.”*

*“Another three brigades are on their way [to Donbas], which is 20,000 to 25,000 troops more. The total number will reach 150,000, not to mention the nationalists. This is about*

*two-thirds of Ukrainian Armed Forces' personnel,"* Basurin said on the Rossiya 1 television channel (VGTRK) on Thursday.

*"Ukrainian troops are stationed along the 320-kilometer front line,"* he said.

Unlike what has just happened, the Ukrainian attack did not result in U.S. sanctions on Ukraine. There were no meetings of the UN to condemn Ukrainian aggression. There was no talk of world war. On the contrary, Ukraine government used American weapons in its attack and asked America for more weapons to continue their attack. Let's listen to Rick Rozoff again: *"The Armed Forces of Ukraine used the American anti-tank missile system Javelin in the hostilities in Donbas. This was announced by the head of the Main Intelligence Directorate of the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine Kirill Budanov in an interview...."*

Budanov said that ideally, the U.S. would help deter any Russian incursion, through additional military aid and increased diplomatic and economic pressure, including more sanctions against Russia and the seizure and blocking of Russian banking accounts.

Also, in addition to U.S. aid already promised and delivered, including Mark VI patrol boats, Javelin anti-armor systems and AN/TPQ-53 light counter-fire radar systems, Ukraine seeks additional air, missile and drone defense systems and electronic jamming devices, Budonov said. Patriot missile batteries and counter rocket, artillery and mortar systems are on Ukraine's wish list.

The AN/TPQ-53 systems were used to great effect, Ukraine military officials have previously reported. Budanov said, *"the Javelin systems have also been used against Russian forces. Those, along with Turkish-manufactured drones, used against Russian-aligned separatist artillery troops, have a significant psychological deterrent value, said Budanov."*

Why the difference? We think that the U.S. should not have shipped arms to Ukraine. Doing this made the situation worse. But for what we're saying now, it doesn't matter what you think of the policy. The key point is that because there was no international outcry and no sanctions, the matter remained a local fight. If brain dead Biden and his gang had reacted to the so-called Russian "invasion" in the same way, the matter would have remained a local quarrel. Russia and Ukraine would have made a deal and that would be that.

The neocon warmongers and other defenders of *"democracy,"* who unfortunately include some deluded *"libertarians"* object. Don't we have a duty to resist *"aggression?"* The answer is clear: No, we don't. We do not have a duty to evaluate every foreign quarrel and assess who is at fault. We do not have a duty to require leaders of regimes we, or rather our masters in Washington, don't like to accept existing boundaries of countries as unchangeable. We should reject the false doctrine of *"collective security,"* which makes every border disputes a world war. The great American historian Charles Beard recognized what was wrong with *"collective security"* in the 1930s. In his article, *"Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels,"* he asked: *"On what ... should the foreign policy of*

*the United States be based? Here is one answer and it is not excogitated in any professor's study or supplied by political agitators. It is the doctrine formulated by George Washington, supplemented by James Monroe, and followed by the Government of the United States until near the end of the nineteenth century, when the frenzy for foreign adventurism burst upon the country. This doctrine is simple. Europe has a set of 'primary interests' which have little or no relation to us, and is constantly vexed by 'ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice.' The United States is a continental power separated from Europe by a wide ocean which, despite all changes in warfare, is still a powerful asset of defense. In the ordinary or regular vicissitudes of European politics the United States should not become implicated by any permanent ties. We should promote commerce, but force 'nothing.' We should steer clear of hates and loves. We should maintain correct and formal relations with all established governments without respect to their forms or their religions, whether Christian, Mohammedan, Shinto, or what have you." Beard was referring to the Monroe Doctrine in his words.*

Beard then responded to those who wanted to scrap our traditional policy of non-intervention with "collective security": *"In the rest of the world, outside this hemisphere, our interests are remote and our power to enforce our will is relatively slight. Nothing we can do for Europeans will substantially increase our trade or add to our, or their, well-being. Nothing we can do for Asiatics will materially increase our trade or add to our, or their, well-being. With all countries in Europe and Asia, our relations should be formal and correct. As individuals we may indulge in hate and love, but the Government of the United States embarks on stormy seas when it begins to love one power and hate another officially. We should heed Beard's wisdom today. Otherwise, the world may go up in flames."*

David Stockman's Contra Corner said recently,

*"Economic, social and political dangers abound. That's because Washington and its subservient mainstream media are delirious with war fever like at no time in the last seven decades.*

*The resulting reckless pursuit of an unhinged Sanctions War against Russia poses a dire threat to the global economy and domestic prosperity and does so for no good reason of homeland security whatsoever.*

*With respect to the latter, the sheer facts are overwhelming. So we repeat them with an added total for the respective military budgets: To wit, the economic might of NATO is 29X that of Russia and its combined defense budgets are 18X greater, which tells you all you need to know about the "Russian threat":*

NATO: \$42.78 trillion of GDP; 945 million population; \$45,130 per capita income; \$1,200 billion defense budget;

RUSSIA: \$1.46 trillion of GDP; 144 million population; \$10,300 per capita income; \$67 billion defense budget."

Given these realities, why should Washington care about an intramural battle among contiguous peoples and territories that have been joined at the hip for most of the last 1300 years?

The implicit answer is because it's the world's self-appointed policeman and Spanker-in-Chief.

Beyond that, it's apparently due to a putative aggrandizement syndrome. That is, Putin's Russia may be puny in the economic and military scheme of things today, but once it is permitted to acquire a taste for conquest it is certain to grow into a Hitlerian monster.

Needless to say, the former reason is based on Washington's institutionalized arrogance and has no place at all in realistic thinking about national security, while the latter is based on sheer ignorance about the actual history of Hitler's conquests.

The truth is, there was nothing inexorable about it. Contrary to today's nostrums, Nazi Germany wasn't a self-feeding *deus ex machina* of conquest, nor was it a generic model of what happens when ruthless dictators are not braced with opposing force early on.

To the contrary, Hitler was a product of a specific, unique and unfortunate history that bears no resemblance to current circumstances on the Ukrainian/Russian line of conflict. In fact, Hitler's original expansion was rooted in deep German grievances about its territorial, industrial and financial (i.e. onerous reparations) decapitation by the vengeful winners at Versailles.

Thus, the re-occupation of the Alsace-Lorain and the Ruhr, the annexation of the German speaking Sudetenland, the dispute over the Danzig Corridor in Poland – all involved the reclamation of former German territories, while the Anschluss with Austria was a voluntary marriage of German-speaking losers from the abomination of 1919.

So Hitler's rise and initial territorial expansion had been preventable, not inexorable, because it was rooted in historic mistakes that took on a life of their own: Namely, the irridentism of an aggrieved German population that had been stripped of 15% of its historic territory and upwards of 50% of its coal and other industrial resources by the "peacemakers" at Versailles.

Stated differently, Hitler was the metastasized residue of history gone wrong, not the inexorable product of annexing, for instance, the overwhelmingly German speaking population of the Sudetenland. The latter had been extracted from Germany in 1919 and handed to the new state of Czechoslovakia, which, in turn, had been carved out of whole cloth by President Woodrow Wilson & Co.

The correct lesson from the 1930s, therefore, is more nearly the opposite of the *deus ex machina* aggrandizement syndrome peddled by Washington and Brussels. It was the West's insistence on the creation and perpetuation of the artificial states of Poland and

Czechoslovakia that gestated Hitler, not the mere fact of neighboring territories being conquered after the fact.

As it happened, Poland had disappeared from the maps of Europe in 1795 and had no reason to come back in the fulsome extent provided by the Versailles Treaty except for Wilson's courting of the Polish vote in the industrial Midwest. Similarly, the mongrel state of Czechoslovakia with its linguistic, religious and ethnic concoction had no historical basis or reason for existence at all. Well, again, except for American electoral machinations, which constituted the raw politics underlying Wilson's messianic determination to remake the map of the world so as to be "safe for democracy" in his own exalted opinion.

The fact is, Ukraine is the Poland and Czechoslovakia of the present time – an artificial state loaded with Russians and with no reason for existence in its present form and girth. Well, still again, other than Washington's fanatical insistence that the happenstance map of administrative units which fell out of the Soviet Union's collapse constitute sacred borders that must be preserved at all hazards.

To the contrary, what Putin wants, ironically, is the pre-communist status quo ante. That is, he wants Crimea, where Ukrainians constitute but a tiny minority and which had been Russian since 1783. And, more crucially, which hosts the greatest strategic military asset possessed by Russia thereafter – the great Naval base at the headwaters of the Black Sea in Sevastopol.

Likewise, the Donbas and territories east of the Dnieper River and along the northern edge of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov have been Russian for upwards of 300 years. By all facts of pre-1922 history, these territories amounted to Novorossiia ("New Russia") as shown in this map from 1897.

As it happened, they became "Ukrainian" only by writ of two of history's greatest evil monsters – Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin – who placed them in the administrative unit of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for reasons that have no historic validity whatsoever.

Yet a devastating war goes on there today – a war which is careening to the precipice of WWII – because Washington encourages Kiev to insist on retention of "every inch" of a map put together by Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev.

In fact, the latter did for the map of Ukraine what Woodrow Wilson & Co. did to Germany after the Great War. That is to say, these long gone commie dictators extracted from Russian and Polish territories a combustible mongrel that begs to be partitioned and returned to the status quo ante, not defended to the last drop of Ukrainian blood and US/NATO treasure.

Needless to say, there is no Washington policy-maker familiar with the above map, nor Capitol Hill armchair warrior who has a clue. Most especially, by shrieking about

“borders” being violated and the need for all out support to a heroic nation valiantly resisting the Russian ogre, the GOP’s bloodthirsty hawks and neocons have made it easy as pie for Biden and his national security minions to pivot to an all-out war footing against Russia, thereby distracting the American public from the abysmal failure of their domestic policies.

Indeed, red in tooth and claw the vast majority of Republicans are now demanding suicidal measures like a No Fly Zone and secondary sanctions, including against China. The latter are being proffered in the vain hope that it will weaken Russia enough to eventually cause it to quit its *“invasion”* and permit the map of Ukraine to revert to what Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev ordered it to be.

One of these war-loving Republicans is Senator Pat Toomey (R-PA), ranking member of the Senate Banking Committee, who recently relieved himself of the following gem in an op-ed published in *‘The Wall Street Journal’*.

*“To cut off Mr. Putin’s oil and gas sales globally, the administration and Congress should impose secondary sanctions on the entirety of Russia’s financial sector.”*

What he means is that any bank on the entire planet which should dare to defy Washington’s writ and finance a Russian oil trade to a third party, such as China, India or Brazil, should be slapped with sanctions for aiding and abetting what amounts to global commerce—now redefined as an act of war against the U.S. and NATO.

So to repeat: The GOP has gone for full-scale *“war socialism.”* Suddenly, the rights of private property owners are not so sacred after all – if they are involved in exporting, importing or financial intermediation with anything Russian. In those instances, they are far game for Washington’s economic draft – and the consequent loss of markets, sales, profits and value on the say so of war-loving blowhards like Senator Toomey.

The worst thing, of course, is that all of this *“war socialism”* has nothing to do with defense of the homeland or anything rational at all. To the contrary, it’s the rotten spawn of an Imperial City populated by careerist politicians who get their jollies pretending to be the suzerains of mankind and Spanker-in-Chief of the planet’s malefactors.

Unfortunately, the current mess isn’t the half of it. The MSM is presenting such a distorted and fanciful picture of on-the-ground conditions in the Ukraine that the American public is totally in the dark about what comes next. That is, the Ukrainian military has been decimated and the resistance of the Kiev government is on its last legs – notwithstanding the nonstop whistling past the graveyard of the nation’s clownish president.

Recently, the peripatetic Mike Whitney had a powerful interview with one Larry C Johnson. The latter is a veteran of the CIA and the State Department’s Office of Counter Terrorism. He is the founder and managing partner of BERG Associates, which was established in 1998 to provide training to the US Military’s Special Operations



community. He has been vilified by the right and the left, which means he must be doing something right.

In any event, Johnson summarized what amounts to the dogs of war which are not barking on the Ukrainian side of the ledger. The implication is that it's only a matter of time until a fait accompli on the ground in Ukraine results in the aforementioned partition of its borders and the demilitarization and neutralization of the rump state left behind, even as Washington finds itself in full-scale economic war with Russia.

That is to say, either Imperial Washington is going to surrender from its Sanctions War or the real truth of the matter will come to light. Namely, that the violation of Ukraine's putative borders is only the excuse for Washington hegemonic determination to call the shots in the former Soviet Union – just like it has attempted to do elsewhere on the planet during the last 70 years in the name of promoting democracy.

As to the looming collapse of the Ukrainian resistance, here are the key spoiler alerts from the Johnson interview, conveying the inconvenient truths about where the war is actually heading.

Russia's de facto No Fly Zone within the first 24 hours of the Russian military operation in Ukraine, all Ukrainian Ground Radar Intercept capabilities were wiped out. Without those radars, the Ukrainian Air Force lost its ability to do air to air intercept. In the intervening three weeks, Russia has established a de facto No Fly Zone over Ukraine. While still vulnerable to shoulder fired Surface to Air Missiles supplied by the U.S. and NATO to the Ukrainians, there is no evidence that Russia has had to curtail Combat Air Operations.

#### The Allegedly Stalled 40-Mile Russian Column

When a 24 mile (or 40 mile, depends on the news source) was positioned north of Kiev for more than a week, it was clear that Ukraine's ability to launch significant military operations had been eliminated. If their artillery was intact, then that column was easy pickings for massive destruction. That did not happen. Alternatively, if the Ukrainian's had a viable fixed wing or rotary wing capability they should have destroyed that column from the air. That did not happen. Or, if they had a viable cruise missile capability they should have rained down hell on the supposedly stalled Russian column. That did not happen. The Ukrainians did not even mount a significant infantry ambush of the column with their newly supplied US Javelins.

#### Cut Off to the South, North and East:

We have not seen a single instance of a Ukrainian regiment or brigade size unit attacking and defeating a comparable Russian unit. Instead, the Russians have split the Ukrainian Army into fragments and cut their lines of communication. The Russians are consolidating their control of Mariupol and have secured all approaches on the Black Sea. Ukraine is now cut off in the South and the North.

## Destruction of De Facto NATO Military Bases:

The really big news came this week with the Russian missile strikes on what are de facto NATO bases in Yavoriv and Zhytomyr. NATO conducted cyber security training at Zhytomyr in September 2018 and described Ukraine as a “NATO partner.” Zhytomyr was destroyed with hypersonic missiles on Saturday. Yavoriv suffered a similar fate last Sunday. It was the primary training and logistics center that NATO and EUCOM used to supply fighters and weapons to Ukraine. A large number of the military and civilian personnel at that base became casualties.

## Agreement with Colonel Douglas Macgregor – A Guest on the Tucker Carlson Show Who Said:

*“The war is really over for the Ukrainians. They have been ground into bits, there is no question about that despite what we hear from our mainstream media. So, the real question for us at this stage is, Tucker, are we going to live with the Russian people and their government or we going to continue to pursue this sort of regime change dressed up as a Ukrainian war? Are we going to stop using Ukraine as a battering ram against Moscow, which is effectively what we’ve done.”*

## Washington’s Massive Miscalculation:

*I am shocked at the miscalculation in thinking economic sanctions on Russia would bring them to their knees. The opposite is true. Russia is self-sufficient and is not dependent on imports. Its exports are critical to the economic well-being of the West. If they withhold wheat, potash, gas, oil, palladium, finished nickel and other key minerals from the West, the European and US economies will be savaged. And this attempt to coerce Russia with sanctions has now made it very likely that the US dollar’s role as the international reserve currency will show up in the dustbin of history.*

Rick Sterling an independent journalist wrote a piece for Global Research on the RAND “think tank” prescribing how U.S. provocations against Russia designed to undermine Russia. The report was written in a 2019 Rand report titled “Overextending and Unbalancing Russia”, the U.S. goal is to undermine Russia just as it did the Soviet Union in the cold war. Rather than “*trying to stay ahead*” or trying to improve the U.S. domestically or in international relations, the emphasis is on efforts and actions to undermine the designated adversary Russia. Rand is a quasi-US governmental think tank that receives three-quarters of its funding from the U.S. military.

The report lists anti-Russia measures divided into the following areas: economic, geopolitical, ideological/informational, and military. They are assessed according to the perceived risks, benefits and “likelihood of success”.

# Overextending and Unbalancing Russia

## Assessing the Impact of Cost-Imposing Options

by James Dobbins, Raphael S. Cohen, Nathan Chandler, Bryan Frederick, Edward Geist, Paul DeLuca, Forrest E. Morgan, Howard J. Shatz, Brent Williams

Related Topics: Geopolitical Strategic Competition, Military Command and Control, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Nuclear Deterrence, Peacekeeping and Stability Operations, Russia, U.S.-European Relations



### Screenshot from [RAND](#)

The report notes that Russia has “deep seated” anxieties about western interference and potential military attack. These anxieties are deemed to be a vulnerability to exploit. There is no mention of the cause of the Russian anxieties: they have been invaded multiple times and had 27 million deaths in WW2.

### Significance of Ukraine

Ukraine is important to Russia. The two countries share much common heritage and a long common border. One of the most important leaders of the Soviet Union, **Nikita Khrushchev**, was Ukrainian. During WW2, Ukraine was one of Hitler’s invasion routes and there was a small but active number of Ukrainian collaborators with Nazi Germany. The distance from the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, to Moscow is less than 500 miles.

For these same reasons of geography and history, Ukraine is a major component of a US/NATO effort to undermine Russia. Current Under-Secretary for Political Affairs, **Victoria Nuland**, said that over 20 years the US invested \$5 billion in the project to turn Ukraine. The culmination was a violent coup in February 2014. Since 2015, the U.S. has been training ultra nationalist and Neo-Nazi militias. This has been documented in articles such as “[U.S. House admits Nazi role in Ukraine](#)” (Robert Parry, 2015), “[The US is arming and assisting neo-nazis in Ukraine while the House debates prohibition](#)”(Max Blumenthal, 2018), “[Neo Nazis and the far right are on the march in Ukraine](#)” (Lev Golinken in 2019) and “[The CIA may be breeding Nazi terror in Ukraine](#)” (Branko Marcetic Jan. 2022).

### Rand suggested provocations

Prior to 2018, the U.S. only provided “defensive” military weaponry to Ukraine. The Rand report assesses that providing lethal (offensive) military aid to Ukraine will have a high risk but also a high benefit. Accordingly, U.S. lethal weaponry skyrocketed from near zero to **\$250M** in 2019, to **\$303M** in 2020, to **\$350M** in 2021. Total military aid is much higher. A few weeks ago, *The Hill* [reported](#), “*The U.S. has contributed more than \$1 billion to help Ukraine’s military over the past year*”.

The Rand report lists many techniques and “measures” to provoke and threaten Russia. Some of the steps include:

- Repositioning bombers within easy striking range of key Russian strategic targets
- Deploying additional tactical nuclear weapons to locations in Europe and Asia

- Increasing U.S. and allied naval force posture and presence in Russia's operating areas (Black Sea)
- Holding NATO war exercises on Russia's borders
- Withdrawing from the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty

These and many other provocations suggested by Rand have, in fact, been implemented. For example, NATO conducted massive war exercises dubbed "**Defender 2021**" right up to Russia's border. NATO has started "**patrolling**" the Black Sea and engaging in **provocative intrusions** into Crimean waters. The U.S. has withdrawn from the INF Treaty.

Since 2008, when NATO "**welcomed**" the membership aspirations of Ukraine and Georgia, Russia has said this would cross a red line and threaten its security. In recent years NATO has provided advisers, training and ever increasing amounts of military hardware. While Ukraine is not a formal member of NATO, it has increasingly been treated like one. The [full Rand report](#) says "*While NATO's requirement for unanimity makes it unlikely that Ukraine could gain membership in the foreseeable future, Washington's pushing this possibility could boost Ukrainian resolve while leading Russia to redouble its efforts to forestall such a development.*"

The alternative, which could have prevented or at least forestalled the current Russian intervention in Ukraine, would have been to declare Ukraine ineligible for NATO. But this would have been contrary to the U.S. intention of deliberately stressing, provoking and threatening Russia.

### **Ukraine as US client**

In November 2021, the U.S. and Ukraine signed a [Charter on Strategic Partnership](#). This agreement confirmed Ukrainian aspirations to join NATO and rejection of the Crimean peoples decision to re-unify with Russia following the 2014 Kiev coup. The agreement signaled a consolidation of Washington's economic, political and military influence.

### **December 2021 Russia red lines followed by military action**

In December 2021, Russia proposed a **treaty** with the U.S. and NATO. The central Russian proposal was a written agreement that Ukraine would not join the NATO military alliance.

When the proposed treaty was rebuffed by Washington, it seems the die was cast. On February 21, Putin delivered a [speech](#) detailing their grievances. On February 24, Putin delivered [another speech](#) announcing the justification and objectives of the military intervention to "demilitarize" and "denazify" Ukraine.

As Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov later said, "*This is not about Ukraine. This is the end result of a policy that the West has carried out since the early 1990's.*"

### **Afghanistan again?**

As earlier indicated, the Rand report assesses the costs and benefits of various U.S. actions. It is considered a “benefit” if increased U.S. assistance to Ukraine results in the loss of Russian blood and resources. Speculating on the possibility of Russian troop presence in Ukraine, the report suggests that it could become *“quite controversial at home, as it did when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan.”* (pg. 99 of full report)

That historical reference is significant. Beginning in 1979, the U.S. and Saudi Arabia funded and trained sectarian foreign fighters to invade and destabilize the progressive Afghan government. The goals were to overthrow the socialist inclined government and lure the Soviet Union into supporting the destabilized government. It achieved these Machiavellian goals at the cost of millions of Afghan citizens whose country has never been the same.

It appears that Ukrainian citizens are similarly being manipulated to serve US goals.

#### **A “disadvantageous peace settlement”**

The Rand report says, *“Increasing U.S. military aid would certainly drive up the Russian costs, but doing so could also increase the loss of Ukrainian lives and territory or result in a disadvantageous peace settlement.”*

But who would a peace settlement be *“disadvantageous”* for? Ukrainian lives and territory are currently being lost. Over fourteen thousand Ukrainian lives have been lost in the eastern Donbass region since the 2014 coup.

A peace settlement that guaranteed basic rights for all Ukrainians and state neutrality in the rivalry of big powers, would be advantageous to most Ukrainians. It is only the U.S. foreign policy establishment including the US military media industrial complex and Ukrainian ultra-nationalists who would be “disadvantaged”.

Since Ukraine is a multi-ethnic state, it would seem best to accept that reality and find a compromise national solution which facilitates all Ukrainians. Being a client of a distant foreign power is not in Ukraine’s national best interest.

The Rand report shows how U.S. policy focuses on actions to hurt Russia and manipulates third party countries (Ukraine) toward that task.

The world’s energy markets need Russian oil and no producer can replace it, United Arab Emirates (UAE) Minister of Energy Suhail al-Mazrouei said on Monday.

Russia produces some 10 million barrels of oil a day, which makes it a critical member of the OPEC+ energy alliance, al-Mazrouei explained during an energy forum in Dubai.

*“Leaving the politics aside, that volume is needed today,”* he insisted, adding that *“unless someone is willing to come and deliver that amount, we don’t see that someone can substitute Russia.”*

Russia is the world's second biggest crude exporter after Saudi Arabia. Following Russia's military operation in Ukraine, some nations, led by the U.S., have pledged to stop buying Russian oil and gas. The United States, Europe, and others have been calling on Gulf Arab oil producers to ramp up production and help bring down crude prices, which at one point shot above \$120 a barrel.

The International Energy Agency announced earlier this month that it had decided to release 60 million barrels of oil from its emergency reserves, saying that global oil markets were already tight with highly volatile prices and commercial inventories at their lowest level since 2014.

Many have expressed doubts, however, about whether it was possible to ditch Russia's energy resources.

Last week, the EU stepped back from imposing an embargo on Russian crude and petroleum products, despite pressure from the U.S. An immediate embargo on Russia's fossil fuels *"from one day to the next would mean plunging our country and the whole of Europe into a recession,"* German Chancellor Olaf Scholz said last week. Europe gets nearly 30% of its crude and roughly 50% of its petroleum products from Russia.

Reducing dependence on natural gas – something that the EU hopes to achieve over the next few years – may prove difficult as well. Qatar – which holds the third-largest natural gas reserves in the world – said last week that it was practically impossible to replace Russian gas on the European market, as between 30 and 40% of the total volume of gas supplied to the world market comes from Russia.

The late Dr. Jack Van Impe decades ago said World War III would be fought over energy resources. As the world stares into the abyss, it will not be long before it is over!

Blessings,

Pastor Bob, [EvanTeachr@aol.com](mailto:EvanTeachr@aol.com)  
[www.pastorbobreid.com](http://www.pastorbobreid.com)